

**STATE OF ALASKA  
COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT**

**DRAFT MINUTES OF FUNDING MEETING FOR FY2008  
June 7, 8 & 9, 2007**

**Hampton Inn  
4301 Credit Union Drive  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**Thursday, June 7, 2007**

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

Chair Janna Stewart called the quarterly meeting of the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault to order at 8:30 a.m. Six Council members were present at roll call.

**Council members present:** Janna Stewart, Public Member; Cathy Satterfield (for Rick Svobodny), Department of Law; Audie Holloway, Department of Public Safety (DPS); Ann House, Public Member; Bill Hogan, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Health & Social Services; Kim Williams, Public Member

**Council member absent:** Barbara Thompson

**Council staff present:** Chris Ashenbrenner, Executive Director (listened in on the first day, attended June 8 & 9), Joanne Griggs, Administrative Manager; Ella Nierra, Administrative Assistant; Theresa Woelk, Associate Coordinator (by teleconference); Michael Hildebrand, Statistical Technician (by teleconference)

The Chair noted that Chris Ashenbrenner was confirmed as the Executive Director of the CDVSA, however, Chris was ill and would not be attending this day of the meeting.

**Others present or on teleconference during the three-day meeting:** Peggy Brown, Alaska Network on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault; Ginger Baim, SAFE (Dillingham); Brenda Stanfill, IAC (Fairbanks); Tish Raub and Susan Killary, KWRCC (Kodiak); Dragon London and Kelly Jenks, WISH (Ketchikan); Marianna Keil, Melissa Stone and Dixie Landenburger, SCS (Seward); Octavia Thompson and Rowena Palomar, AVV (Valdez); Judy Cordell, Suzi Pearson and Tim Dee, AWAIC (Anchorage); Cheri Smith and Sue Best, LeeShore Center (Kenai); Saralyn Tabachnick, Ann Ropp and Rachael Helf, AWARE (Juneau); Donn Bennice and Judy Gette, AFS (Palmer); Michelle DeWitt, TWC (Bethel); Peg Coleman, SPHH (Homer); Nancy Haag, STAR (Anchorage); Chris Bauman, SAFV (Sitka); Rosalie Nadeau, Diane Ogilvie and Pam Wilmoth-Schaf, AWRC-Akeela (Anchorage); Michelle Dakai, MFCC (Kotzebue); Lynn Crane, USAFV (Unalaska); Nicole Songer,

CFRC (Cordova); **Linda Stanford** and **Mary Ann Warden**, AWIC (Barrow); **Debbie Patton** and **Jasmine Stewart**, KIC (Ketchikan); **Janet Ahmasuk**, BSWG (Nome); **Susan Bomalaski** and **Susie Delgado**, Catholic Social Services (Anchorage); **Kimberly Elias**, Providence Valdez Counseling Center; **Katie TePas**, Alaska State Troopers - Support

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

Chair Stewart invited Council members and those people sitting in for absent Council members to introduce themselves. Cathy Satterfield from the Department of Law was sitting in for Deputy Attorney General Richard Svobodny.

The Chair also asked people present in the audience to identify themselves by name and organization.

## **COUNCIL CONFLICT INQUIRY**

Chair Janna Stewart asked if any Council members had a conflict of interest to declare for any items on this meeting's agenda that require a decision. She said that Kim Williams submitted a letter to the chair a few days ago reiterating her general role in the Dillingham community. She said the Council had discussed this issue previously and determined that Williams did not have a conflict because she did not have direct oversight with the actual Council-funded program in Dillingham. She indicated that there would be no conflict at this meeting for those purposes.

Chair Stewart questioned Audie Holloway about his previous position on the board of Abused Women's Aid In Crisis (AWAIC) in Anchorage. Holloway confirmed that his association with AWAIC did not impair his ability to make a determination about AWAIC's funding.

There were no further questions about conflicts, and the Chair determined that there were no conflicts that would prevent any board members from voting on any of the funding decisions.

## **ACCEPTANCE OR REVISION OF AGENDA**

Chair Stewart indicated that the Program Summary Reports, the CDVSA Executive Director Report, and Discussion of the Chair would be moved to later in the meeting because of the executive director's absence today.

## **APPROVE MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2007 CDVSA MEETING**

Cathy Satterfield corrected the spelling of her first name in the minutes.

BILL HOGAN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE

MARCH 23, 2007 MEETING AS AMENDED. KIM WILLIAMS SECONDED.

Peggy Brown mentioned that "Senator Olsen" on page 10 should be spelled "Olson."

The motion passed unanimously.

### **PROGRAM SUMMARY REPORTS FOR THE THIRD QUARTER OF FISCAL YEAR 2007**

The various program quarterly reports for the period January 1 to March 31, 2007 were included in the meeting packet that was given to Council members in advance of the meeting.

### **CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATION (CIVIL RIGHTS) 05-02**

Jo Griggs, CDVSA Administrative Manager, reported that the CDVSA is required to give every program that receives federal funding the information that they are required to have a person in their office who is responsible for accepting any civil rights complaints and forwarding them on to the appropriate federal agency.

### **NETWORK (ANDVSA) REPORT**

Peggy Brown, executive director of the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, said the programs will be telling the Council over the next two days about enormous health insurance cost increases. The Network itself has experienced a 17% increase in health insurance. As programs struggle to address this issue, most of them are requiring their employees to contribute part of the insurance premiums. This makes it difficult for programs to keep staff and pay them market-driven wages and provide health insurance.

Brown stated that the Network's summer meeting will be in Bethel on August 13-16, 2007. They will be looking at core services and the cost of doing business. The hope is to inform the Council by fall what those numbers are. If the Council chooses to request increased funding from the Legislature it will have solid data to back up the request.

The Network has learned that one batterers intervention program is not going to be able to do safety checks. An emerging issue to begin looking at is the batterers intervention funding, which has not changed in quite a few years.

Brown said she and Chris are gathering names put forth by the programs for the upcoming public member vacancy on the Council, in order to make recommendations to the Governor.

Brown reported that the Network received CDVSA funding for training and went through a burst of training this spring. They were able to include people and topics that had not

be covered for a while — sexual assault response team (SART), disabilities, some prevention work, and legal work. Trisha Gentle, a consultant from Washington, D.C. and a former CDVSA executive director, will be working with people around the state to ascertain resources and gaps in services for victims of sexual assault. Gentle's findings are expected by the end of July.

The Network is working with the Governor's Council on Disabilities and the University of Alaska to get a disabilities grant, expected to be \$750,000 for three years.

Brown said the Network staff and CDVSA staff are doing amazing work on the database and working with the programs in a helpful and informative way. She indicated that all parties involved appreciated that.

On behalf of the Network body and programs, Brown thanked Janna Stewart for her service on the Council. She said Stewart has taken the CDVSA through some difficult times, and they all appreciate her leadership and guidance. They will miss her greatly.

Bill Hogan asked for more information on the disabilities grant. Brown said the grant is to work with victims of violence who also have disabilities. The focus is on physical disabilities, but they will try to also work with developmental disabilities. The root of the grant is to develop a curriculum that will work for not only advocacy providers, but disability providers like SAIL, so they are cross-trained. It is an underserved population. The Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority had paid for a survey several years ago and the only data they could find on victims who had disabilities was through CDVSA reports from the programs.

Chair Stewart stated that she was very interested in the Network's survey of core services. The previous Department of Public Safety commissioner had wanted to determine what services existed in communities and what services needed to be supplemented. She noted that there is a great disparity in domestic violence services available around the state, and it is unclear if that is because somebody fought hard to get services in a particular community while another community lacked that impetus. When reviewing program requests for funding, Council members see some great "Cadillac" programs and say those services are also needed there, there and there around the state. If the Council does not fund everybody fully it is not because the services are not good but because resources are short, and so far there has been no way to equalize things around the state. She said she hoped the Council would be able to talk about the Network's survey of core services in the context of a discussion about using other funds to do some kind of an evaluation model.

Brown said the most difficult thing is to define core services, but they are looking for some commonalities that define core services. Programs have tailored services to fit a particular community, and the challenge is to get a good picture of how much things cost related to other programs. The Network's effort is at least a start.

In closing, Brown stated that it is an honor and a privilege working with Chris Ashenbrenner. They are on the phone every day, and their working relationship is amazing. It is obvious how this cooperation lessens the workload for different agencies.

Chair Stewart said if there was no objection the Council would begin hearing funding proposal presentations early and break for Public Comment at the appropriate time on the agenda.

### **VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS**

Fiscal year 2008 is the first year of a CDVSA two-year funding cycle. Chair Stewart said three minutes were allowed for oral presentations, followed by up to 15 minutes for Council questions and answers. Programs would then have two minutes for final comments.

*[Details of the presentations are available on tape and kept on file at the CDVSA Office.]*

#### **Kotzebue - MFCC**

##### **Maniilaq Association - Family Crisis Center**

Presenter: Michelle Dakai (program director)

FY07 Award .....	\$300,000
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$419,983

#### *Questions/answers after presentation:*

Chair Stewart asked where the requested increase would go in MFCC's budget. Dakai replied that they are typically overspent, so the increase would go to recruit and train more volunteers. There are many people in the community who would like to assist but they don't know how. MFCC wants to go in that direction, especially with setting up the thrift shop. Part of the request would go to increase the salary for the new supervisor, Denette Perry, who has extensive experience. They would also like to add an advocate position and increase the part-time legal advocate to a full-time position because there is a need for that.

House asked what type of training MFCC intended to do. Dakai indicated she did not know the specifics but that Denette Perry has done education in the past 12 years and will be bringing those things forward. House asked if Perry has specific skills in advocating prevention. Dakai said yes.

Hogan inquired how MFCC has involved other agencies in the community in planning for services. He said he did not see any evidence of involvement with the Violent Crimes Compensation Board (VCCB) and asked for a comment on that.

Dakai said that MFCC is working closer with the behavioral health services through Maniilaq to partner those services for the families in a more streamlined way. The other partnerships that are stronger in the community are law enforcement and State

Troopers. Moving forward with the multi-disciplinary team approach is creating a stronger network that way. Regarding the second question, MFCC refers every victim to the VCCB. She admitted that she did not know a great deal about the VCCB but was in the learning process. She said when she asked how many people go forward with receiving that kind of compensation she was told that when MFCC encounters a lot of victims they are not ready to go forward with those steps. However, MFCC is working toward the follow-up and encouraging and readdressing those issues at that time.

Williams asked if Maniilaq's behavioral health services have family service workers in every community so that MFCC has someone to work with in the individual communities. Dakai said yes, that is imperative. The behavioral health system has village-based counselors in each village. Behavioral health services is responsible for their training and education, but MFCC has been recently invited to their upcoming training to provide advocacy and awareness so that the counselors can work with the safe home providers to provide follow-up services to the victims and to the providers themselves because they experience the same type of trauma when they deal with a victim.

Satterfield requested more information about MFCC's SART program. Dakai said their SART coordinator is Jackie Egan, and the children's advocacy center is working. They have done 10 or 12 successful cases where all the players are at the table, the child is telling their story one time, and it is a good system. Egan is dedicated and striving to obtain the services that victims need right away. Satterfield asked if Egan worked for CDC. Dakai said Egan works for Maniilaq. Egan is not a nurse, but there are two nurses on the multi-disciplinary team and a board-certified forensic pediatric examiner from the hospital. Satterfield said she was noticing in the budget that the salary for that position was quite a bit higher than even the program director's salary. Dakai said Maniilaq's salary structure is based on years of experience.

Holloway said that MFCC's grant application mentioned problems in contacting with the MBT(?) coordinator. Dakai stated that they have established a single point contact on-call phone number so that kind of situation does not occur in the future.

Regarding fiscal management, Hogan said he did not see any evidence of an audit since 2005 and asked why there wasn't a more recent audit. Dakai responded that she did not have a good reason but surmised that Maniilaq had the audit in 2005, got the report in 2006, and then set up the next audit in 2007 that would occur in 2008. She did not think that was completely effective, but it was the best answer she had to give.

Satterfield asked if the CDVSA had done an on-site evaluation of the Maniilaq program. Dakai said not that she knew of, but Linda Hoven had asked if she could visit the program at the end of August.

Williams asked Dakai to describe her evaluation and planning within the program. Dakai said the evaluation has been talking to staff and getting a better understanding of the

services they are currently providing and where they are going with those services. They have established the same kind of evaluation with the multi-disciplinary team, asking the community members where they see shortcomings and how to make improvements. The next step is to go to the Elders Council and begin that specific dialog because they believe changes will not occur unless there is community buy-in. Once Denette Perry is aboard, Dakai said she would like to see a survey of the communities to get feedback on that kind of thing.

Chair Stewart encouraged Dakai to use the resources sitting in the room because MFCC is new coming into the CDVSA funding process. There are other communities with very similar geographic isolation issues, cost issues, and multiple tribal issues that MFCC could tap into.

Dakai had two minutes for closing comments.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Stewart asked if there was anyone present in Anchorage or on line who wished to make public comment. There was no one.

### **VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS (Continued)**

#### **Valdez - AVV**

#### **Advocates for Victims of Violence**

Presenter: Octavia Thompson (executive director), accompanied by Rowena Palomar

FY07 Award ..... \$269,576

FY08 Core Services Grant Request..... \$275,446

#### *Questions/answers after presentation:*

Williams said she was surprised that AVV's requested increase was only \$5,870, given how utilities costs have gone up. She noted that both AVV and the Cordova program serve the community of Tatitlek, and she wondered how they get there when travel costs have gone up. Thompson replied that she traveled to Tatitlek in November 2006, and it was one of the most moving experiences of her professional career. They normally have to "beg, steal and borrow" to get there, and she was lucky to catch a ride on a boat that Chugachmiut chartered to Tatitlek to do a training.

Williams asked how much more money AVV would need "in a perfect dream world" to serve rural communities outside of Valdez. Thompson said it costs \$1,200 to \$2,000 to charter a boat round trip to Tatitlek. Williams inquired how AVV provides core services without the money to make these trips. Thompson said mostly by telephone and emails. She added that they have several community members from Tatitlek who also live in Valdez and go back and forth. These people are very strong within the community and have been helpful in getting AVV into the schools and providing staff with a place to stay while there.

Satterfield requested clarification about the healthcare item in the budget, given Thompson's earlier statement that AVV has a high staff turnover because they don't provide health benefits. Thompson replied that AVV does not provide health insurance but they will reimburse employees for a percentage of healthcare expenses after an employee has paid for a service. Satterfield asked what positions have not seen turnover since Thompson joined AVV. Thompson said she started as the direct services coordinator in 2005 and became executive director after Marcia Robertson left. She said Rowena Palomar is in her fourth year with AVV and is the most senior person at the center. Palomar added that during her tenure she has been through 3-1/2 executive directors. Thompson said AVV had to replace the direct services coordinator position when she was promoted, the youth services coordinator position has lapsed, and the CDC Delta person moved on to Arizona. So there is basically a full change in the services staff. Satterfield asked if the turnover is attributable to people leaving Valdez. Thompson said no, that AVV has to compete with quite high salaries for tourism jobs in Valdez. AVV advocates get paid \$10-\$12 an hour, while high school students can get \$15-\$18 an hour working at hotels.

Satterfield commended AVV for maintaining great youth programs for years. She inquired about the Trust Walk Youth Camp and the cost of kayaking guides, etc. Thompson said the majority of that position is covered by the City of Valdez. The budget item is not necessarily for the kayaking equipment but for insurance and liability.

Satterfield asked how many volunteers AVV uses. Palomar explained that they have a volunteer they can call to fix mechanical things, there are student volunteers, and there are 20-25 regular volunteers from the community that may change over time. She added that it is so easy to get volunteers in Valdez, that if the center needs something people are right there. Thompson said AVV works closely within the Valdez School District, and volunteers come from the different programs. Satterfield noted that AVV's proposal showed volunteer staff for FY02 so it sounded like AVV was continuing to use them. She added that using volunteers is really important, and she especially noted the hairdresser volunteer.

Satterfield recalled that AVV held some large fundraisers in the early 2000s that helped pay off the building mortgage. She asked if AVV has been able to continue doing those fundraisers. Palomar said they have one coming in October called "Women of Distinction." Thompson said they just did a membership drive within the last couple of weeks that went very well.

Satterfield inquired if there were any findings from the fiscal audit a year ago. Palomar said no. She added that AVV is expecting another audit the third week of October. Satterfield asked about the CDVSA audit. Thompson said that was in August 2006. Satterfield asked about AVV's status for compliance with the recommendations. Thompson replied that they are in full compliance with the recommendations, and they have to reply to CDVSA by June 30.

Chair Stewart asked about the number of shelter beds and the number of safe homes. Thompson said the shelter has seven beds, and there are currently two safe homes in Glennallen. They have sort of a safe home in Valdez, which is used on the rare occasion that a male client contacts AVV.

House stated that she found the Teen Talk program interesting and commendable. Thompson confirmed that Teen Talk has been operating for nine years and, due to teen interest in participating early, they sometimes break it into younger teens and older teens because they have totally different issues. Kids can start attending at the Teen Center after they pass out of sixth grade. House said she found it interesting and unusual that AVV charges the guests \$2 a night and thought taking that responsibility is good. Thompson clarified that the \$2 charge is if the guest has the ability to pay.

Hogan mentioned that AVV's description of the program's needs seemed largely anecdotal. He asked if they had access to statistical data in Valdez and/or Glennallen, and if so, what that data was telling AVV about need. Thompson explained that they work very closely with the police department regarding statistics, as well as Providence Valdez Behavioral Health Clinic and the emergency and the State Troopers in Glennallen. Needs at the program itself have skyrocketed as far as women needing legal assistance, especially related to custody issues.

Thompson was given two minutes for closing comments.

**Fairbanks - IAC**  
**Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living**

Presenter: Brenda Stanfill (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$767,642
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$945,514

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Holloway asked for more information about the maintenance person issue. Stanfill said she took a different approach with the IAC proposal this year to really get across what their true needs were. Her "dream" would be to have a maintenance person. Right now IAC is at the whim of whomever they call, and it would be nice to have a person who actually worked for the program, who cared whether the building was maintained, and who did not come in to do the same repair four times and charge for each time. IAC has three properties now: transitional housing, the old shelter building that they are still trying to figure out what it will be, and then the current facility (51,000 square feet). She has worked out a potential agreement with the person who built the building to assist IAC for another year, knowing that a maintenance person would not likely be funded this year.

Holloway asked if the rural outreach educator position was new. Stanfill said it was. IAC serves the largest service area in the state and has not had a rural outreach program in

many years. When the Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC) received STOP Grant money in 1993-94, they started doing rural outreach. At that time, IAC experienced a large decrease in funding, so they pulled back on the rural outreach because TCC was doing it well. About four years ago TCC lost their rural outreach money for travel and staffing, etc., and IAC had been partnering with them to get outreach done. Since then IAC partnered a couple of times with CDVSA on their rural grants and wrote a grant of their own but have not been successful in receiving rural travel and outreach monies. IAC has done some work by telephone and been able to go out to some road system villages, and a few villages have actually paid for IAC to come in. But in terms of a real rural outreach program, they are struggling.

Holloway inquired if there were any volunteers in those communities to step up and do some of the outreach. Stanfill said the challenge is the need to have somebody who can do the outreach to get the volunteers in the community, a person who knows the community and knows who to call. IAC does not have that knowledge. They are working with Public Health right now to see if they can piggyback with them. So they are looking at a lot of different ways to solve the gap, but right now they do not have anyone who even knows the communities.

Chair Stewart asked for more detail about the working relationship with the court system, the domestic violence protective order model, and advocacy. Stanfill stated that the working relationship between the legal advocate at the shelter and the court system is very good. IAC's legal advocate is used quite extensively to go for court representation and to work in partnership with Alaska Legal Services. The legal advocate located in the courthouse, which is funded through a federal grant, has been a challenge for IAC. The court system does not seem to understand why the legal advocate cannot serve both parties. The court system feels that unless IAC can come up with a different place to send the perpetrator that they cannot have the legal advocate in the courthouse. IAC continues to work hard to figure out how to work with the court system on how to fit that person in with their expectation of an unbiased person located there. IAC is biased toward the victim and always will be. It is a little bit different than what the court system thought they were getting.

Hogan commended IAC for having very comprehensive, thorough explanations of goals and objectives. He said one of his concerns has been around the goals and objectives focusing primarily on the *number* of meetings, calls, sessions, etc. He noted in the evaluation and planning section that IAC talked about client outcomes, particularly related to clients experiencing a feeling of safety and decrease of fear. He commended IAC for the focus on client outcomes, which is really what this is all about. He asked how IAC incorporates those true client outcomes into the planning for additional services.

Stanfill stated that there are a lot of outcomes that IAC would like to track, and sometimes figuring out the method to track them has been challenging. Outcome measures like what things made people feel safe or unsafe were used extensively when

they were planning the new facility — if there were people who said they were abused at the shelter, was it because they were sharing a room with someone? That is how they came up with private rooms with a lock on the door. In terms of planning services, one of the challenges is to come up with an outcome of the service. Sometimes the perceivable outcome of a service that IAC provides now doesn't happen until later, and IAC may not necessarily still be involved with them. So IAC is working on ways to track whether they are changing patterns. They ask people to fill out some evaluations about what they learned, and IAC is reviewing especially based-based things to see if the curriculum is correct and something that clients can understand. So right now the outcomes are narrow focused because that is what IAC can get their hands on, but they have books on evaluation, planning and outcomes, etc. to figure out how to do some longer-term tracking and what that will look like in light of confidentiality. A lot of people 10 years down the road just want to forget that they were ever a victim of violence, and that presents a challenge for IAC in getting long-term outcomes of programs.

House asked how IAC intended to spend the requested increase. Stanfill said the two biggest things are health insurance increases (\$18,641, a 16%-17% increase expected), and the shelter switched to natural gas and then were notified of a 24% increase for natural gas in the Fairbanks area (\$7,200 minimum). Those are two expenses that IAC cannot shuffle anywhere. Because they are operating on such a tight budget right now those two increases represent having to cut a full-time position. The other two requests, for a rural outreach person and associated travel money, and for a maintenance person, are new positions, and she realized this was not a good year for those kinds of things. The other increase was to pay the staff what she would call a semi-competitive wage in order to attract staff. It is challenging when there is an opening and they don't get an applicant. It is a struggle of juggling schedules to cover shifts when they can't find a person who is willing to work for what IAC is able to pay. Starting wage is \$11.70 an hour right now, and they really need to be starting at a minimum of \$13.00.

Satterfield noted that Stanfill is doing both the executive director and accounting functions. She asked if that was going to be long term. Stanfill replied that it has to be long term. She said the first year she took the job the program had flat funding, and she proposed to her board that with certain policy changes she could do both functions and they could still have good controls. IAC is down five full-time positions over the last eight years. The FY08 request is not asking for any of those positions back; IAC has scaled down the management team and they have taken on more responsibilities. There is no longer a shelter manager — the advocates cover that duty. So she did not foresee the accountant coming back unless something wonderful drops from the sky. The accountant position would be one of the last things she would bring back because she can do the function. However, they always think about if she were to leave they would have to make sure the accounting function was covered.

Holloway stated that IAC's proposal mentioned the difficulty in educating people in the community about sexual offenses and people being found guilty at trials. He asked if

IAC was working with any other agencies to help in that regard. Stanfill replied that IAC just started something. A couple of months ago they sat through a trial where a judge said to the man who had raped a drunk woman and who had admitted to having sex this way at least a hundred other times that he didn't see him as a predator but as an opportunist. So IAC has worked with the faith-based domestic violence task force, and this group is taking on sexual assault court watch. IAC thought that if it were done from their agency it could be attributed to "the radical feminist women who just have issues," but this way it is done by an unbiased group that will track every sexual assault in the community through to the end. Donations will fund putting information out to the community because it will take some kind of media keeping it going to really get the community involved. The hope is that the district attorney's office will beef up how they do their expert witnessing. It is imperative to educate the jury during a trial when people are found not guilty because all the information was not presented or the defense put on a great expert witness who did not say anything accurate but there was no clarifying rebuttal. So IAC is doing a lot of work in that area but trying to do it in partnership with other agencies where it comes out to the community different.

Stanfill had two minutes for closing comments. She stressed that IAC's proposal relayed the program's true needs at this point in time but not the true needs in the larger picture. If a program only asks for \$20,000 because they know there is a small pot of money, the Council may award \$10,000 believing it has funded half of that program's need. So while this is a time of limited funds, IAC has asked for the true need but knowing this is not a good year. IAC has worked hard to diversify its funding sources by bringing in other programs where it can shift some of the operating costs. One example is job trainings that will be starting soon. IAC is down to 45% CDVSA funded, and the FY08 request would bring that up to 55%.

The Chair called a break from 10:00 to 10:20 a.m.

**Anchorage - STAR  
Standing Together Against Rape**

Presenter: Nancy Haag (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$487,789
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$761,637

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Williams asked how the increased grant request would be spent. Haag said STAR would like to increase the number of direct care advocates who respond to a SART (sexual assault response team) call-out on a 24-hour basis. They want to expand the education department because currently the requests for education are three and four months out. STAR was able to reach approximately 8,000 children in the Anchorage School District, but there are 40,000 yet to reach. One-time funding from the municipality for SART call-outs is going away this year. Part of the increase would also be for administrative support, including paying for part of the executive director's salary.

Williams asked further for some dollar figures to go with the priorities. Haag said the staffing piece would be about \$200,000 and would include increasing fringe benefit costs like health insurance. Replacement of the SART program was \$50,000.

House inquired how STAR intended to expand the education program. Haag stated that they have the curriculum developed for each age group, but they need more bodies providing the information to the students. STAR is working with the YMCAs and Boys and Girls Clubs for the summer.

Williams asked if STAR has aligned its curriculums to the state Department of Education standards. Haag said yes, that they work closely with Carol Comeau, the superintendent of the Anchorage School District.

Chair Stewart asked how many new direct-care advocate positions there would be and how many would be going from part-time to full-time. Haag responded that they want one new full-time direct-service advocate, two full-time educators, a part-time administrative assistant, and then they are looking at including a cares-specific advocate for children.

Satterfield requested more information about the DART Program. Haag said the program was started with funding from the CDVSA. It is designed to train service providers who work with persons with disabilities to help their clients report or understand that they can report sexual assault. One of the educators has been working with that population of service providers. She said she believes as a direct result of that STAR has had more persons with disabilities reporting sexual assault. Both the SART clinic and the Cares clinic are very responsive to that. An example was a 49-year-old woman, who was developmentally about four years old, who reported and was seen at the Cares clinic, which was much more child friendly. The police were very responsive to that need too.

Satterfield commended STAR for their volunteer program and their excellent training. STAR's crisis line is primarily handled by volunteers in the evenings and on weekends and holidays, which is very good. Haag said technology is making that somewhat of a struggle, but the volunteers are great, and STAR wouldn't be what it is without them.

Chair Stewart observed that for almost everybody else technology is making things easier, so she wondered why Haag said it was making things harder for STAR. Haag stated that confidentiality of people who call the crisis line is of utmost importance to STAR. Many people have caller ID on their phone and how difficult is it to remove that during the time of the crisis line. The other issue is that a lot of people are going away from land lines to cellular phones. It is not very welcoming for the person calling the crisis line for the responder to pick up the phone and be in Fred Meyer. There are also a lot of dropped calls with cell phones. So those are the technical issues in terms of having a caller feel safe and protected and heard when calls are dropped, when numbers show up on caller ID, etc.

Satterfield asked how STAR is addressing those concerns. Haag said they are still researching solutions, including assisting volunteers in having a land line so the call can be transferred (because a lot of people don't want that expense anymore). Haag indicated they are looking at a lot of options in order to continue the crisis line.

Chair Stewart inquired how many volunteers don't have land lines. Haag said they are all required to have lines, so they do. There are approximately 45 volunteers who man the crisis lines, and STAR has lost volunteers who have chosen to go away from land lines or who could not participate because they don't have a land line.

Hogan said he was intrigued by STAR's rural outreach project. He asked Haag to describe what services they provide, to what villages, and the rationale for a rural outreach project from Anchorage. Haag explained that STAR received federal funding to travel to rural Alaskan sites and provide intimate partner violence education, and in so doing also provide information to the communities about child sexual assault. One of the communities was Dutch Harbor, as well as smaller villages in the Interior and Southeast.

Hogan asked if STAR coordinates with other programs in the state that have responsibility for those villages. Haag said STAR coordinates with the Network and sister agencies in the Network, as well as schools that may not be in the Network. They certainly try to work with the community that has invited STAR in and find natural leaders to help maintain that information.

Holloway stated that one of the groups that law enforcement has the hardest time serving and taking care of is those with substance abuse problems. He asked if STAR is doing anything with that because it is very hard to keep up with that particular group of victims. Haag agreed that it is a very hard population to track, not only substance abuse but homeless (a lot of victims of sexual assault are homeless). STAR's relationship with the Anchorage Police Department is superior, and those detectives will literally go under bridges looking for former victims of sexual assault, particularly if there is a court case pending. So STAR works with the police in keeping track of their clients. STAR has also done a presentation at the Bean's Cafe to stay connected to former clients of STAR and so people know how to contact the program when they need it. Holloway indicated that Haag had answered his question to some degree, but he was hoping there was more that could be done.

Haag was given two minutes in closing and shared some comments from Anchorage high school students that followed a presentation dealing with victim blaming. She also described how STAR has participated in developing the triage criteria that the police use to identify whether there should be a SART call-out. STAR is experiencing greater coordination of services, both legally and medically. The SART center, the Care center, the Anchorage Police Department, and the Alaska State Troopers are working on a plan to co-locate in a facility to better serve and empower victims.

**Bethel - TWC**

**Tundra Women's Coalition**

Presenter: Michelle DeWitt (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$746,133
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$827,564

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Responding to Chair Stewart's question, DeWitt stated that TWC did not fill the community outreach position and the legal advocate position because they could not afford to fill them, not because there were no applicants.

Satterfield stated that TWC's letters of support were very heartfelt and testimony to the good work that TWC is doing in Bethel, and she enjoyed reading them.

Addressing her comment to all the programs, Chair Stewart said that she does not pay much attention to a form support letter that has been signed by 15 agencies. But once in a while a particular letter or quote from a kid makes her heart stop.

Chair Stewart stated that she was very concerned about DeWitt's report that TWC has 43% less staff than 10 years ago and that there are unfilled positions. She said the question is whether TWC is trying to do more than can be done.

DeWitt replied that TWC has a reputation for actually delivering services, and she is proud of that. People who come to TWC don't get a referral to somewhere else and that's it — they get a product. Saying no is a difficult place to go for TWC because there are already a lot of "no's" and "can't's" in the region and the community. So, absolutely, TWC is trying to do too much right now with too few people, and she planned to address that in closing. But these things are directly related to TWC's mission and what they are supposed to be doing. It is hard to deny, but they are in that place now.

Chair Stewart said she was a district attorney in Bethel at one time, and Bethel now has four court rooms, etc. So other agencies that are related to domestic violence practices in the Bethel area have increased dramatically, and yet TWC has gone the other direction. She said something is wrong with the picture, but she did not mean DeWitt personally.

DeWitt pointed out that the CDVSA funding is only about half TWC's total budget, and they have diversified their funding sources so much. The CDVSA funding increases go to keep the doors open; it is all operations and health insurance and commercial insurance. Some years ago they were paying about \$20,000 a year in utilities, and they are paying about \$86,000 this year. Unfortunately, when they write new grants — and other folks will say the same thing — they tend to be for new programs and new positions. So there will be bodies in the building but they are doing other things — for example, family preservation, which is a very specific program and not what the CDVSA

is funding. So some of the direct services, classroom work, and outreach and education are real CDVSA specific, and there aren't other places to get all that funding. However, TWC has tried and made some progress.

Regarding TWC trying to do too much and work with 56 villages, Williams asked how TWC works with YKHC (Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation) and their Behavioral Health and if TWC can tap into their family service workers. She further asked if TWC has any HIPAA (American Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996) violations with YKHC in terms of service delivery.

DeWitt said TWC can manage a lot of that through releases of information. Behavioral Health is stretched so thin in Bethel, and it is always changing, so she is not the expert to speak on that. TWC coordinates with YKHC Behavioral Health when they can. Eight behavioral health aides and a clinical supervisor will be at a TWC workshop next Monday and Tuesday, so TWC is providing education so the YKHC folks can be doing more direct service work with victims.

Williams asked if YKHC has community health reps that TWC can work with. DeWitt said they have had community health reps, and TWC still has close relationships with some former ones and some current ones. But there is only a handful. Everyone does what they can, and everyone has the best of intentions, but the resources are stretched very thin.

Hogan said he has been looking in all the proposals, when they talk about referrals, for memoranda of agreement (MOA). Regarding DeWitt's comment that things are always changing, he wondered if it would make sense to have an MOA with YKHC or some other organization so at least there would be something on paper to go back to if staff is changing so frequently that there is no real continuity. He asked for comment on that.

DeWitt stated that TWC has two different memorandums of understanding (MOU) with YKHC, but she did not include those in the funding application. Hogan said that was one of the things he was looking for. DeWitt said YKHC would say that it is very difficult for them to provide some of the follow-up due to open positions and cutbacks.

Holloway referenced TWC's report dealing with forensic interviewers and SART call-outs and said he was wondering if all that work was being as productive as it could be. He said he understood that part of it was helping victims and families, especially in the child part of it. He asked if the forensic interviews add toward building a case that either helps the family or prosecutes an offender.

DeWitt indicated she thought he was talking about TWC's children's advocacy center, which is not funded by any CDVSA dollars. It is a separate grant and a separate program with separate staffing and fairly unrelated to what she has been talking about today. She clarified that outside of the inter-office coordination, the bilingual forensic interviewer's work is not related to the CDVSA package. Her mentioning it in the grant

application was only as part of the agency overview.

Holloway asked how TWC arranged its travel to all the villages. DeWitt responded that the Lower Yukon School District asks TWC to go to every school in the district every year and pays for a portion of the travel. For example, TWC will pay an advocate's travel to and from Mountain Village, and the school district will pay for their travel out to other villages from that point. TWC will arrange with whatever air service is cheaper and that works with the required schedule. She stated that client travel is the larger amount of the travel costs. TWC pays to fly a lot of people to Bethel every year for immediate safety — it is about 136 this year so far — and flights are getting more expensive with rising fuel costs. But getting someone to a safe place, if necessary, is primary to TWC's mission. Big families require chartering a plane; smaller families, it depends on which airline comes next to the village.

Holloway asked if the air service vendors work with TWC. DeWitt replied that they work with TWC very, very well.

Chair Stewart inquired if TWC has a safe home network. DeWitt said no, that they do not necessarily have established safe homes. She knows that Emmonak Women's Shelter has some established in the Lower Yukon region. TWC worked on a safe home project years ago, holding workshops in communities and talking to people, and in every community people were scared to be thought of as an established safe home. They did not feel there was enough law enforcement protection for them if people knew they were the designated safe home. People felt that folks kind of know who is safe and trustworthy that they can go to in the community, so there is an informal network of safe homes in the Delta.

House commented that if she had a big company she would want DeWitt to manage it. A 43% decrease in staffing is wonderful, but TWC needs it now.

Holloway asked about TWC's relationship with the VPSOs (village public safety officers). DeWitt said she felt it was reasonable. VPSOs have a lot of turnover, but TWC has regular phone conversations with the ones who have been around for quite a while and come for TWC trainings every year. When turnover occurs it takes a while to establish relationships with the new people. She said that as law enforcement officers they coordinate well with TWC.

Chair Stewart inquired about what is happening in Emmonak, which the CDVSA stopped funding two years ago. DeWitt said she was not the best person to talk about Emmonak because she was not aware enough of what they are able to provide. She just knew that Emmonak was providing some services, doing the best they can with what they've got. She has tried to touch base with shelter director Lynn Hootch a couple of times but they haven't connected.

In closing, DeWitt said TWC is essentially past capacity. Each year she has reported to

the Council that TWC was close to having to tell people no, close to not being able to fulfill requests. And this was the year that they started having to say no. It is not for lack of diversifying funding, because they have. The FY08 proposal is nuts-and-bolts funding to serve their mission in the most basic way, nothing bright and shiny, no bells and whistles. She worries about the spirit of the program, and the spirit is what keeps her and the staff motivated to continue working at TWC. The letters of support are very rewarding to them. But she has never in her ten years at TWC seen the level of strain that she and the staff are experiencing, so she is concerned about morale and about being able to fulfill what they are there to do. The requested funding would allow TWC to re-establish its basic capacity and get back to a level playing field where they were a couple of years ago - but not to the level of 10 years ago. DeWitt said she also is working on a capital project for a new building on purchased land.

**Cordova - CFRC**

**Cordova Family Resource Center**

Presenter: Nicole Songer (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$87,964
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$92,362

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Hogan said he was impressed with the number and content of CFRC's memoranda of agreement and the good job they've done with the bullying program. He said he got the sense from both the written proposal and the verbal presentation that CFRC serves as a one-stop shop in Cordova, and that is admirable. He said his only concern was about not having an independent audit, although he guessed that was because of the lower dollar amount of grants.

Songer confirmed that the state requirement for an independent audit is a \$300,000 grant and the federal requirement is \$500,000. CFRC had an audit with very favorable outcomes as she was starting as executive director three years ago.

Hogan suggested that it is probably a good practice to have an audit, maybe not every year but at least on a regular basis, even though it is not required.

Williams asked Songer to explain the services to Chenega and Tatitlek. Songer said CFRC tries to fly there twice a year; they were out to both Chenega and Tatitlek in April 2007 with the traveling health fair, which is also sponsored by Alyeska. They travel around the Prince William Sound and are gone for about 8-10 days providing service and education. CFRC also has the 24-hour hotline, which is an 800 number so those communities can call in. They have provided education and prevention in the schools. Mr. and Mrs. Palmer and Mr. and Mrs. Gee in those two communities have asked CFRC to visit. In April both communities asked CFRC to do "good touch, bad touch" which they have renamed to "three kinds of touches" and use the Pennsylvania Coalition training curriculum. In Tatitlek during that presentation over three-quarters of the children disclosed that there had been something going on in their community. Not

as much in Chenega Bay. CFRC usually flies to Tatitlek. When there was an Office of Children's Services worker in Cordova in the past, when there was an infant learning program that would service those areas (no longer happening), and when there was a WIC (Women, Infants and Children) program, which is now serviced out of Valdez, CFRC would share the charter flight and it would be about \$200 for each organization or about \$800 per round trip to Tatitlek. It is about \$500 round trip to Chenega Bay. CFRC shared the last trip to Chenega Bay with Alonka(?) Clinic, which sent someone to do some education.

House asked for more information about the peer program. Songer explained that a large part of the increased funding last year went to bring their full-time person back up to full hours after being cut to half-time. They had started the Windows Between Worlds art project, which also was a way for CFRC to get into the school, when the high school had imposed some restrictions because it did not have any other elective times. There was so much going on that the high school felt it would take away from the students. There are three peer program groups currently. Fourth through sixth grade gets art education, social skills building, peer pressure, conflict resolution, self esteem, etc. They also do that in the high school, seventh through twelfth grade, in CFRC's new renovated space that was completed in October. Then there was an opportunity to do the Windows Between Worlds project during the morning for the group of bus students that gets dropped off early, as an alternative to just hanging out until school starts. There is a new school superintendent this year, and CFRC already has in place working through the university to offer dual credit through high school and the university for a peer counseling class as an elective. They hope to have some students in the high school art project come into the class and become peer mentors. The hope is to have a hotline just for teens, managed by teens, from 7-9 on Mondays. Also, those teenagers would work with the youth in the bullying program.

Satterfield asked if CFRC still has a SART program. Songer said they do not because they do not have the medical staff to do the examinations in Cordova. CFRC has the advocates and law enforcement trained, and they escort the victims to Anchorage for an evaluation, stay with them, and accompany them back to Cordova.

Satterfield inquired about CFRC's fundraisers. Songer explained that they have two fundraisers, the spring basket auction in April with donated Easter baskets that raised about \$2,000 this year, and the biggest fundraiser in October that includes a "quarter" auction of wrapped donated items that raised over \$3,000 last fall.

Hogan said he knew that the community has had a lot of discussion about the future of the hospital in Cordova and whether it will continue to be a critical access hospital or something else. He asked if CFRC or Songer have been involved in those discussions or planning, specifically related to the SART question. Songer replied that they were involved in the discussion in the beginning, but it has taken a different road and the program is not really involved in it any longer. The doctors that were able to do SART examinations, because they are usually called to testify, and they maybe do five or nine

SART exams a year, they didn't feel comfortable that they were serving the best interests of the client to do an examination in an appropriate manner since it is evidence gathering.

Williams asked if CFRC couldn't have the SART program in terms of critical access. She thought they probably could because Bristol Bay is critical access. It means more money when it goes critical access. Songer indicated she did not know the answer.

Chair Stewart inquired how things were going with domestic violence protective orders and other issues related to the court system in Cordova. Songer said things are going well. She added that last year CFRC had reported issues with the magistrate because even though a protective order was denied he was sending the information to the perpetrator saying that an order had been served. She said that to her knowledge the magistrate has not said he is not doing that, but they are not seeing that coming through. So right now things are going as smooth as possible. CFRC lost a staff member who moved out of state and just hired a former officer who has the legal background and will be doing a lot more court watch and follow-up.

Songer was given two minutes for closing comments. She said CFRC was able to secure an internship through Exxon Mobil for just this summer and is looking to hire a young person to do one or two camps. They are exploring the notion that instead of there being nothing for teenagers to do in Cordova they may just lack funds to get a fishing pole to go out fishing, for example. She also passed out some pictures and feedback comments from projects.

### **LUNCH BREAK**

Chair Stewart recessed the meeting for lunch at 11:23 a.m. The meeting was called back to order at 1:02 p.m. to continue hearing proposals from the victim services programs for FY08 funding:

#### **Unalaska - USAFV**

#### **Unalaskans Against Sexual Assault and Family Violence**

Presenter: Lynn Crane (executive director) by teleconference

FY07 Award .....	\$132,571
FY08 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$135,802

#### *Questions/answers after presentation:*

Hogan asked Crane to describe in more detail the types of direct services she coordinates with Eastern Aleutian Tribes and the Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association (APIA). Crane replied that they have worked with APIA to coordinate some regional trainings for law enforcement and other service providers. Most of the activities with Eastern Aleutian Tribes have been making and receiving referrals. She also tries to participate when possible in a monthly teleconference with Eastern Aleutian Tribes Child and Family Task Force. There are only three communities out of the 11 in the region

that have direct flights to Unalaska. So a lot of people who are in domestic violence or sexual assault situations who need to leave their communities for safety don't actually come to Unalaska. USAFV may be coordinating with these other agencies to get the victims to a safe shelter elsewhere in the state.

Hogan said it looked like USAFV's evaluation process was sort of informal and subjective when talking to people about how well the program is doing. He asked if Crane has thought about using a more formal process like surveys or focus groups. Crane said that USAFV gives every client served an evaluation form with an opportunity to send it in anonymously; unfortunately, they do not get a lot of evaluations back. A more formal process is not something that USAFV has talked about specifically, but it is something they would be open to. The local clinic has struggled with the same issue in trying to evaluate services and get feedback from the community. When the clinic has done surveys they have been less than successful. But USAFV could work on trying to get some more concrete feedback. She said she likes to think that the community support that USAFV enjoys through its fundraising, the donations it receives, and the fact that other providers are comfortable making referrals to USAFV says a lot for how the community views the program. But she understood the need for clients to have the opportunity to give more feedback.

Chair Stewart inquired about the income from membership dues. Crane said every year USAFV does a corporate membership drive that raises about \$5,000. Then the big fundraising event that usually takes place in March every year serves food so they have to make it open to members only according to Department of Environmental Conservation rules. So the entry fee for that fundraiser is actually for purchase of a membership.

Chair Stewart commented that it sounded pretty effective. She noted that USAFV's requested increase for FY08 is quite minimal and appeared to be for higher fixed costs.

Holloway asked if USAFV pays the travel to send a victim to another center like Anchorage, and if USAFV coordinates with the shelter in the community they are sending the victim to. Crane replied that if someone has to leave the community for safety reasons USAFV will pay for that if the funds are available. They do not use CDVSA funds for that. Usually they use cash. If someone from one of the other communities, such as Adak or St. Paul, has to travel to safety, USAFV cannot use city funds for that because they are not local clients. USAFV would have to get permission from the agency to use Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association funds, and it would be compromising confidentiality. So generally they use cash funds, and they can only assist people to get as far as Anchorage because it is so expensive. A one-way ticket is about \$500.

Chair Stewart inquired about unfilled positions at USAFV and why the positions are vacant. Crane stated that all the positions are now filled. One staff member left in December 2006 but they filled that position in March. The new bookkeeper also started

in April.

Satterfield complimented Crane on USAFV's community coordination, saying she was impressed at the level of support from such a small community and the amount of fundraising they do with such a small staff. She said Crane has been doing an outstanding job in Unalaska.

Crane said she would pass that along to the staff. They have worked very hard on community coordination. There is an interagency group she started several years ago that meets once a month. There have not been that many concrete projects that have come out of it, but it has definitely increased connections among all the service providers and they can share any problems they are dealing with. It has been a very positive thing.

Regarding education and community outreach to the 11 other communities outside of Dutch Harbor, Williams asked how much money it would take for USAFV to travel. She said the proposal indicated "as funding allows," and she wanted to get to the unmet need for those communities.

Crane stated that a person cannot fly directly to Unalaska from most of those communities. Someone flying from Unalaska to Sand Point would have to fly to Anchorage first, and a roundtrip ticket would be about \$1,800, so it is pretty prohibitive. When there is training in Unalaska or Anchorage they try to bring people from the other communities to that training so they can make those connections. It would be expensive to have someone traveling to the other communities full time, and she was not sure how that would work.

Williams asked if someone in Anchorage traveled to those 11 communities for outreach. Crane said USAFV has sent people when they have received special grants, either through the CDVSA or through the Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association. Other education outreach is done through newsletters and bulk mailers, and participation in teleconferences. USAFV has done some training for Head Start providers by audio conference call and that kind of thing. There is some telemedicine happening in some of the communities now, and USAFV is looking at how they might be able to take advantage of that and coordinate some workshops using videoconferencing with the sites that have that available.

In closing, Crane asked only that people help the folks in Juneau keep the domestic violence/sexual assault issue alive and on the table because it really makes a difference to the people in the state.

**Barrow - AWIC  
Arctic Women In Crisis**

Presenter: Linda Stanford (program coordinator), accompanied by Reverend Mary Ann Warden (board chair)

FY07 Award .....	\$249,848
No Supplemental Requested .....	\$555,238

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Hogan said he noticed that utilization of AWIC's services was up nearly 50% and asked what the primary reason was for that. Stanford replied that there are many factors. The North Slope Borough is reducing jobs and funding, and it is the primary employer on the North Slope. The unemployment is creating a lot of stress. Also, drug use has increased, and meth is really a big drug on the North Slope right now. Two homicides were directly related to meth use.

Hogan asked what sorts of expectations or outcomes AWIC might have in addressing trauma with the clients it works with. Stanford explained that trauma has been one of the focuses for the clinician, who has attended several trainings and is working with the North Slope Borough Mental Health Department. The clinician is trying to address issues as quickly as possible because that helps reduce trauma. One of the other focuses is providing training for other employees across the Slope.

Hogan complimented Stanford on an excellent, well-written proposal that outlines a comprehensive program that is collaborative in nature.

Williams asked the purpose of the attachment on the Native Village of Barrow Travel Victims Assistance Grant. Stanford said it was part of AWIC's memorandum of agreement. She said it has been a really good partnership that is helping AWIC address the needs of all victims of crime, which is the primary focus of that particular grant.

Satterfield noted that there was nothing under project income in the proposal. She asked about any fundraising activities or donations from the community. Stanford said AWIC receives donations of clothing and food regularly. They have a partnership with Akita, the school for at-risk students, where the donations are taken to the store there (because space is limited at the shelter), and in return AWIC get passes for clients to go shopping there. They have attempted a couple of fundraising events that have not been real successful. They have had meetings recently to say this is something they have to revisit. They have been talking with Akita about partnering to manage the store and different things, as well as putting together a fiddling contest, etc.

Satterfield stated that many small communities like Barrow have done excellent work doing fundraising. She suggested that Stanford collaborate with sister agencies to come up with some ideas that might work in the Barrow community. It is not only to bring in a little income but it is great public awareness.

House said she noticed there is a high rate of assault in Barrow and she asked if AWIC is focusing on that directly, and if so, how. Stanford said they are in the communities a lot to provide awareness activities, they are constantly putting up posters, there are placemats at all the restaurants at least two to three times a year, they are on the radio

many times, and there was a Take Back the Night march with a good turnout. Public service announcements on the radio have been really helpful because they reach the entire Slope. AWIC is involved in the women's coalition, with legal providers, and with counselors and clinicians of the North Slope Borough Health Department.

House noted that Barrow has a 600% higher rate of incidents than any place in the state, and that is alarming. Stanford agreed that it was.

Holloway asked if AWIC provides the advocate that goes to a sexual assault investigation. Stanford said yes.

Chair Stewart said she noted what she thought was extraordinarily high expenses under commodities, although she realized it was not all from CDVSA funding — \$1,500 for medical supplies, and \$11,800 for gloves, cleaning supplies, linens and diapers. She said that appeared high for an eight-bed shelter, even in Barrow.

Stanford stated that AWIC is often over capacity, and they often send supplies out to the safe homes. The safe home nights are not counted in AWIC's numbers because they do not do the pink and blue forms. The cost of diapers is outrageous.

Chair Stewart noted \$36,400 for food and asked if that included food boxes. Stanford said yes and that towards the end of the year they are stretching Hamburger Helper and utilizing every dollar for food.

Chair Stewart asked if there are safe homes in every one of the villages. Stanford said yes.

Stanford was given two minutes for closing comments. She said AWIC is facing a crisis and will be laying off three people if they do not receive additional money. Rev. Mary Ann Warden stated that she was part of the board in Juneau when she was there. She did her internship in seminary with a shelter, and she is aware of all the problems that communities have regarding trust. How trust is established with a shelter is very important. If anything prevents the things that a shelter provides, it is hard on the victims. If the shelter has difficulty getting funds, it makes it even harder for the shelter to say anything to the victims that will help them in their plight for independence and self esteem. She applauded the way the shelter in Barrow has provided safe homes. She said Heather Dingman is working at the shelter, and it is good for young people to be visible in helping victims of any kind. Also, there is a "healthy" man on the AWIC advisory board, and it is important for people from homes with drug and substance abuse and unemployment to know that there are healthy men.

**Homer - SPHH**

**South Peninsula Haven House**

Presenter: Peg Coleman (executive director)

FY07 Award ..... \$292,195

FY08 Core Services Grant Request..... \$379,830

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield noted that Coleman did not mention much about audits in the fiscal management section of the proposal. She also asked who is responsible for SPHH bookkeeping.

Coleman said SPHH hires a CPA on contract. Also, SPHH has a yearly federal audit, and they are in full compliance. SPHH completed a CDVSA audit two years ago, and they are ready to begin another one soon. SPHH is in compliance with the CDVSA.

Holloway noted the unreported sexual assaults and at-risk teens staying around town couch-surfing that were mentioned in the SPHH proposal. He asked if the community was working with SPHH in any way. Coleman said yes, there is a task force. She added that there was a study on homelessness in Homer, and it really is a case of hopelessness. They talk to young women and men about their experiences, and these people describe what service providers know as sexual assault and rape. To them it is a rite of passage, what they do to survive, because it is easier, safer, and more comfortable to be on somebody else's couch than to live in the homes they were living in. It is a community problem that SPHH is dealing with. There was an anonymous donation that was used for a trial run at working in the schools with the Reconnecting Youth Program, which has national outcomes that are really credible. There was also a one-time STOP Grant for outreach working with youth that is showing good results as far as 18-24-year-olds coming in "to help" SPHH and talking about what is going on in their homes. The Homer Spit would be tent city anywhere else because rampant substance abuse and sexual assault goes on there. So SPHH is aware of any community work and she is very collaborative. They have a terrific relationship with the police department — the department has SPHH's back and SPHH has theirs.

Chair Stewart asked Coleman to identify specifically what the increased requests are for. Coleman stated that SPHH reapplied for the federal rural funding but she did not want to rely on that. The increase covers the position that the rural funding and the STOP Grant paid for. Those are two important pieces for those advocates to be in there. Years back Homer did a lot of work in the villages, and it was all under the federal rural funding. That funding was stopped, and it was basically received as a broken promise to the villages. That is not acceptable. Coleman said she does not want SPHH's capability to go into those villages and set up programs to be waived — it really needs to be incorporated into the core services. SPHH has rebuilt those relationships as much as possible. While she hates to fly, she will tag-team and personally go over to the villages so those relationships are sustained and not impacted by a high rate of staff turnover.

Satterfield inquired about fundraising activities. Coleman indicated that she sought support in this area from other shelter directors when she started. The SPHH board does a Women of Distinction fundraiser that has really shifted how the community looks

at the program. SPHH was previously very isolated and marginalized in the community. She thought the program led with its politics, and it isolated them in a way that was not serving anybody — and it did not help the bottom line. Interestingly this year — and she believes it was because of the outreach to youth and her attendance at almost every meeting there is in the community — a lot of people are stepping up to do fundraising for SPHH because she does not have the time. Kids recently put on a rock concert and raised \$3,000, and these are kids that previously got services from SPHH. The local Rotary group stepped up and took over the kids room, saying that it needs to be a place that is safe. Rotary just voted to give SPHH a small stipend on a monthly basis. A bartender organized a rally for SPHH. This is what is happening now, and the community fundraising is the kind she likes to do. She indicated she would go and talk about it if invited.

Hogan said he appreciated Coleman's comments about not screening people out who have mental health and substance abuse problems. He added that the fact that SPHH allows women to bring small pets to the shelter is important and he appreciated Coleman being that open to accommodating people, particularly in difficult circumstances. He asked about the 24-hour crisis line and translation services.

Coleman said SPHH has a 24/7 hotline with a toll-free number. For translation services SPHH uses the AT&T translation line. There is a growing number of Latino women moving into town that are using SPHH services. There is also a small deaf community in Homer, and SPHH is fortunate to have two staff people who sign. Then of course there are the Russian language people.

Hogan stated that it appeared that the SPHH board was entirely Caucasian, but he was not sure about the staff, and perhaps he misread that. Coleman said he misread that.

Chair Stewart said that Coleman had talked a lot about the cultural issues and regaining trust. She said that struck her as a little odd because Homer, right up there with Talkeetna, has the reputation of being the home of sort of the "nuts and berries." Coleman said she has heard it called "Hell with a view" as well. She agreed with the chair that Homer has a population that can really enjoy being very welcomed and open. But because of how SPHH presented itself in the past, being disrespectful of people who held onto very traditional values, older women were not coming to the program. They are coming to SPHH now. So there were some people with long-term core values that were not reflected in the Grateful Dead kind of atmosphere that SPHH needed to be respectful of. It is not about SPHH, it is about the people that need the services.

In her two-minute closing, Coleman thanked the Council for the friendly process and said it reflects what she sees as a collaboration, that the CDVSA and the agencies want to be successful with each other. It is definitely a shift. Coleman said SPHH was dis-invited into the schools, and she thought it was because they were known as the "way out there" people, and they were not respectful to some of the things that people need to hear in the schools. Also, SPHH made it unsafe for some of the youth that were living

in violent situations by talking about violence — because what happens in the home stays in the home. SPHH is in a much more structured place now at the schools. While she and everyone she works with have their own politics and philosophies, they really have made a point to put that on the back burner — especially when dealing with youth — to meet where people are at, and to understand what it is like to live on the north fork in Anchor Point, where the police are not going to be able to respond and where there has been generational violence, and to understand that they can work with those kids and hold hope for them without having to shove down a philosophy.

**Kenai - LSC  
LeeShore Center**

Presenter: Cheri Smith (executive director), accompanied by Sue Best (bookkeeper)

FY07 Award .....	\$511,094
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$550,928

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield complimented Smith on the way she described LSC goals and whether they had met or exceeded those goals in previous years. She said it was easy to read for Council members to get a better idea of what LSC is doing. The letters of support were very personalized, and that says a lot about the community support for LSC. LSC also does some excellent fundraising, which is a form of public awareness that is very important. She asked if the 45 hours of community awareness workshops were with the college or done at the shelter.

Smith explained that a few years ago LSC used some capital money to add a conference room onto the facility. The community awareness workshops are held twice a year in that conference room.

Satterfield asked Smith what would happen if LSC did not receive the funding increase requested for FY08. Smith replied that LSC received a big chunk of supplemental money last year to bring the program back to what it needed for operating. She thought the Council recognized that the program had not been getting much increased funding over the prior ten years. For FY08 the requested increase is just for basic operating costs. If LSC does not receive that, she might have to look at taking away a position, which she would hate to do because there are only eight advocates (including the shelter manager) in what is a large program. The CDVSA pays for six of those positions. Another alternative might be to get rid of health insurance or have a huge copay again. Last year was the first time in quite a few years that staff did not have to pay copay for their insurance. At the highest, the copay was \$125 a month for insurance.

Williams requested details about the services that LSC provides outside Kenai and Soldotna. Smith said their service area is from Clam Gulch all the way to Cooper Landing and Hope. They try to be as expansive as they possibly can. LSC is in the school systems a lot, but Seward itself goes out to the school in Seward so LSC hasn't

been out to that school system. LSC also has a staff person who goes to Cooper Landing and Hope and leaves brochures and does some outreach when she can.

Chair Stewart noted that LSC has a fairly substantial cash donations income, and she was curious as to how LSC accomplished that. Best stated that the board has an annual fundraiser, and there has been a radio-thon in past years that brings in a large number of in-kind donations, which works towards providing clients with things like hair cuts or gas cards to get to appointments. The business community is awesome. This year the board tried a dinner/dance which had a great outcome, raising about \$7,900. The community was so excited that they are talking about coming back next year and bringing more people. LSC also generates a little income from the run, which is the awareness program. Sponsors of the run are told that if there is anything left over after paying the costs of the run it goes to client services, so they are more than happy to give a little extra. LSC generates money through memberships and that involves a couple of thousand dollars in total. Then there are just general donations throughout the year, and that can be \$3,000-\$5,000 received in the mail unsolicited.

Chair Stewart commented that she found LSC's proposal format particularly easy to follow. She said sometimes Council members ask questions when the answers are probably somewhere in the proposals, but their eyes can glaze over after a while.

In closing, Smith thanked the Council for all the assistance over the years. The CDVSA is basically the main funder for the emergency shelter. She said that unless the shelter has community involvement and support it can be quite difficult. So over the next year LSC will be working with a local drug and alcohol program to put together an ongoing support group for women focused around safety and sobriety.

**Ketchikan - WISH  
Women In Safe Homes**

Presenter: Dragon London (executive director), accompanied by Kelly Jenks (board chair)

FY07 Award .....	\$552,698
FY08 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$591,565

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield asked how WISH was doing as far as meeting its goals and objectives for current periods (the proposal only included 2004). London said she thought WISH had surpassed all of its goals and objectives for fiscal year 2007. Satterfield asked how that compared to the previous year. London said they have increased every year, but they have had a decrease in shelter nights. WISH's services are slowly moving from residential to the non-residential services, a flow she has observed since 2004 when she came to the agency.

Satterfield asked what types of victims of crimes would be staying at the WISH shelter that are not related to domestic violence and sexual assault. London replied that WISH

houses a lot of people who could be collateral family members, victims of homicide, or people who have been injured through DWI or drug-related crimes.

Satterfield said she did not see anything in the grant application regarding coordinating activities with the Victims of Crimes Compensation Board. *[Tape change - London's entire response was not captured.]* ...relationship is very close, and the staff remain highly trained in those areas and are working to make those services available in an incredible new opportunity for the clients right now.

Satterfield inquired who the bookkeeper was. London said WISH has a contracted accountant, and there is an outside auditor who does a single audit annually. Satterfield commented that she did not see any report on the status of the last audit. London replied that it was just completed as she was doing the grant application, but the audit had no findings. She has since submitted that report to the CDVSA. Satterfield asked when the most recent CDVSA audit was. London said that WISH is due for an a CDVSA audit in August. The last one was two years ago, with a follow-up review the year after. The program is in compliance, which was not the case when she started at WISH three years ago.

Satterfield asked for some detail about the high project income (\$100,000) reported in the budget section of the application. London stated that WISH is very fortunate to have a partnership grant with Tlingit Haida that currently provides \$50,000 a year in somewhat unrestricted funds. There has also been a good amount of donations, which is an up trend they feel very good about in terms of public relations. Membership is still their failing but they are working on it. WISH changed banks and is now getting interest, and she has invested the small amount they do have in investment markets. There are some other things happening with their money that will help WISH in the future for sustainable funds. WISH has also started into gaming as a source of sustainable funds, and the results have been a small steady flow of money.

Williams asked London to address the recommendations from the CDVSA audit in 2004 about WISH's fiscal and operational policies that the narrative indicated they hoped to complete by 2007. London indicated those recommendations were completed. She said it did not take that long, but the policies had to be redone because there were federal requirements that came in so it was a two-time process.

Hogan requested more detail under the evaluation and planning section about WISH moving toward more of an outcome-based evaluation rather than a quantitative focus. London stated that Ginger Baim in Dillingham has been very helpful with some basic outcome-based tools that WISH has already adopted and is using with clients. This is something that clients will complete, and WISH will have some measurements, and that is not something that they have had consistently.

Hogan said he did not see any reference to survivors in decision-making roles. He said he assumed that WISH had some survivors on the board and on staff. London said yes,

that she guessed about 50% of the board and 50% of the staff have a history with some form of abuse, either personally or in their family.

WISH was given two minutes for a closing statement. Kelly Jenks, the finance and member services director of the Ketchikan Visitors Bureau and the chair of the board of WISH, said she was a survivor of domestic violence. She related her personal experience with WISH starting in 1998 and how her boys are learning about personal safety and healthy relationships through the school system with the WISH prevention education program. She also recently went to WISH for legal advocacy during a custody battle, so even 10 years later she is pretty involved with WISH. Dragon London also invited the Council members to come visit WISH.

Break from 2:15 to 2:24 p.m.

**Dillingham - SAFE**

**Safe and Fear-Free Environment**

Presenter: Ginger Baim (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$422,116
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$468,380

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

House said alarms went off for her when she read SAFE's proposal because it was a question of the program not being there if it did not get the CDVSA funding. She asked how SAFE planned to spend the additional money if it got the FY08 grant amount requested.

Baim explained that she prepared the grant application in March, and the whole world changes between March and June. Like probably most of the programs, 90% of the funds in the budget are projected based on what they have applied for. She requested a \$46,000 increase, and the application spelled out exactly what that increase was for. Whether that is pertinent now is another question.

House asked what was pertinent now. Baim said she had not had time to take inventory, but in the last three weeks SAFE received news that its Native Association did not get a renewal on the STOP Violence Against Indian Women Grant, so that is a significant loss to SAFE. The program's insurance went up 20%, the health insurance increased 27%, the audit doubled, and they lost a community child development block grant of about \$55,000 a year. So that is about \$150,000 down in the last three weeks.

House inquired about the high travel costs of \$68,000. Baim said it was so high because at the time she wrote the grant application SAFE had two federal grants (STOP Violence Against Indian Women Grant, and a Rural Domestic Violence & Child Victimization Grant) that require SAFE to set aside \$20,000 for travel outside the state to funding conferences, etc. So \$40,000 of the \$68,000 is for the two grants, one of which SAFE is not going to get now. The RDV&CV grant is a two-year grant, so she

should not have put \$20,000 for travel in FY08 because that is spread over two years.

House asked Baim to elaborate about the high housing costs and unemployment in the Dillingham area. Baim stated that housing affordability and the fact that the community does not have available housing are factors when clients are trying to get apartments. Dillingham has more low-income housing available now than it has had in the last ten years, however, there is a 70% need and a 20% meeting of that need. Also, a lot of people that SAFE serves are not eligible for the low-income housing, and some of that is because of problems they have had in their past (fights in their home, housing has been torn up, unpaid rent, etc.). That is the same issue with unemployment. People have been unemployed for so long that they are not on the unemployment list. The official unemployment rate in Bristol Bay is about 7%, but the actual rate is probably 70%. A lot of those people cannot get jobs even if there were jobs because of the crime barrier matrix problem. It is an increasingly huge problem for agencies in Bristol Bay.

Williams said that getting on the CDVSA has made her even more aware of domestic violence than she was before. The tribal administrator in Tatitlek was killed, her best friend's sister got killed in Naknek, and her daughter got beat up. She asked how SAFE does outreach to 32 villages in the region with a travel budget from CDVSA of \$3,000 and if it was enough.

Baim said of course \$3,000 for outreach travel is not enough. But how they have to do it, and where they are very well set up to do it in Bristol Bay, is through building on the inherent strengths in the communities. SAFE has a trained volunteer in every village. Because of a federal grant, SAFE has five part-time paid staff in five area villages, and they are hoping to be able to maintain that. SAFE has training collaboration agreements with the health aides, the community health representatives, the family service workers, the tribal children's service workers, and the suicide prevention people. So SAFE trains them, and they train SAFE people. So in every village there are at least two trained volunteers, and in some of the villages there are actually paid staff. These are limited services, but if somebody calls SAFE from a village they can give them a name of somebody in that village that has been trained in these issues and knows resources and how to access them. SAFE tries to get at least two people in every village so if a caller does not want to deal with one of them because of history or family conflicts then there is somebody else to get in touch with. There isn't one person providing services who isn't touched by it in some way, and some people have multiple issues with their family and friends. Baim said a woman was murdered in Dillingham this winter, and her body was found very close to Baim's home. Every time she goes home there is a stack of flowers on the roadside where the woman was found. This woman was the mother of seven children, two of whom have been adopted by a woman that Baim works with. This murdered woman did not have to die, but she did not have what she needed.

Satterfield complimented Baim on a very well-written grant application that answered CDVSA questions. She said it is a good sample model to use.

Chair Stewart said it was particularly helpful to have the section on what the increases were being requested for and what would happen without that funding, without having to pick through the pages to find it.

Holloway asked if SAFE works cooperatively with or gets much help from the VPSOs. Baim said absolutely, that she did not know what they would do without the law enforcement. SAFE works very closely with the Dillingham Police Department, the Togiak Police Department on again/off again, and the State Troopers and the VPSOs. SAFE has a memorandum of agreement with the Bristol Bay Native Association and provides training to the VPSOs. Katie TePas of the Alaska State Troopers Administrative Support just had SAFE do a training last month. Baim said she was surprised to find VPSOs from Kodiak and Southeastern Alaska there as well and not just from the region. Through the STOP Violence Against Indian Women Grant, SAFE has set up a court watch and tribal notification system. For the last eight years they have had somebody in court every day to track all the criminal activities and court actions, and SAFE informs people in the villages through writing and e-mails about anything that happens regarding domestic violence and sexual assault that involves a person from their village. SAFE started that system because years ago the VPSOs were not even getting the information. The VPSO would arrest someone, send them to Dillingham, they would be heard in court, and nobody would ever tell the VPSO what the release conditions were. That is getting a lot better now, but SAFE has this system that keeps them in really close contact with the VPSOs. It also gives the tribes the timely information they need if they choose to do an intervention at the village level.

Williams asked if Baim has ever considered videoconferencing with the health corporation. Baim said SAFE gets and gives a lot of training through videoconferencing. The problem is that it is usually through the health aide that villages have that capability, and their time on line is tied up, and there is not a lot of available time for SAFE to use that system.

Chair Stewart inquired if all the Denali Commission-funded facility work got done. Baim said it should be finished by the time she returns home. The grant ends June 30. They are still waiting for the ground to thaw enough to finish restoring the backyard that got tore up digging foundations and constructing arctic entrances. SAFE has already opened the new thrift store.

Baim was given two minutes for closing comments. She said she did not ask for everything SAFE needed but she asked for what they could make it on. She is increasingly concerned that several agencies have set themselves up in an untenable position, that is, she does not think that SAFE will be able to find somebody like her who will work the hours she does and put the effort in that she does. She knows of at least four agencies that are living off the work of their directors, and people have learned to expect that, and if the programs do not have that they will not be able to provide the services. She said Dillingham is often categorized as being poor, dysfunctional, addicted, and troubled. All those things are true, but it is also joyous and warm and

embracing and rooted in deep cultural values that she admires and respects. When the community is given the opportunity to stand up to the plate, they have all been there in spades every time. With the CDVSA's help, they will be able to continue to do that.

**Anchorage - AKEELA (for Alaska Women's Resource Center)**

Presenter: Rosalie Nadeau (executive director), accompanied by Pamela Schaf (women's programs director for AWRC)

FY07 Award for AWRC ..... \$212,134  
FY08 Core Services Grant Request..... \$276,706

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield asked if AWRC's outstanding legal advocacy program would continue as strongly. It complemented AWAIC because they had primarily volunteers available at the court house after hours and on weekends. Nadeau said that for 2005 and 2006 AWRC had a grant, but she did not know what happened to it. When AKEELA took over management of AWRC they were told that grant money was there and they even tried to bill on it but were told there was some sort of snafu and AWRC was not funded for that program. That is one the reasons why AKEELA requested an increase. She said AKEELA believes the legal advocacy program is a crucial service. They have been doing a lot with volunteers, but because they don't have the money they have fallen down on meeting their target.

Satterfield agreed that AWRC received grant funding in the last couple of years, but they provided that service for many years by utilizing volunteers. She asked if AKEELA would be able to continue that program through volunteers if it did not receive the requested increase in FY08. Schaf stated that when AKEELA discovered that the funding had gone away, they maintained the volunteers and transferred the two paid people into the daycare facility and the substance abuse program. She visited them yesterday and they were anxious about the funding meeting because they both want to resume the positions that they had and were fully committed to. Nadeau added that since that money went away AKEELA has recruited a corps of volunteers and, while very active, they don't have the full coverage they had with the funded positions.

Under the statement of need narrative, Hogan asked for clarification on how the population will benefit. He said the statement jumped out at him that "AKEELA/AWRC will become their support system," and he interpreted that more like the program was promoting dependence rather than independence.

Nadeau said that without providing a support system you don't have independence, that there has to be an entity they can call for support. It is like the WISH chairperson saying that she went back to the program when she had a need. When AKEELA and AWRC are put together there is a broad array of services that anyone who shows up in that kind of a setting might need. These people's money is gone, their housing is gone, and they arrive with the clothes on their back. Allowing them access to services beyond the

emergency support, at least in the interim, is perhaps longer-term support than the program has been able to provide in the past.

Hogan asked about projected utilization, because it seemed that the numbers were down dramatically, particularly related to goals one and two. He asked why that is. Schaf replied that when they did the grid on projected and what actual was, they went back to the previous grant years and projected from there. The reason the numbers are down is that AKEELA is rebuilding a program that had deteriorated from lack of upper management by the time they took over. The application contains realistic and measurable goals and objectives. They have surpassed any target numbers they set before, and she believes they will surpass the new goals.

Hogan asked if it typical to wait 48 hours after a woman makes contact to ensure safety. Schaf said they were looking at weekends when she wrote that. They have only a skeleton staff working on weekends, and calls are referred to the counselor who typically works Monday through Friday but can be brought in on the weekend to work on a crisis.

Hogan said there seemed to be an extended time period from initial contact to follow-up as well. Schaf stated that AKEELA's typical follow-up is to connect weekly with the women who have come in and received services to check their status and see if they need any additional support. Regarding Hogan's earlier question about dependence, she said the grant application was talking about the continuum of care that the two agencies together are able to offer. There is substance abuse counseling and therapy, both outpatient and residential. There is mental health counseling in both formats as well. It is a one-stop shop where a woman can acquire services.

Williams questioned the goals and objectives that mention 750 women and children seeking assistance, and then the activities where the numbers don't add up. Schaf said the numbers are spread out among all the activities. She added that it is not only domestic violence cases coming through the door directly or by telephone but having the two residential treatment and outpatient programs where domestic violence counseling groups are offered in all four of those settings.

Hogan said he did not know what the phase "diminish the emergent need" in goal #1 meant. Also, he interpreted goal #2 as primarily prevention-oriented, yet the activities seemed all direct service. Schaf said she would use herself as an example of a survivor: when she decided to take her children and leave an abusive relationship she needed shelter, medical help, clothing, food, transportation, and a job after not working for five years. Those are emergent needs, right in the here and now, where a person cannot see any hope unless they have some of their primary needs met. For goal #2 regarding prevention and direct service activities, Schaf said that when she reads "decrease the amount of crisis experienced by women and children who experience domestic violence," to her that is direct service delivery. It is going back to the emergent needs, things such as medical needs (broken bones and bleeding) that have to be taken care

of today — the crisis. In her own experience, a case manager at the shelter helped her make decisions and see options where she couldn't see any at that point in her life. To her those are direct-service kinds of things.

Chair Stewart asked who is at AKEELA right now who was an AWRC employee, for what period of time, and what specific domestic violence-related activities are these people currently engaged in. Schaf stated that Inez Larson was an AWRC employee since September 2006 and is the program manager. Larson does part-time domestic violence and part-time outpatient services. Bonnice Larson has been with AWRC since May 2006 and is currently doing information and referral. Martha Miner runs the clothing shop and does vocational training, and has been with AWRC for about seven or eight years.

Chair Stewart noted that the AKEELA proposal made reference to employees who might want to come back. She asked who that would be and what the circumstances might be of their return. Schaf said she was referring to the court advocates, who had been in that position for two years prior to AKEELA coming on. Chair Stewart asked how many people have left as a result of not wanting to work with AKEELA. Nadeau replied that a number of people left but not all of them left because they didn't want to work with AKEELA. She added that two prevention specialists, who had been at AWRC about three years, got married and left the state in April to be with their new husbands. Regarding the one person who did not want to work with AKEELA, Schaf said it was primarily due to staffing issues that AKEELA had with her. Nadeau related that she told the AWRC board and the AKEELA board that when you begin to shake up an organization that has some management issues there are going to be some upset people. AKEELA laid off six people who were primarily in various clerical positions. AWRC did not have an accountant or any accounting staff, but there were six secretaries of one sort or another. Nadeau said she told both boards that people either are attracted to an organization in crisis because that is how they function, or they learn to normalize that kind of chaos — and it feels wrong when it starts to change. One domestic violence-related person left because of disagreements, and there were the two who got married and left. There were three or four military-related employees in the last year, who worked for AWRC but were not domestic violence people, who were transferred out of the area. Schaf added that the person who had a difference of opinion with AKEELA had misrepresented her credentials, and when that came to light she was unable to produce her credentials. She then wanted to move on to a totally different type of work.

Williams asked, given the questions around this issue, why AKEELA did not just submit a brand-new application on behalf of AKEELA, rather than piggyback them together. Nadeau said because they will be operating as AWRC, with AWRC as a dba (doing business as) of AKEELA. She said they were coming to the Council in the middle of operating a DV program. Only when they were reaching the point where people needed to make a decision about transferring to AKEELA, — AWRC will be holding their board meeting next week to alert the membership that they are moving toward dissolution.

AKEELA submitted a grant application under the name of AKEELA, but they referenced many of the programs they had been running for the past year. They are not just a DV program if they are funded. They will continue to run the other programs under the name AWRC, and that was the reason behind that. Schaf added that AWRC is well-known throughout the state, and doing away with the name is like doing away with a resource. People know that AWRC offers women's and children's services. That was the thinking behind keeping AWRC as a dba.

Chair Stewart stated that there have been some significant audit problems with AWRC, and the CDVSA is trying to get those addressed. She said it appeared that AKEELA was trying to take the benefit of claiming AWRC experience yet not taking the responsibility for the AWRC problems. Nadeau said she did not know quite how to begin answering that. The AWRC board, through the AKEELA board, invited the management of AKEELA to come in and take over management, come back to them with recommendations, and to manage their programs with her as acting executive director for them during that period of time. She still retains that position. They seriously looked at doing exactly what Council members were suggesting - take over those kinds of problems. They put a merger committee of the two boards together to look at a merger. That committee got an outside person to conduct due diligence to look at the problems or benefits involved in a merger. They would love to have done a merger, but they discovered that there were so many truly significant problems, not the first of which, and the largest, was an IRS problem that AWRC had had for about three or four years. AWRC has an offer in compromise with the IRS that effectively says, "Okay, you paid us some money, and now we're going to let you go with this condition. You must make every tax deposit payment on time and timely, and if you don't, we will come back and we want \$1.6 million from you." They didn't meet the condition of that offer in compromise. The AKEELA board would have been fiducially irresponsible had they agreed to a merger with that kind of a liability. And that was only one of the liabilities hanging over AWRC's head.

Chair Stewart commented that the CDVSA has had problems with getting data reports from AKEELA that were both accurate and timely. She asked what AKEELA was doing to resolve those issues. Schaf stated that the system that Public Safety requires is on a different reporting schedule; their systems are set up to gather data and kick out reports every 30 days. So 30 days after the end of the quarter they reported. The 15 days that they have after the end of the quarter to be able to do their reporting to the Department of Public Safety takes some getting used to. AKEELA is a large organization, and it is difficult at times financially to close out the books and to kick in those reports that would go hand-in-glove with the program reports. They think that they have all the kinks ironed out, and that is not going to be a problem. AKEELA is current with its reporting. They are in the process of going through their on-site audit from DB today.

Satterfield asked for information about the training that the DV advocate has. Schaf replied that the current DV advocate is a student who is doing a practicum. However, the student went through the 40-hour training that the other two advocates took a

couple of years ago. Satterfield asked who the DV advocate was receiving the training from. Schaf said she received it through AWRC, but it was before her time and she could not speak to that. She knew about the manuals used during the training, and Victoria went through that along with the other two court advocates. Satterfield sought confirmation that all the advocates that are working in the DV program have completed satisfactorily 40 hours of DV training. Schaf said yes, that they have completed more than that. They were also required to attend the DV conference, so they have had 44 hours total.

Regarding organizational structure on page 41 of the application, Hogan asked who the current AWRC program director was. Schaf said she was. Hogan asked who the domestic violence manager was. Schaf said it was Inez Larson. Chair Stewart commented that Inez Larson was working part-time. Schaf confirmed that Larson worked full-time, but she was funded part-time through DV and part-time through the outpatient. Both jobs are in the same basic location, and Larson is actually available 100% of the time if DV clients who come in need somebody to interface with.

Chair Stewart observed that the question/answer session with AKEELA had exceeded the time allotted. She gave them one minute for closing comments.

Nadeau stated that AKEELA has a solid track record in records. She stayed for a bit with Linda Hoven today, who looked at AKEELA's audit for the same year and done by the same accountant, and Hoven said, "Rosalie, you're right, it's great." Nadeau said that AKEELA has a solid record of providing programs. They have a great background in prevention, have worked in 60 communities across the state, and DV is the height of prevention needs and prevention activity. AKEELA has the ability to provide this program, provide it well, and meet the requirements of the commission. They have moved from what was an ugly site downtown out onto Northern Lights Blvd., and they are already getting more people in because of accessibility than they were getting downtown.

Break from 3:15 to 3:22 p.m.

**Anchorage - CSS  
Catholic Social Services**

Presenter: Susan Bomalaski (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$ 0
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$100,000

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield noted that Clare House started in 1983 and CSS has identified about 41% of the women who go there as victims of domestic violence (which may be an under-reported number). She asked why it has taken CSS so long to address providing services to victims of domestic violence.

Bomalaski said she has been in the executive director position for about a year, having moved from San Antonio, Texas. She ran a home there for child victims of abuse and neglect, and they started a counseling center and received VOCA (Victims of Crime Act) funds through the Texas State Attorney General to provide those services. So when she started looking at the programs in Anchorage and at the statistics for the people they served that was her exact question. She investigated how things worked in Alaska, got together with the director of Clare House, and they decided that this would be an essential service to expand CSS's programming in this area. So it may have been not knowing that the funds were available, or not having experience, and also some thinking outside the box about how to enhance services by a person new to the situation.

Holloway asked how CSS intended to work with other agencies in Anchorage and how their relationship has been with the other programs. Bomalaski stated that Clare House has a memorandum of agreement with the five emergency shelters in the city, one of which is AWAIC (Abused Women's Aid In Crisis). Currently AWAIC and Clare House cross-refer constantly. They also work with the (Salvation Army) McKinnel Shelter and Brother Francis Shelter. CSS can learn from them as they implement their program and share resources. They currently don't provide victims assistance. They have been through the training and will implement that as part of the program, but AWAIC has been doing that for a long time so CSS has been calling on them as a resource. Both of the shelters are at capacity most of the time, so their staffs are on the phone daily to each other, and they plan to continue that relationship. They plan to expand in the community through the education piece.

Satterfield inquired how CSS could assure the CDVSA that there won't be a duplication of services. That was something that always surfaced with AWRC and AWAIC, and she saw that they were complementing one another.

Bomalaski said she saw it as complementing services. If the women are in acute domestic violence situations they would go to AWAIC. Clare House often gets women from AWAIC, and they would coordinate around what information these women have been given and where they are in their planning before they come to Clare House. Clare House also gets people from different communities in the state who escape from domestic violence situations and come right to Clare House. CSS realizes there aren't enough resources in Anchorage to duplicate services, and a big focus is moving people into permanent housing - recognizing and breaking the cycle of domestic violence. CSS will be working with children and knows that AWAIC has a therapist there that the children start with, and CSS would want to continue with that to further the healing process.

Hogan said that in looking at CSS's grant application he was trying to apply traditional victim service criteria to a somewhat different proposal. He asked for more information about safety planning and follow-up, particularly how that might happen with the CSS program and with what has been provided at Clare House.

Bomalaski stated that the women who come to CSS may or may not be coming from an acute situation, but 41% is likely an under-estimation of the number who are domestic violence victims. When these women do not see a lot of alternatives they may go back into that situation, and that is where she sees the safety planning coming in, assisting the women to make sure they have a viable plan when they leave and don't see re-entering that relationship as the only option they have. CSS has been doing that, but a DV program would give the staff a higher level of training to recognize that. She said there is the prevention aspect with the children, with 61% of the residents being children that have been part of a domestic violence situation. She acknowledged that the CSS proposal is a little different, but she thought there was a lot of work still to do to reinforce what the people experienced when they were at AWAIC.

House said she loved the CSS comment that "education is needed about the availability of services rather than more education that domestic violence is not acceptable." She asked how CSS would go about doing that. Bomalaski replied that she would think that everybody in the community knows what services are available to help them, but it is not the case. This is where CSS is complementing other agencies, working together, and it is not four or five agencies presenting the availability of their services. It is first identifying that a person is a victim, and then identifying what would be most appropriate for them out of the continuum of services that are out there.

Chair Stewart asked what would change at a very practical and grassroots level if the CSS proposal were to be funded. She asked what questions CSS would ask a homeless woman with children right now, and would those questions differ if CSS was trying to identify persons needing services related to domestic violence. Bomalaski said she did not see the initial intake questions varying because it is an emergency situation when women come in, and the focus is to make sure they are appropriate to come into Clare House versus AWAIC or another shelter.

Chair Stewart asked how CSS currently makes the distinction for a woman to go to AWAIC or another shelter. Bomalaski said the first thing is whether they are a female with children. Clare House will occasionally take women without children, but they are usually at such capacity that they would refer them to the Brother Francis Shelter. CSS determines the level of the violence situation — is it acute, and is the perpetrator around - because AWAIC is more secure and has more safety features than Clare House. CSS already asks these questions and talks back and forth among the shelters to make sure people are in the right place. Once a person is over the trauma of coming into a shelter, then having the family enrichment coordinator position would allow CSS to dig down a little deeper into the stories of people who say on their intake that one of the reasons they are homeless is domestic violence. It also allows CSS to set up educational workshops and have another staff member for a client to have a relationship with so that if the person did not mention domestic violence in the initial assessment it could come out later. By digging deeper, CSS can help people identify their barriers to stable housing, and there could be many of them. The initial intake would likely not change significantly, but the requested funding would change the programming and allow CSS

to have more targeted activities for the women and their children.

Williams asked Bomalaski to expand on her earlier mention of Clare House's ability to provide services for people coming from the Bush communities. Bomalaski described a woman with two children, who had been a rape victim in a village and needed to leave that setting, who came right to Clare House. The woman had classroom skills, and CSS was able to link her up with CITC (Cook Inlet Tribal Council) and get her back working in a school. CSS has housing vouchers through a cooperative arrangement with Cook Inlet Housing Authority and was able to get this woman into her own place within about six weeks.

Williams asked if CSS works with existing shelters outside of Anchorage, for example, if a family came in from Dillingham would CSS contact SAFE to find out what services they were provided in Dillingham. Bomalaski said no, they don't do that. She said there might be something going on that she was not aware of, but she didn't think there were a lot of linkages that way. She said it is definitely a resource that CSS should take advantage of. Williams asked if the family service position proposed in the grant request would do some of that work. Bomalaski said yes, that she would see CSS, as part of the education and outreach piece, contacting other communities and letting them know that CSS would be available if someone needed to leave that community.

Bomalaski was given two minutes for a closing statement.

**Seward - SCS  
Seaview Community Services**

Presenter: Marianna Keil (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$88,154
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$88,154

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Williams inquired why SCS did not ask for an increase in FY08. Keil said it was a management decision with input from some board members, some clients, and the advisory committee. She said a lot of the other programs in the state need the money more than SCS does, but it is not that SCS couldn't use extra money. Because they are a multi-service agency, other people can step in and help SCS out. The SCS staff carry cell phones, so other people working at the agency can call them if there is a problem or crisis and they are not in. SCS is a program that does not operate a shelter.

Chair Stewart said she liked the proposal's sort of official designation of SCS as the shelter-less model. In the Council's discussion about core services and identifying different regions and different needs, it seems that it is one place where the CDVSA could focus on identifying services. Other communities don't have shelters but they don't really call themselves the shelter-less model. There may be some education and sharing needed about that, because Seward does a remarkably good job of that and without having the complexities of an in-house shelter. She said she did not know if

there was something unique about Seward that makes that possible.

Keil stated that there is a certain amount of buy-in from other community partners, because SCS would not be able to do it without law enforcement arresting perpetrators and keeping people in jail. If the court didn't put conditions of release that the perpetrator could not go home, it wouldn't work. These components are in place in Seward right now. Sometimes when people in positions change, SCS has to get back into the trenches and educate, and SCS is persistent. But SCS has a cordial relationship with the police department.

Satterfield commended SCS on its strong community coordination. Noting there was a SART training in 2006, She asked about the status of the SART program. Keil replied that SCS got \$5,000 from the City of Seward, which they used to purchase equipment. They have a medical person who is trained and willing to do exams, although that person was ill and out of town for a while. The management at Central Peninsula General Hospital changed and they asked why not use their hospital. But SCS has been through that before — since 1996 they have been trying to coordinate SART through the hospital, and the hospital hasn't really been interested. So they have moved forward on the SART program and suffered some setbacks, but they are close to doing the SART. The protocols are to be signed June 13 if everyone is in agreement.

Satterfield requested more detail about SCS staffing, which is unusual — 1-1/2 positions 6 months of the year and half a position the other six months. She wondered how SCS meets the needs. Keil said that is where they could use extra funding. But she is always available when she is not at her other job. If there is a call-out on a sexual assault and the on-call person cannot go out, Keil will go as a volunteer. That is just doing what needs to be done for the community. The half-time person will work beyond her four hours a day if there are clients needing her. Then if the prevention team leaders are not available, all the staff in the agency are trained on domestic violence and sexual assault. But the prevention team people are the recognized experts in the agency on dv/sa.

Holloway commented that this is a good way to go in some cases, but he wondered how SCS is able to pull it off. In a way, there are already "shelters" for perpetrators, and law enforcement would like to put them there but has been unable to get the judges to go along with it as well as they could have. He commended Keil on that coordination and said he hoped that Seward gets another judge that does the same thing if the current judge leaves.

Keil said that is training for the court system, and they always need more training. For example, she shares tapes with the magistrate, and he is good about that. She hoped that more magistrates and judges would have an open mind — it is not trying to prejudice, only to educate.

Hogan thanked Keil and SCS and their board for allowing Melissa Stone to join the

Department of Health & Social Services as the behavioral health director. He said it would not influence his scoring of the SCS proposal, particularly as they were not asking for extra money.

In closing, Keil said she received a message on her answering machine that said, "Thank you for helping me to realize that I have the strength to go out on my own. I'm sorry I didn't stop by to say goodbye, but I am going to be okay." And the caller had left the state. So that sort of summed up that SCS did not have to do everything for this person, that she did a lot of it on her own.

**RECESS**

Before recessing for the day, Chair Stewart asked if would be a problem for anyone if the Council started its funding discussions tomorrow afternoon rather than waiting until Saturday morning. There was no objection.

The Chair recessed the meeting for the day at 3:54 p.m.

**Friday, June 8, 2007**

**CALL BACK TO ORDER**

Chair Janna Stewart called the meeting back to order at 8:25 a.m. In addition to the Chair, Council members Hogan, Holloway, House, Satterfield (for Rick Svobodny), and Williams were present.

Chris Ashenbrenner, the executive director of CDVSA, who was absent due to illness on Thursday, joined the meeting in person for the second day of the three-day meeting.

**PROGRAM PRESENTATIONS (Continued)**

**VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS (Continued)**

The Council continued to hear proposals from the victim services programs for FY08 core services funding.

**Juneau - AWARE**

**Aiding Women in Abuse and Rape Emergencies**

Presenter: Saralyn Tabachnick (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$534,330
FY08 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$625,875

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield commended Tabachnick for an extremely well-written grant application —

each category was specifically stated and the information supported. She said it was one of the best she had read. The letters of support were very personalized and clearly demonstrated a strong coordinated community response to domestic violence and sexual assault. The proposal listed some very good project income through donations, fundraisers and memberships, and that also reflects the coordinated community response. The youth program, TRAIN, is one of the outstanding programs that AWARE offers. She asked AWARE to justify the requested funding increase for FY08.

Tabachnick said the increase is based on staff raises, and about half is making up for money from a VAWA discretionary grant that AWARE received last year. That funding could come from VAWA discretionary funds again, once that request for proposal (RFP) becomes available. Some of the increase is for the three-quarter-time office assistant position to become full-time.

Holloway commented that the evaluation section was very complete. There was some kind of evaluation component from the individual all the way up to the community.

Chair Stewart asked why volunteers cost \$26,000 each. Tabachnick explained that it was the value of the volunteer, not an actual expense. The actual cost of a volunteer is less than \$1,000 in personnel.

Regarding service to other communities outside of Juneau, Williams asked if AWARE was not requesting any travel funds in this grant. Tabachnick confirmed that. Williams asked if AWARE had sufficient travel funds to go to these communities. Tabachnick said Tlingit & Haida Central Council forwards on to AWARE some Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) grant funds that it receives, and AWARE uses that money for rural outreach.

Tabachnick was given two minutes for closing comments. She said AWARE is at a critical juncture, and the requested funding is central to keeping a very good staff and paying them a living wage in Juneau. The funding is crucial to maintain the forward movement of community participation and to set a standard of zero tolerance for all forms of abuse.

**Kodiak - KWRCC**  
**Kodiak Women's Resource and Crisis Center**

Presenter: Susan Killary (board president), joined by Tish Raub (executive director) by teleconference

FY07 Award .....	\$285,456
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$297,669

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Williams indicated that she appreciated the information about trends from FY04 to FY07. She said she noticed some fluctuations this year and wondered if the lower usage of services by mid-year FY07 was seasonal or an overall drop. Killary replied that

she liked to think they were doing better education. Kodiak was down on the number of State Troopers for a while, and there is always orientation for new officers of the Kodiak Police Department or the Troopers. These people are well trained in the law, but KWRCC likes to educate them on the dynamics of domestic violence and the sensitivities involved in that.

Raub stated that they never know what size families will be coming in to the shelter. It seemed during the first half of the year KWRCC had mostly single women or women with one or two children. Right after she wrote the grant KWRCC got swamped with larger families again, so the statistics are already out of sync.

Williams noted that there was little travel funds in the grant request for services to villages in remote areas. Killary stated that the community and village outreach is funded by the Kodiak Island Borough, and that includes travel to seven villages two times a year.

Williams said that KWRCC had an audit done FY04 and FY05, but it took until FY06 for the results of the audit to be accepted. She asked why that was. Killary replied that she did know that this is an audit year, and KWRCC has about \$10,000 budgeted. Raub stated that she usually works directly with the auditors and could explain. KWRCC puts the audit out to bid and the board selects an auditor; it is done every other year and is a two-year audit. The audit firm was not able to come to the center to do the audit until December, and she did not get a draft report from them until March. That is pretty standard, working with a firm from Anchorage. She took the draft directly to the finance committee and then to the board.

Satterfield made note that the KWRCC budget had full-time staff positions at 32 hours a week, and she recalled that those hours had been reduced to that based on limited funding. She asked if KWRCC would increase the full-time staff to more hours if they were to receive the requested increase. Raub said no, that the requested increase would enable KWRCC to hang onto the 32-hour week. For several years they had reduced everybody to 30 hours a week because of funding difficulties. She said they are desperate to hang onto the 32-hour positions. Killary added that the increase accounts for the health insurance increase of about 20% and the annual raises.

Holloway commented that four SART-trained advocates was a lot. Killary stated that Kodiak lost its SART program, but KWRCC's staff is trained to work with a program. The certification requires that the person who does SART examinations has to participate in a certain number of examinations to stay certified. Kodiak does not have that number of incidents. Unfortunately, a victim of sexual assault has to travel to receive the services. Raub added that KWRCC's advocates function as they would if there were going to be a SANE (sexual assault nurse examiner) with them, and they help the Troopers and the Kodiak Police Department bring the victims to the center where there is a room to do the interview and collect the evidence. That way the KWRCC advocate can work right with the victim, and if the victim is going to be transported off the island to have the

examination done then KWRCC can help make the arrangements with the police or the Troopers.

House asked KWRCC to define what they meant in the proposal by saying people are in dangerous working conditions. Killary explained that a lot of client spouses work on boats as fishermen or Coast Guard, which are dangerous conditions that put a strain on the families. Plus there is economic strain because fishing is not as good as it was.

Hogan questioned why KWRCC is getting FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) funding and how they use it. Raub explained that KWRCC applies to FEMA each year for a small grant that they use to buy food for the shelter. It runs through the United Way in Anchorage. She confirmed for Hogan that the shelter seems to fit under the FEMA criteria of food for people who do not have food.

Satterfield inquired when the last CDVSA audit of KWRCC was and if there were any recommendations. Raub said the audit was August 2006, and there were no recommendations.

In closing, Killary mentioned KWRCC having over 70 volunteers so there is always somebody who can help. The program's networking is incredible.

**Anchorage - AWAIC  
Abused Women's Aid In Crisis**

Presenters: Judy Cordell (executive director) and Suzi Pearson (deputy director)  
FY07 Award ..... \$883,616  
FY08 Core Services Grant Request..... \$1,029,541

[AWAIC's presentation was not recorded]  
*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Referring to the evaluation and planning section, Hogan said he found exemplary AWAIC's focus on true outcomes and whether or not the program made a difference in the people's lives they are serving. AWAIC is ahead of the curve there. Cordell said that credit goes to the deputy director, Suzi Pearson, who has 11 years with AWAIC and holds a masters in public administration. In the reorganization in the last two years, Pearson is now primarily responsible for grants.

Chair Stewart asked what impact the problems and diminished services at AWRC in Anchorage in the past year have had on the AWAIC operation. Cordell said it was a difficult question for her to provide on the public record, out of loyalty to the sister agency. AWAIC was spawned by AWRC 28 years ago, and it was with serious consideration that she provided the following opinion. She cautioned that the board has not been apprised of her response because she did not anticipate the Council's question. Cordell said that the transition of AWRC and their challenges caused the company to decompensate such that they were assumed by AKEELA. Today, 4.6% of their budget is CDVSA funding. AWAIC over the last 30 years has evolved to be the

primary DV provider in Anchorage. It is all AWAIC does. AWAIC is leading fatality review, and they lead the Domestic Violence Awareness Month when it comes out in the fall, and the partnership with all the stakeholders in the state. Pearson has been participating in a major way in the housing and homelessness issue in Anchorage. She was on the Governor's Steering Council for Housing and Homelessness. She is present on the national scene and a statewide recognized expert on the issue. Frequently AWRC is not at the table in those arenas. AWRC is a participant in the DV Caucus, they attend fatality review, and they did attend the Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Cordell said she was aware that recently this fiscal year, and for whatever reason — and it was confirmed yesterday — AWRC let go of all their DV staff that were related to the CDVSA grant. AWAIC received a call in the last month from a woman who identified herself at Martha. She stated that she was recently reassigned to be the DV advocate for AWRC's program, and she was seeking assistance from AWAIC because there was no one over there competent to train her in DV. AWAIC offered to provide 26 hours of training and to review the position description and core competencies to be able to provide those services. And it was confirmed by their identified program manager, Inez Larson, that they were in need of that support. The counselor who called didn't even know what AWAIC did. Cordell asked if that answered the chair's question.

Chair Stewart said it got to the question. She said she wanted to make it clear to her fellow Council members and to Cordell and to the other people in the room that her concern was what needs are not being met as a result of AWRC's decompensation. She said she was not asking Cordell to rat out a fellow program or to breach confidentiality, but she was deeply concerned about the need for the services within Anchorage. She was very concerned and wanted to know what additional work, burdens, responsibilities, and assistance AWAIC has stepped up to the plate to provide. For example, offering to train another agency's staff member and offering a curriculum and to do a review is exactly the kind of thing that the Council needs to know. The Council's concern at the bottom line is that the services are provided and that people get the help they need in all aspects. She said she deeply appreciated AWAIC being willing to try to step in and fill those gaps. But the CDVSA needs to know that those gaps are there because the Council is facing significant dollar requests from the three Anchorage agencies, and the Council wants to make sure that those dollars are spread equitably and that the money is going to get to the core services that are needed. She said she was sorry to put Cordell on the spot, but it is clear that the Council needs to do a concentrated look at the three agencies in the Anchorage bowl. She said she appreciated Cordell's discomfort at the question.

Cordell stated that her obligation is to the population that AWAIC serves. She said AWRC/AKEELA does a fine job in addressing a different level of care. AWAIC is primarily shelter. AWRC is competent to intervene and treat co-occurring disorders, does a fine job with drug and alcohol treatment, residential long-term living, has a strong Native component in their programming (as AWAIC has), and provides mental health services. She saw the weaknesses in services as being primarily legal advocacy. It is a struggle in Anchorage — 5,000 arrests, and there is one legal advocate at the court

house, and that position was gone for three months last year. The state was able to provide some funding at 80%, but AWAIC is still trying to offset that 20% cost because research indicates that if you want an effective outcome in domestic violence intervention, legal advocacy is the biggest bang for the buck. There are published studies on that. That is where AWAIC is trying to intervene, to drop the fatality rate in Anchorage. AWAIC has lost a partner in AWRC. She said they did not have any business expanding services at this point because they are having a difficult time collectively as a group sustaining core operations. It is not a good best-practices business model to expand when you cannot sustain what you are already doing. But expanding the legal advocacy program would be her next step, if she had her druthers. The legal advocate that AWAIC sustains had 900 unduplicated cases last year — would anyone like that job? Twenty to 30 cases a week, that is quite a case load. And the legal advocate's pay is 17% under the market rate.

Regarding impact on services, Pearson said there are two things in which AWAIC is involved, looking at the current fiscal year. AWAIC is projecting an additional 2,000 bed nights over last year, a significant increase. Just at the six-month mark, with the information they are gathering for the CDVSA database, AWAIC is at three-quarters of the numbers that they provided services to last year. So they are definitely seeing a lot more people and providing more services.

Cordell added that AWAIC actually has 128 beds altogether, but CDVSA beds are 52. She asked Council members to visualize 52 beds with a census of 60 or 70. There are moms and kids sharing beds, on the couches and on the floors. They are at maximum capacity. They are triaging by lethality and moving people out 4.5 days faster. The average length of stay has dropped from 18 days to 13.5 days.

Satterfield asked for a description of the coordination that AWAIC has with Clare House. Cordell said AWAIC has a strong long history of a quality relationship with Clare House, she assumed going all the way back to 1983. She could confirm Catholic Social Services data that 41% of their population are DV and that that is probably an under-reported number. CSS is struggling financially in their operating dollars, and they are looking everywhere they can, as are other shelter agencies in Anchorage. As STAR testified to yesterday, they are all seeing a serious spike in service access. That is a good indicator, but AWAIC is providing 25% more services with serious cuts. So they are all looking to just buckle down and sustain operations, and then hopefully their next move would be to expand into those other areas.

Satterfield asked if Cordell saw CSS's proposal for which they requested CDVSA funding as complementing AWAIC's services. Cordell said she did not think there would be any more beds but that CSS was trying to pay for the beds that are already there, because CSS is experiencing the same cuts in their operational dollars. In her opinion, CSS was justified to seek funding to cover that 41% defendable DV beds. She did not know about the proposals to expand into family therapy intervention or to do outreach and education — CSS is having a hard time sustaining core operations the same as

AWAIC is. It is tough to make a grant proposal presentation because frequently funders want to hear about something new that will yield positive outcomes. Cordell said she did not think it was wise to expand anything if they cannot maintain core operations statewide.

Chair Stewart said that was one of her concerns about the CSS proposal — if CDVSA provides them funding, would they be able to strengthen some of their services, which might deflect some of those long-term needs that AWAIC would ordinarily address. Cordell said that CSS is not going to expand beds, it is to sustain the beds they have. And Clare House is providing DV services. Chair Stewart asked if CSS providing DV services would reduce in any way the demand on DV services at AWAIC (not beds, but transitional assistance, the therapeutic assistance, etc.), Cordell said she did not think so, that she thought it would allow CSS to continue to hang on. The most expensive resource in any of the budgets is personnel. That is a value that AWAIC is holding, to hang onto the core staff. Pearson has 11 years of tenure, Cordell has been the executive director for three years of a four-year contract, and the average tenure is two years for an executive director in a not-for-profit in Anchorage. One has only to look at STAR's turnover or AWRC's turnover. With the turnover at AWRC came decompensation. Clare House is also trying to hold onto core staff. Bluntly, there is only a little extra money on the table in this funding cycle. There is some more money coming with the VAWA earmark. Cordell said she would support CSS's application for funding, but she was deeply concerned about the testimony she heard yesterday and today about core operations.

Pearson stated that Clare House is not the DV shelter and will not provide bed nights if there a lethality of any kind. They will only accept people into Clare House if they have not had active contact or threats or any domestic violence within the past several weeks and months. That is because AWAIC is the experts. However, once that lethality has decreased, AWAIC often sends people to Clare House. The people will continue with non-residential services, but they need that temporary transition until housing might be able to kick in. The length of stay at AWAIC has decreased this year, and that is where the impact comes in, that Clare House is serving DV victims but just not at the lethality level that AWAIC is — which is appropriate. Cordell added that CSS is a good collaborative partner and does fine work at Clare House.

Williams inquired about transitional services, in light of AWAIC moving families out of the shelter a lot faster this year. Cordell said she wanted to highlight AWAIC's 10-bed Harmony House program that opened in 2004. When she came to AWAIC there wasn't an accompanying operational plan in place in the business plan so it was slow to census. Today they are full with a wait list of 10, so there is definitely a need for that transitional housing. AWAIC's Moving Forward program is in its twelfth year, and that funding has been cut such that they have had to cut the case manager second position. AWAIC does not see that trend stopping, and that funding may dry up. Pearson added that in the numbers for the current year the children's length of stay has increased up to 20 days, so the overall decrease is coming from women who are coming in briefly.

Families are actually staying longer. There is not much in the transitional piece for families. Safe Harbor is a strong partner with AWAIC and with all of the agencies involved. Safe Harbor provides transitional housing to women and children, but they also have an extensive wait list as well. AWAIC works with women as much as they can because it is proven in homeless populations that a person or family is much more successful if they move the least number of times. Cordell mentioned that she heard a National Public Radio story last week that Safe Harbor has 100 on their wait list currently.

House asked if AWAIC was holding a gaming permit. Cordell said yes, that she had detailed some of the games revenue so that the Council would know that they are not actively taking cuts. They have reorganized such that Pearson can go out and be more aggressive in contract negotiations and seeking grants. But AWAIC has a gaming queue, and that \$80,000 a year helps AWAIC offset some of the serious decreases. They also get some additional money in small grants and reimbursables. But gaming money is unrestricted cash and wonderful. AWAIC was cut \$50,000 in United Way funding in two years. So gaming income was able to offset that cut, but the gaming queue is not predictable. AWAIC does not know when they may be out of the gaming queue, and that happened to them before.

Chair Stewart noted that the allotted time for AWAIC had run over, but they had two minutes for closing comments. Cordell described the short staffing on the night shift, the increased demand community-wide for services, the goal to sustain core services, and the desire to expand the legal advocacy and outreach component should funding allow.

**Palmer - AFS**

**Alaska Family Services**

Presenter: Donn Bennice (chief executive officer)

FY07 Award .....	\$473,575
FY08 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$494,975

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Responding to Satterfield, Bennice said AFS merging with two other programs in the area has really added to the services of the domestic violence and sexual assault program.

Satterfield asked if the number of domestic violence and sexual assault clients has increased because of the expansion. Bennice said that was tough to answer although he would say yes because AFS is much more well-known. People who only knew AFS as a domestic violence program ten years ago now get exposed to AFS in a lot of different ways.

Satterfield noted that the grant application does not reflect any sort of fundraising or other cash income. She asked if AFS is actively involved in raising money. Bennice replied that they do not fundraise a lot, but they do some and the money goes to the

agency and not into the AFS budget. The board policy is that all fundraising is a general donation to the agency, and the money is applied as needed. Additional cash funds for the program come from FEMA, and a thrift store generates about \$80,000 year for the agency, most of which comes back into the victim services program.

Satterfield inquired about coordination with Violent Crimes Compensation, since she did not see any reference in the application. Bennice indicated he could not answer that because the executive director wrote the grant. Satterfield asked when the last CDVSA audit was. Bennice said last fall. Satterfield asked about any audit recommendations. Bennice said it was a good audit, and the board was very pleased that there was nothing to correct.

Satterfield asked the size of AFS's service area. Bennice said it was the entire Mat-Su Borough — Talkeetna, Glennallen, etc. Satterfield asked if AFS has clients come from those communities. Bennice said they do but not many from Glennallen. AFS works with the Valdez program to help cover some of theirs when there are issues there. AFS has three emergency respite homes in the Talkeetna area that were put in place about three years ago — they don't use them very often, and usually people get transported to Palmer.

Holloway noted that AFS does a lot with its volunteer program and uses college interns. He asked for more information about that. Bennice said AFS does that throughout the agency, and his background is in the college/university setting so he has an affinity for that. The AFS staff is limited in terms of training, and it only adds value to the program to have other people and some diversity come in. AFS works closely with the college, and any intern/mentoring type system that they can add, they do. AFS does not hand-pick them, but the people come to AFS, and it certainly supplements the staffing.

*[Blank section on tape - possible question from House, according to staff tape log]*

Bennice said they have to put some kind of dollar amount on in-kinds, so they equate the kind of job they are doing to what AFS would normally pay if they hired a staff person. In that case, it's an entry level position reflected in the dollar amount.

Williams asked Bennice to describe AFS's security procedures for victim safety. Bennice replied that a lot of it has to do with training staff. The external security is obvious, but they are getting such a diverse type of client coming through that there is a wide range of problems. Security internally within the shelter includes room searches, search-and-seizure for drug paraphernalia etc., things AFS had not seen before. A lot of that requires training staff on how to identify situations that may be unsafe and then administering those policies.

Under services provided, Williams asked for more information about the follow-up that AFS does for clients. Bennice said they have added two case management positions in the last two years. Case management starts when clients come into the shelter, but it includes following up on job opportunities, interviews, and returning for support groups

and training. AFS has really expanded the support groups in the last two to three years.

Regarding the evaluation section of the proposal, Williams said it was difficult to determine the qualified staff. Bennice stated that AFS has a wide range of qualified staff. One of the problems is the turnover rate, and the reason that people leave is not always the money. One reason is the stress of the shelter, and a lot of it is lack of training when they come in. Staff undergo a basic 40-hour training when they start as a new advocate, but that does not prepare them for some of the real severe mental health and substance abuse situations. It is an ongoing training process. So AFS has qualified staff, but it is a process of developing that over a two-year period. If they don't stay two years, it creates a huge problem for AFS.

Williams asked if AFS has survivors on its board. Bennice said there is one right now out of seven members. Williams noted that AFS is a large organization and wondered why it does not have an indirect rate. Bennice said it was something to think about. AFS has not qualified previously, but they are getting to the point where they may need to think about it.

Hogan said it looked like the number of people served has risen a little bit but the shelter nights have really grown dramatically. He asked for comment on why that is the case. Bennice responded that the main reason is because of AFS's change in philosophy — they are focusing on not just having women enter the shelter and providing a safe environment, but working with them over time to move them from being a victim to being able to deal with transitioning out. The average stay at AFS is about 30-45 days, and that is because AFS is working with the people in many different ways.

Chair Stewart mentioned a conversation that happened after yesterday's proposals were over dealing with the issue of a shelter that had actual knowledge that a client who was coming in was on a sex offender registry. The question had to do with issues of liability — is it a "don't ask, don't tell" philosophy? But if you have active information about that, what is the obligation to the other residents? She said that because Bennice talked about people coming in with broad-ranging and sometimes very serious co-occurring issues, she wanted him to talk a bit more about how AFS has addressed that, whether the particular question has come up, and what impact that has on AFS's services overall.

Bennice replied that those kinds of issues are what they are having to deal with more. AFS certainly is a "no ask" type of situation and they don't particularly go out and look for that. But if they become aware of it — and first staff has to be trained to identify those issues — a lot of time people are not going to tell staff. So training is a huge issue. Regarding the Chair's specific questions, AFS addresses everything on a case-by-case basis. So when something happens, safety is their first issue. So they would inform people who need to be informed, talk to staff about what that means, and they certainly talk to law enforcement a lot. AFS has a great relationship with law enforcement, so if that (sex offender) is an issue they start bringing that into the mix.

For his two-minute closing, Bennice talked about the needs of the program in FY08. One is time-relevant training for residential staff, many of whom have not received the training necessary to deal with issues they are now seeing within the shelters. It is time to move into the twenty-first century and start adopting some training mechanisms, such as self-paced learning, distance delivery, and tel-education opportunities that are not currently used very well. As someone who trained as an educator and spent 20 years as a college professor who specialized in teacher education, and being part of the community health aide certification movement, Bennice said he recommended that the Council at least consider looking at some kind of certification program for the advocates. It adds credibility and it adds consistency across the board. AFS has spent considerable time and effort over the last two years to review its basic philosophies about domestic violence and how it approaches services to the families. They are committed to attacking the root causes of domestic violence.

**Nome - BSWG**

**Bering Sea Women's Group**

Presenter: Janet Ahmasuk

FY07 Award .....	\$465,406
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$487,114

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Holloway inquired about BSWG's statement that it does not get statistics from the police department because the department doesn't provide uniform crime statistics. He asked if BSWG gets a local set of statistics from the police department, because it seems like it would be very important so BSWG could justify its program. Ahmasuk said not that she was aware of.

Hogan noted that it looked like the data was primarily based on national or state prevalence data rather than Nome-specific data. He asked if it was possible for BSWG to ask for that data. If there is a problem, perhaps the CDVSA or others might be able to intervene on BSWG's behalf, because it is important to have that data to justify BSWG's services. He questioned one of the objectives that BSWG indicated it did not meet related to clients filing claims for Violent Crimes Compensation — BSWG had projected to serve about 70 people, and in April 2006 it was modified to six people.

Ahmasuk stated that there was new staff at the time, and she did not know what the bookkeeping method was or how they looked at it. Hogan asked if it was just that people are not reporting that it is happening or if really is not happening. Ahmasuk said that all she knew was the statistics since she came on and what the program has experienced since March 2006. She does not know how to reconcile what the previous staff were using, so she did not know what to say.

Hogan inquired why BSWG, as a non-profit, had a line item in the budget for property taxes. Ahmasuk confirmed that BSWG was being assessed property taxes in Nome,

something she assumed was a Nome City Council thing.

Chair Stewart questioned the other unmet objective that a legal advocate or designee would provide 360 criminal and civil justice system advocacy interventions. Ahmasuk said she did not know what happened with the statistics with the previous folks who were there. Chair Stewart said she understood about the distrust of the legal system and some of the other issues in the community there, but everyone else looks at legal advocacy as being a real significant need. She asked Ahmasuk if she had a sense, even anecdotally, that legal issues have diminished, that there are fewer issues regarding custody, etc.

Ahmasuk stated that Nome has a history of going up and down, lots and few, so she could understand it going up, but she did not know about it going up to 360 or not. When she worked at the hospital for many years they could go a long time with the number of people coming in for something being very low and then all of a sudden there would be an influx. It seems like that trend carries over to the shelter too. She said the law enforcement thing might be an issue with some people too, she didn't know.

Williams inquired about the status of BSWG's audit. Ahmasuk said they just had one about two weeks ago, and it was fine. Williams asked if BSWG has a federal audit completed. Ahmasuk said it has all been done.

Satterfield asked about the last CDVSA audit. Ahmasuk replied that there probably hadn't been anyone to Nome in a couple of years. Ashenbrenner indicated BSWG was due for an audit later this year. Satterfield said that was a good idea because of so many changes that are occurring with the program.

Chair Stewart asked Ahmasuk to identify what the requested increase was for. Ahmasuk said it was basically for staffing, higher fuel costs, and new computers, just trying to maintain services for the most part. BSWG is also losing its Rural Grant, because it was one-time funding. The program has different types of computers, different ages, and only one computer has a firewall. She said she thought the computer system had been hacked into, it almost crashes, and it needs major fixing.

Ahmasuk was given two minutes for closing comments. Regarding the poor attitude of hospital staff and the loss of the SART, Ahmasuk referred to an Amnesty International book that chronicles the problems with sexual assault exams in Alaska and said that Nome isn't any exception. She said she and the executive director decided that BSWG has to address the slow response to sexual assault in the village, to speed things up if they can, even it involves training the health aides to do some of the data collecting so it won't get lost because there are weather problems sometimes. The other problem is housing. Ahmasuk related two recent success stories of women who had been at the shelter for two or three months and who got housing. But if women have more than two children there is nothing available. There is a woman at the shelter with five children, she does not have much education, and she returned to the abuser once and was

almost killed. BSWG does not know what they are going to do. Ahmasuk said she talked to Representative Foster and Senator Olson, who indicated the shelter's best bet was probably to contact Senator Lisa Murkowski for help.

**Sitka - SAFV**

**Sitkans Against Family Violence**

Presenter: Chris Bauman (executive director)

FY07 Award .....	\$336,503
FY08 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$376,395

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Holloway asked for an explanation of the high staff turnover mentioned in SAFV's proposal. Bauman said she thought it was coincidental, but last summer six staff members left within a three-month period. Two were JVs (Jesuit volunteers), and there were no replacements. One person got married and moved to Juneau, one person moved down south, and one went back to college. It wasn't anything going on at the agency, but it felt awful to lose half the staff at the same time and have all new people coming in because it takes six months to a year to train them. SAFV is very steady right now and has a great staff.

Chair Stewart said she understood there were some board issues and board turnover, as well as some problems of coordination with the police department. She asked for more information about that. Bauman stated that SAFV has had a great relationship with the police department for the last 20 years. Two years ago the police chief changed, and the new police chief was on the SAFV board until recently. Philosophies change with people sometimes. Last December some issues were brought to the board from staff about the police department and the relationship. The board investigated for about three months, talking to other agencies in town, to the police department, and to staff, and the board concluded that the police chief had been acting inappropriately as a SAFV board member, misrepresenting the agency. With the help of an attorney (\$3,000), SAFV asked the police chief to leave the board. He continues to act inappropriately. SAFV had a memorandum of agreement with the police department for 18 years, and it no longer does. The police department is duplicating SAFV's services. The department has a victim services coordinator who has begun to do advocacy basically with victims, helping them with protective orders, and offering domestic violence education in the community, things that SAFV has traditionally done. The board has a plan to work with the police department on a proposal to work on concrete things, because when the police chief presents to the public it is all SAFV's fault. So there is some miscommunication. If the SAFV board cannot work with the police chief, there is a plan to ask the city if they can mediate. Bauman said the police chief tends to use a lot of tactics that batterers do, and it is really difficult to stand up to a police chief. It has been an awful process for the community, and it is hurting victims.

Chair Stewart asked if there have been other changes on the SAFV board as a result of this conflict. Bauman said the district attorney resigned from the board and is also

leaving town. The district attorney was a very close friend of the police chief, so he may have done it as a friendship kind of thing. The police chief had invited the head of the tribe to join the board right about the time that all this was coming to a head; this woman was on the board about a month and then said she did not want to be involved.

Chair Stewart asked Bauman to explain the impact to victims of all this. Bauman said that what SAFV hears from victims when they come to SAFV is that when they worked with the police department they were not told about SAFV and they were not referred to SAFV. Several people have come to SAFV who had misinformation given to them about legal services. For example, someone got a protective order based on the police department's recommendation, and then came to SAFV and said the protective order was making everything awful with custody issues and property. Because the victim *[tape change...]* no choice, it was just we need to go get a protective order. So SAFV is finding itself helping people correct what was done before. Bauman said it concerns her that people are not being referred to SAFV. A couple of weeks ago they heard on the police scanner that officers were going out to a call, and they said, "What's SAFV? Is that a hotel?" So police officers are not even being trained on what SAFV is or that the program exists in the community. That is an injustice for victims.

Ashenbrenner inquired if the victim services coordinator at the police department works with or talks to SAFV at all. Bauman replied that before this person was hired by the police department she used to work very closely with SAFV on multiple cases. With the change in personnel, she believed SAFV has worked with the police department's victim services coordinator on three cases in the past year — so very rarely, and only when the victim knows and asks for SAFV personally.

Satterfield stated that she knew the district attorney's office has had a very good working relationship with SAFV. With the DA's departure from the SAFV board, she asked what SAFV's relationship was like as far as working with the victim witness paralegal. She encouraged Bauman, when a new district attorney is assigned to Sitka, to recruit them to follow-up with that. Bauman stated that SAFV's relationship with the DA's office is very good, actually better now that the district attorney is not on the SAFV board. SAFV works with him more closely. SAFV has always had a good relationship with the victim witness coordinator and works a lot with her.

Williams pointed out that there was nothing in SAFV's goals and activities about services to Port Alexander, although the proposal indicates SAFV works with that community. She asked what kind of services are offered to Port Alexander. Bauman stated that SAFV has not gone to Port Alexander for the last couple of years, partly because of not enough funding, but partly because they have expressed to SAFV that they do not want them there. So if a woman in Port Alexander were to call SAFV and say she was in danger and could SAFV help her get out of the situation, SAFV would pay for her to come to the shelter. The 800 number is advertised in Port Alexander. But SAFV has not been in the schools or in the community for a couple of years.

Hogan inquired about the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Delta Grant. Bauman explained that it is a federal grant that is passed through the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault. The grant provides funding in four sites in Alaska. SAFV has a prevention coordinator who focuses primarily on teens and does sessions in the high school on healthy relationships. She is also starting a teen group that has borrowed the name from AWARE (Juneau) and borrowed the model from Bethel to start a theater group so that these teens will be trained and can do peer education for other high-schoolers and the middle school.

Referring to the fiscal management section of the proposal dealing with audits, Hogan noted that SAFV had an audit in fiscal year 2003 and then had what is called "agreed upon procedures." He asked what that is, saying it was not a term he was familiar with. Bauman said there is an accounting firm in Juneau that works with a lot of non-profits doing their audits. SAFV being a United Way agency, United Way requires an audit. SAFV is not required to have a state or fiscal audit because the program does not meet the financial limits. There were many United Way agencies that did not meet that limit but were paying \$5,000 to \$10,000 for an audit, which is a huge amount if the budget is only \$200,000. So the accounting firm worked with United Way to come up with a procedure that is almost like a mini audit. This outside auditor looks at the financial policies and whether the program is following those, looks at whether the program is following the grant requirements, and does some testing but about a quarter of the financial testing that a full audit would require. Then the auditor writes a report. So they don't re-do the financial statements like an audit would do, but they look at all the controls to make sure that a program is working in an appropriate manner. That is what SAFV has chosen to do, since they are not required to have an audit.

House asked what SAFV was doing in Angoon, where the rape is 95% to 100% sexual assault. Bauman stated that SAFV had someone go to Angoon last week for the first time in about six months. SAFV has had trouble finding a qualified person for the outreach coordinator position, but they have someone starting July 1 and hope to be able to get back to visiting Angoon at least four times a year.

Satterfield stated that the Family Justice Center in Sitka is being evaluated to determine whether it is filling a gap in services or whether it is duplicating existing services. She asked if SAFV has made any determination on that. Bauman said no, that it is an active discussion at every steering committee meeting. The last statistics are that the Family Justice Center is getting about 14 clients per month coming in, and about 80% of them are also being served by SAFV. Sometimes if the shelter is really busy SAFV sends people to the Justice Center to do paperwork because SAFV has an advocate sitting there bored. Bauman said she came into that project three years ago, one month after the Family Justice Center got the grant. It is a big city model, and it has been a real challenge for the community to do this project. SAFV is really looking at other ways of going and has applied for several federal grants to get attorneys and maybe focus more on the legal advocacy piece. They are also looking into doing a safe visitation center there, so it is very much in flux right now.

Satterfield asked if SAFV or the Family Justice Center was paying for the advocate there. Bauman said the Family Justice Center, that SAFV has a contract with them to provide an advocate there.

Chair Stewart commented that it sounded like there was a fair amount of fragmentation going on in Sitka right now, between what is going on at the police department, what is going on at SAFV, and what is going on with the Family Justice Center. She asked if all these entities are represented on the steering committee that Bauman mentioned earlier and if they are actively questioning the fragmentation. Bauman said the Family Justice Center has actually destroyed the collaboration — it was supposed to make it stronger and it has actually sort of destroyed it. In addition, Sitka's judge is retiring, they are losing the head of social services, they have lost the batterers intervention program in the past year, and the head of the drug and alcohol program is leaving town. Several really key people in Sitka are leaving town, so everything feels like it is totally falling apart, and SAFV is just trying to keep the pieces together until all the new players come on board and they can try to pull it back together.

SAFV was given the allotted two minutes for a closing statement.

Break from 10:24 to 10:56 a.m.

## **COMMUNITY-BASED BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS**

Chair Stewart indicated the Council would next hear proposals from agencies seeking FY08 CDVSA funding for community-based batterers intervention programs. She said programs would have three minutes to make a presentation after which the Council would have 15 minutes to ask questions. There would be two minutes at the end for a closing statement.

### **Valdez - PVCC**

#### **Providence Valdez Counseling Center**

Presenter: Kimberly Elias (executive director) by teleconference

FY07 Community-based BIP Award..... \$ 0

FY08 Community-based BIP Grant Request..... \$9,123

#### *Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield asked for information about the type of education that PVCC is providing in the batterers program, and, importantly, about victim safety checks. Elias stated that PVCC does a lot of cognitive \_\_\_\_\_ type education and uses a lot of irrational-emotive therapy. They have a strong education program that teaches the men about identifying irrational beliefs and hopefully correcting those beliefs. They educate about what domestic violence is, and taking responsibility and accountability for what the men have done in the past. PVCC does an initial victim safety check and also sends a letter

and pamphlets and does a safety plan with the victim. The questions cover the man's past history, the current situation, what brought the man to the program, and how much follow-up the victim would like. PVCC also refers the woman to victim services. They typically contact the victim monthly to see how she is doing, if he has re-offended, etc.

Satterfield asked how involved Advocates for Victims of Violence (AVV) in Valdez was with PVCC. Elias stated that in the past AVV has done the victim safety checks for PVCC, but that stopped along the way after there was new management at AVV. However, PVCC is starting to talk with AVV about again becoming more involved in the victim safety check process. She added that a few years ago PVCC sent an AVV advocate to a training in Oregon about the offender program side, which also had an emphasis on victim safety. Then there were some management changes and PVCC was unable to get that back in place at that time.

Holloway requested some statistics on whether the batterers intervention program has been successful or not. Elias said that when she did her year-end report for CDVSA the recidivism rate was 18%, and that included those that graduated who had been through the entire program over its six-year history. The 18% either re-offended and were arrested, or PVCC had talked to the victim and found out that the man continues to be physically abusive.

Chair Stewart asked if the 47 clients served represented those who had successfully completed the entire program. Elias said she was out of town and did not have those figures with her, but she did not think so. She guessed it would be about 20.

Hogan asked Elias to comment specifically on whether PVCC focuses on the continuum of violence orientation in its program. Elias said yes, that they also focus on the cycle of violence and on the power and control wheel. They have a full curriculum of about 100 pages, and there are eight core assignments that clients need to complete before they can move on to monthlies. The curriculum is similar to the New York model.

Hogan said that although the proposal mentions Glennallen, Copper River, Copper Center and Chitna in the narrative, he did not get a good sense for what sorts of services PVCC is providing to communities outside of Valdez. Elias stated that PVCC has had referrals to the program from those areas, and those people have to travel to Valdez once a week to attend the program. At one time PVCC had had hopes of bringing the program into that area, but they are not able to do that right now due to the low numbers they are experiencing.

Satterfield asked why PVCC was doing only monthly victim safety checks. Elias said they could do more if they had a sense that the victim was in danger — it depends on which client and what is going on with that client. It is not a strict rule to do monthly safety checks, but it averages out to be about monthly. Some they call weekly, but it is usually not over a month.

Chair Stewart made a general comment that all the victim services programs are aware of the problem with the court system and plea bargaining and the recent case where it was determined that regardless of what the statute looks like it says, that you don't have to refer someone to a qualified batterers program. The CDVSA has had no luck addressing that issue, but it is something that everyone recognizes as a problem.

The Chair indicated that PVCC had two minutes for a closing comment. Elias said that she had been doing the job for six years and in the past year moved up to a directorship of the agency. She said she cared a lot about the program and wanted to be able to find a person with the right fit to come in and run the PVCC program and to do important collaboration.

**Ketchikan - KIC**  
**Ketchikan Indian Community**

Presenter: Debbie Patton (deputy general manager), accompanied by Jasmine Stewart (behavioral health director)

FY07 Community-based BIP Award..... \$51,313  
FY08 Community-based BIP Grant Request..... \$64,806

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield complimented KIC on being a strong leader in coordinated community response and in the task force. It has made a difference because the proposal talked about the good working relationship with the district attorney's office, and that is critical. Being present in the court is one of the most important tasks of any batterers intervention program. She asked why KIC was only doing victim safety checks once a month.

As supervisor of the program, Jasmine Stewart stated that they probably do it more often. She weekly asks Lynn Hoffer, the victim advocate, how many victim safety checks she has done that week, and it is often done weekly, if not daily.

Satterfield asked when the last CDVSA audit was, and the status of any recommendations. Jasmine Stewart said the last audit was two years ago, so they need another one, but she was not aware of the schedule. She confirmed that KIC had met all the recommendations of the last audit.

Holloway inquired about any statistics on the recidivism rate. Jasmine Stewart stated that of the 14 clients who have completed the program there has been only one in the last year who was reassigned to the program. Interestingly, that person also still continued to be in contact with KIC. Patton said KIC uses a combination of the Duluth and Emerge model in a phased system so a person doesn't graduate just because they hit the magic number of weeks. They need to successfully work through the curriculum and the program. Many of the offenders do a longer program than the minimum 36-week requirement.

Williams said the RFP requested the narrative on community coordination to include victim services, law enforcement, prosecution, and the court system. She did not find anything in KIC's proposal about law enforcement and wanted to know what kind of coordination they do. Patton stated that they normally have an annual memorandum of agreement with all the partners of the domestic violence task force, and she noticed that that did not make it into the grant application. KIC has a current memorandum of agreement and they provide training to law enforcement, and law enforcement coordinates very closely with KIC on the batterers program. Law enforcement knows the nights that KIC meets and often do drive-bys of the facility because the staff are the only people in the building during those times. Law enforcement also worked with KIC to get their knocks-box up and running. Jasmine Stewart added that law enforcement is on the DV task force as well.

In terms of agency management basic orientation and training, Williams asked for more information about the staff training that is involved in this program. Patton stated that KIC has had no turnover in staff, so the victim advocate who started in 1996 is still providing the services and is a wonderful asset to the agency and the community. Also, Glen Fazakerley, the program counselor, has been with the program for five years. The program is a component within a larger behavioral health department, and they have since added domestic violence components and a child welfare component to the other services, as well as the substance abuse component. Jasmine Stewart added that all nine staff members in the behavioral health department are trained in domestic violence.

Hogan asked what KIC would spend the requested increase on related to doing something with telemedicine. Patton said that in each community they would have a person to open the facility, allow people access to the tele-video cart, and also collect their fees on that site — but not be a trained facilitator. That community would work through KIC's two facilitators in Ketchikan.

Satterfield asked if there would be someone present with the participants to observe their behavior. Patton said yes.

Williams inquired how reliable the tele-video connection is. Jasmine Stewart said the connection is very good. She added that it is not the connection that is the issue in particular in Metlakatla; it is the community's readiness to utilize and to monitor.

Referring to a statement in the proposal, Chair Stewart asked Patton what KIC would do about a court-ordered referral of a client whom KIC determined was not the principal aggressor. Patton replied that sometimes KIC has had inappropriate referrals where the person was not the primary aggressor. When KIC has felt it was not appropriate for that person to participate in a group process they have worked with the person on an individual basis or have gone back to the court to try and address the referral and maybe get a more appropriate referral.

KIC was given two minutes for a closing statement. Jasmine Stewart gave an example of how KIC provides services. In Ketchikan this year there was a death related to domestic violence. KIC supported the family of the victim throughout the process with safety checks, sitting watch in the court, and working with WISH (Women In Safe Homes) in Ketchikan. It is a perfect example of how they work together.

### **LUNCH RECESS**

Chair Stewart recessed the meeting for lunch at 11:23 a.m. and called the meeting back to order at 1:00 p.m. She said someone had suggested combining the presentations of the two batterers intervention programs that operate both a community-based and a prison BIP. Because Donn Bennice had a flight to catch, she invited Alaska Family Services to make the next presentation.

### **COMMUNITY-BASED & PRISON BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS (Continued)**

#### **Palmer - AFS/FVIP**

#### **Family Violence Intervention Program - component of Alaska Family Services**

Presenter: Judy Gette (program manager of FVIP), accompanied by Donn Bennice (executive director of AFS)

FY07 Community-based BIP Award.....	\$55,812
FY08 Community-based BIP Grant Request.....	\$55,812
FY07 Prison BIP Award.....	\$56,589
FY08 Prison BIP Grant Request .....	\$56,589

#### *Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield asked if AFS/FVIP has done something similar with the Palmer district attorney's office that they mentioned having done with the courts. Gette stated that the Palmer district attorney's office toured the facility and will be asking that referral to the program be part of the sentencing.

Hogan inquired about which group held three meeting a week. Gette replied that the community BIP meets three times a week. The prison BIP has three groups that meet weekly: one each at Palmer Minimum, Palmer Medium, and Point McKenzie.

Ashenbrenner stated that the CDVSA has been hearing anecdotally about prosecutors pleading down sentences so it is not domestic violence so the people do not have to be court-ordered. She asked if AFS/FVIP is seeing that in the Palmer area. Gette said they are seeing some of it. When they met with the judges it was interesting because they said "these are clearly not DV." She said she did not ask the judges how they define "clearly not DV" because if there was an affidavit, and there were partners, and there was some assaultive behaviors. So judges are still making some calls about that, and there is some negotiation, because AFS/FVIP will get things where an affidavit makes it

look clearly as if it was a domestic violence offense, and the judgment will be marked non-DV.

Chair Stewart commented that Palmer has a couple of judges who are notorious for circumventing some of those findings, and in many circumstances it has been to avoid the federal gun prohibition. So there is some historical awareness of judges in Palmer being particularly open to avoiding DV. She said it doesn't sound like AFS/FVIP is necessarily seeing that, and that is an area that deserves a little more attention. Gette said she thought that judges — and they even said this at the meeting — don't like rubber stamps or boxes, and they want to make decisions about how to handle a particular case and not just say it's all DV. They want to have the discretion to say that this one looks different than that other one so I'm going to call it this.

Satterfield asked how frequently AFS/FVIP does victim safety checks and who is doing them. Gette explained that two facilitators do the safety checks. They send out packets to everyone they get an address on and then do the follow-up contact. Some of the victims will say things are okay, and AFS/FVIP will tell them they will call once a month, and once a month is all they want. But AFS/FVIP may talk to other victims two or three times a week because of things they know are going on in that home. The frequency of calls is very individual.

Satterfield inquired how successful AFS/FVIP is at following up at three, six and twelve months after a client's successful completion or termination from the program. Gette said she has a tracking system set up and once a month she pulls the names that are due for a three-, six- or twelve-month follow-up. She defines recidivism by checking to see if the person has had a new arrest for a domestic violence related offense (doesn't have to be a conviction) or a protective order or a violation of a protective order. She checks Court View for that. If it is not clear in Court View, she might check with the jails to see if they are in custody. Then she passes them off to one of the facilitators who then attempts to contact the offender and the victim or with the shelter to see if the victim has been receiving services there. AFS/FVIP is finding that it is a little different for the community-based group than for the prison group. Prison group tends to have a higher recidivism rate with that definition, not unexpected because they are a higher risk group and why they are doing time. Over the last two years it has been anywhere from about 6% in the community-based group to about 12% with the prison group.

Holloway asked how far out AFS/FVIP checks on offenders. Gette said one year from the last time they attended a group.

Regarding the prison BIP, Williams requested more information about the in-service training for correctional officers. Gette stated that because it is required by the grant she always makes contact with the superintendent that she wants to do that training. Because she has been coming in for three years, she started with the basics initially and has done some different things after that. She did "In Her Shoes" one year for some of the personnel at Palmer Correctional Center. This year at Point McKenzie she did an

overview of the program with the staff and then did "Tough Guys," talking about male violence in general and how it contributes to a cultural viewpoint that leads to more domestic violence. She tries to vary the topics because it is often the same correctional staff from year to year.

Hogan said he was pretty impressed by AFS/FVIP's recidivism rates, and he wondered if they had an opportunity to look at how those rates measure up to the national benchmarks. Gette stated that as a group of providers they had talked about how the state could have some consistent types of recidivism checks, how they define it, and what they are looking at. They are not quite there. They are finding nationally that recidivism is hard to define. Using re-arrest is one way, but that is not all there is to it. Something could happen and there be no arrest, or something could happen that is abusive but not necessarily an arrestable crime. Gette said that struggling with the different definitions she was unsure if she could compare AFS/FVIP's recidivism rate with any kind of national figures. Hogan said that might be something the CDVSA could work on to help the entire statewide programs. Gette agreed.

Satterfield noted that AFS/FVIP mentioned getting referrals from Office of Children's Services (OCS). Since that is not a court order, she wondered how long those participants are in the program and if they complete the full 36 weeks. She also asked how that impacts the group setting if those participants do not do 36 weeks. Gette explained that OCS will rate it as part of their case plan; OCS is holding the participants' kids over their head with that piece of the plan. Sometimes OCS will say do the whole program, sometimes it might be 12 or 24 weeks and they want documentation of how a person is behaving. If a participant does not do it, there are really no repercussions from AFS/FVIP's end. They will inform the social workers, or the social workers will request a progress report on attendance and participation and homework completion, etc. Satterfield asked if that affected the rest of the participants who are court ordered there. Gette said no because the OCS-referred people feel just as "ordered" and may have the same kind of denial issues, but they are certainly motivated by a different kind of goal than the others.

Chair Stewart asked if someone who starts in the prison program and then is released can transition into the community-based program to complete the required number of weeks. Gette said absolutely. She said that is nice in their community because there is the pre-trial facility, the Palmer Corrections, and the farm — the series of prisons that people will move through. Then from Point McKenzie or Palmer Corrections they may be released and they can continue in the community-based program. If they are releasing to Anchorage, AFS/FVIP gives them information about Anchorage programs so they can transfer their hours over there, too. Chair Stewart asked if some people manage to work through the whole cycle despite all the transitions. Gette stated that a guy at Palmer Medium has done 70-plus classes, and there is a guy at Point McKenzie who had done about 72 classes. Because they have been through the cycle of classes a couple of times, AFS/FVIP tries to give them some special assignments to keep it interesting.

Satterfield asked if some people have attended that many weeks because they have been in prison that long or because they just haven't gotten it yet. Gette said because they have been in prison that long. It is a benefit when conducting a group to have some core people to help the new participants along.

Williams inquired why the grant proposal contains the volunteer program information when it is not part of the score sheets. Bennice stated that it is part of a standard packet that AFS puts together for writing grants. He added that AFS/FVIP uses community service workers, and those in essence are volunteers that AFS charges back their fees off of that.

AFS/FVIP was given two minutes for closing comments. Gette stated that she had 20 years with the Department of Corrections and retired as a probation officer. She always believed in the restorative justice model and the idea that people are part of a community. So one of the things that she does with the community-based groups and the prison groups is they can start to feel isolated and identified and shamed because of their behavior, but they have to develop the idea that they are part of something bigger than their problem, part of a community. She described a flag project and the three-man climbing team that took the flags to the 20,320-foot level of Denali on May 25, 2007. There is also a playhouse building project by the community group and the prison groups as a fundraiser or donation to the shelter.

**Fairbanks - IAC**

**Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living**

Presenter: Brenda Stanfill (executive director)

FY07 Community-based BIP Award.....	\$67,312
FY08 Community-based BIP Grant Request.....	\$67,312
FY07 Prison BIP Award.....	\$41,648
FY08 Prison BIP Grant Request .....	\$42,233

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield commended IAC for having a safety victim advocate, which she thought was critical. She recalled when IAC first started the BIP program that it was a real struggle to have an advocate that had the time available to do safety checks. She asked how successful IAC is at monitoring the batterers after they have completed the program or been terminated, and what the timeline was.

Stanfill said it is a challenge. The people at the prison are very transient. The way the regulations read right now (something for the Council to consider) is that IAC has to track anybody who starts the program. That means tracking everybody in the prison who attended even one group six, twelve and eighteen months out. That is very difficult to do, especially when some of them get transferred to another prison, some are out and move to another community, etc. IAC had a really hard time tracking those folks. It

is much easier in the community-based BIP because normally if the batterer has spent the time to come to the group they are from the community or have ties in the community so IAC can track them down. IAC does it best to track everyone, but sometimes they're not so successful with the prison BIP. With both programs they attempt to track at six, 12 and 18 months at a minimum. In addition to that, IAC is always tracking daily — pulling the police blotter every day and getting all the criminal complaints from court — and has a database. The other way they track is that women that IAC has connected with over the course of the batterer working with the BIP tend to continue on with IAC even if the batterer does not. So this is one tremendously positive piece of men's programs, connecting with a victim whom they may not have connected with otherwise. A woman may not have felt comfortable talking to IAC, but when she is able to say that she has to talk to IAC as part of the batterer's program it gives her a sense of empowerment to communicate. That is another way IAC gets data on re-offenses, because sometimes the victim does not use law enforcement, so it is not going through the police blotter, but IAC learns that the person is re-offending, using power and control tactics, and not behaving appropriately at their home. At a minimum, IAC calls the victim at six, 12 and 18 months, if the victim is not continuing to work with IAC.

Holloway asked what the support was like from the community, the courts, and the prosecutors. Stanfill replied that communication-wise they talk real positive and have a lot of good support. IAC does not have the problems that are happening in Anchorage and some of the other communities, where batterers are told they only have to attend a program for 12 weeks. Fairbanks judges have a set, canned thing that says a batterer is being sent to an alternatives-to-violence program, they must enroll by a certain date, and they must complete by a certain date. The judges don't differ from that. But IAC has found that they are getting less and less people actually referred. About four years ago, in the neighborhood of 250 people were being referred in a year, and now it is down to the mid-100s. It is about 100 people lower but yet the people going through the court system have not decreased. So when IAC asked about that there is some confusion as to whether it is the district attorney's office not asking (which they feel strongly that they are) or the judges not specifically stating it on the record so it is not being put in the judgment. So IAC is currently working to get that rectified. Stanfill said they have good, open communication, so she believed that they will reach a solution.

Referring to the fees listed in the IAC proposal, Chair Stewart asked how successful IAC is in collecting group fees or if the numbers were actually collection numbers. Stanfill stated that IAC is using some of the community-based BIP group fees to help pay for the prison BIP, so it is not that they are collecting fees from the prison members. That program is a little more expensive than IAC gets funded for. IAC operates the two programs as one program, even though it has two different grant funding streams. So the money in the proposal under the prison program is the anticipated group fees collected from the community-based program. About \$38,000 is a normal yearly collection.

Chair Stewart asked what the accounts receivable were. Stanfill stated that since the beginning she was adamant that if someone was going to come to group they were going to pay, and IAC has stuck to that principle from the beginning. So they don't have an accounts receivable; they require prepayment. With that expectation from the start, people have risen to the occasion. When participants get paid, they will come in and pay for the next two groups. They really do have the money. When Office of Children's Services is assisting people in paying their group fees, then IAC will bill OCS as long as they have something that says OCS is taking responsibility for it. IAC feels strongly that if this batterers intervention program is about accountability, people should pay. It is a sliding fee scale, so they may only have to pay \$10. When guys say they don't have any money, IAC tells them they may have to do without two packs of cigarettes that week so they can pay for group — and they do. Chair Stewart said she was impressed.

Satterfield inquired if IAC requires community work in lieu of payment. Stanfill said they do. IAC has found that people can usually come up with the \$10, but a lot of people were calling to say they had to get into the program but did not have that initial \$100 to do the intake (\$75) and orientation (\$25). So IAC allows people to do 10 hours of work service with any agency, or they can help IAC with work around the facility. IAC requires that people complete the 10 hours of work service prior to doing the intake and orientation.

Ashenbrenner asked if it was a problem having the batterers on the grounds of the IAC facility. Stanfill clarified that it is not on IAC's grounds; they don't do the men's' programs anywhere close to the victim services facility. It is a totally separate location in the old shelter space, meaning IAC no longer has to rent space and has been able to lower costs as a result. That is why IAC did not ask for an increase in the programs; they could use the rent savings to pay health insurance increases.

Satterfield asked Stanfill to expand on the statement of need that indicated IAC expects the military to come back and the numbers to go up. Stanfill stated that the military has come back, and unfortunately, the numbers are not going up. The military was deployed for what started out at 12 months, but it ended up they were out of the community about 18 months. That made a dramatic impact on the number of people that IAC was serving. When the military returned, IAC got geared up for the world to fall apart basically, but what happened was that two months after they got back they were all shipped out to different posts. Then there was a new batch of people, but these people are also suffering from a lot of things from what they have seen and been through that are impacting the community now. The military is going into somewhat of a shutdown mode, and they don't want to get the community involved in some of the things that they are dealing with. The military is trying to deal with it inside their agency. There was a change of command on the military installation, which has not been such a positive change. IAC knows there are quite a few people being arrested for battering on the post who are not making it into the BIP as they once would have under the prior commander. So IAC is working with the family advocacy program, the commander, and the social work counseling services to figure out what they can do there. Right now the numbers

for the BIP are still down, not representing the military.

Hogan commented that a lot of people coming back have brain injury. He asked if IAC has had an opportunity to at least touch base with the brain injury network to begin to recognize that in the people that IAC is serving and perhaps modify the approaches that the program might use. Stanfill said it was not something that had popped into her brain yet. She said she appreciated Hogan calling her attention to that, and IAC will definitely look into it so they are prepared.

Chair Stewart gave IAC time for closing comments. Stanfill stated that IAC is currently looking to offer services on Fort Wainwright. They had had a specific group that was geared toward the military at one point, before they were deployed. IAC works a lot with the court systems. Because the courts know that IAC does everything in its power to make sure a low income person and a family does not drown because of the cost of the BIP, they are more inclined to refer people to IAC and make sure that they go through it. Having a non-profit that can offer a sliding fee and do everything they can to work with a person to make sure they can be compliant with the program is a very positive thing in the community. She said that Juneau has requested funding for a prison BIP. At the time that the Juneau program was unfunded, Palmer and Fairbanks received an increase from that funding being split between them. IAC did not necessarily increase the amount of services but they had more money to work with. IAC would have no heartburn in the Council looking at the Juneau program being able to come back. IAC believes that is an important program statewide and would figure out what to do in order for Juneau to have a BIP again. Stanfill said she appreciated the Council's commitment to men's programs. She hoped that the CDVSA in the next legislative session would think about how to get the funding increased because the BIP has a two-fold effect on the women that IAC connects with. It gives men an opportunity to have the skills to change, and it gives IAC an opportunity to connect with people they may not connect with otherwise, who are isolated in the community. She encouraged the Council to keep supporting the batterers intervention programs and thanked them for supporting the Fairbanks programs.

Chair Stewart stated that the testimony letters that she finds particularly compelling are the ones from the guys who have been through the program. Then she asks herself if the men got brownie points for writing the letters, but cynicism aside, and assuming the letters are truthful, they are very compelling testimonials.

Stanfill said there is a percentage of people who are really stuck and kind of enjoy what they are doing, and they may have some other things going on. But for a large percentage of them this is such a learned, entrenched behavior that what we think of normal they cannot even comprehend. Behavior modification is one of the toughest things people ever have to do, and that is what the batterers intervention program is asking — not only behavior modification but changing their belief systems. Sometimes one time through for a guy who is really entrenched in this and its all they know, it is not going to happen. The counselors hope these men learn a few skills, like getting in the

car and driving away, and then the next time they have to teach him that driving away for three days was not what they were talking about. Depending on the skill level and knowledge, not every guy is going to get it the first time through. Recidivism rates are really not an accurate reflection of the success of a program. It is really about who the program is serving, and was quality of life better for everybody involved, including the children and the partner (or the next partner).

**Homer - SPHH**

**South Peninsula Haven House**

Presenter: Peg Coleman (executive director)

FY07 Community-based BIP Award..... \$25,563  
FY08 Community-based BIP Grant Request..... \$34,600

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

House requested information about the Duluth model and the Emerge model. Coleman said SPHH actually uses three models. They use the New York model for the system structure, which makes it a strict disposition of the court that the accountability comes through that system approach. She said she thought the Emerge model was a little more therapeutic. Most of the models have two-stage groups. The demographics in Alaska are unique in that the community is very transient. There are a lot of men who are two months out (of state), two months in, and none of the models really address that. She is working with some of the national people to try to develop a model that will be more consistent with Alaska demographics. SPHH blends the Duluth model and the Emerge model. The Duluth model does mostly the power and control and looks at the system. Emerge is a lot more of the personal accountability and examining the individual relationships. All three models have merit, but none of them fit perfectly in Alaska.

House cited the 15 people in the SPHH BIP program with 11 completing the program. She asked Coleman if the cost to operate the program was fair for the possible prevention of domestic violence. Coleman responded no, that it speaks to why SPHH made a lot of changes to the BIP after she got there. She said she was appalled and pretty annoyed, especially if she thought the money was coming out of victim services. SPHH now has 23 men in the class and they are having to double up because they don't screen people out. She thanked Hogan for his earlier comment about brain injury, because SPHH is working with people with significant disabilities, and she believes they have to meet people where they are at. However, having worked with people with a variety of other barriers, there is no excuse for the violence. And this is targeted partner violence, so the men are choosing their victims. They can usually manage their anger really well with other people. So SPHH approaches it from that point.

Satterfield noted that SPHH indicated it did not provide a BIP program in the villages, yet the budget had travel money. Coleman clarified that the travel budget was for training outside the state. However, SPHH is working to help get a BIP up and running again in Port Graham. Satterfield said the travel budget indicated the money was to

provide emergency transport of women and children. Coleman said that was a bad sentence that got carried over from the past and she wished to take it out — that is not how they are using the money. She said SPHH does not get a lot of referrals from the village, and she believes it is because the judge honors the fact that there are travel issues. Coleman explained that all three models talk about that the primary client of a batterers program is the woman who is the victim. And that is one of the first things that is dropped in a batterers intervention program because the facilitators start focusing on fixing the men. So the money in the budget is for ongoing training, which is really key because there is so much going on nationally — looking at the efficacy and looking at how recidivism rates are analyzed, because most things are unreported. In Homer women used to say don't send him to the BIP because he is becoming a better batterer, so the previous BIP made it much more dangerous for the women. And it took a concerted effort of SPHH working with the police department, the district attorney and the judge to determine if a program was going to work, how it was going to work. If a program is not done with a court response that is immediate to non-compliance, it makes it really unsafe for the woman.

Satterfield asked if there were two facilitators at the SPHH batterers program. Coleman said there are always two and sometimes three. They tag team and really have to watch the facilitation because it is a difficult process. They have to put out the educational material at the same time as they really need to key onto the body language and what is happening, holding the men accountable. Coleman said she could make her life a lot easier if she didn't do a screen-in process, but there is no other monitoring system in the southern peninsula. They have one probation officer who only handles the big cases, and he is in Kenai. So SPHH discussed this at the domestic violence task force, and the best thing to do, at least on a weekly basis, is to hold people accountable and know what is going on. They have gotten pretty good at predicting when something is going to go awry. So the program works — probably better than a bracelet.

Satterfield asked who was doing the victim safety checks and how frequently they were being done. Coleman said often, and it is driven by the victim. The lead advocate handles the safety checks, monitoring what is happening in the court, etc. SPHH keeps in a lot of contact with some women, but it is just very, very dangerous for SPHH to even contact some women at all.

Holloway mentioned the earlier discussion about people camping on the beach in Homer and the problems associated with couch surfing and things like that. He asked how SPHH keeps up with those types of people or if they are not allowed in the BIP. Coleman assured him that SPHH takes them, and for that reason, because when they don't show and don't comply, they are in court and Judge Murphy holds them accountable. Then they're back in class. She said she finds the group quite interesting because they don't separate the population out, and it is the accountability piece. That would not work if she did not have a relationship with the local judge who takes the program seriously and holds status hearings. The same goes for the district attorney and the police department. Because SPHH is not screening people out of the group, the

program is held in high regard by the local police department. When there was a vigil, they showed up with their wives and marched for SPHH. They know who SPHH is working with, and it is not fluff. Coleman said she has a concern in Alaska, and it is really a national concern, but in general batterers programs can become a class issue because the participants are lower-income. The doctors, lawyers, and professional men who get arrested for domestic violence, who SPHH knows have been in chronic abusive relationships, are able to lawyer themselves out. She sees a disproportionate number of poor men to the men who are arrested for domestic violence, and she wanted to caution everyone about that.

Coleman responded to a question that was inaudible (no microphone). She said no, this is an extremely important issue, and she vacillates a lot on the use of funding for victims going for batterers intervention programs. If done well and in partnership, it can be part of a coordinated community response. It cannot be done halfway, it cannot be done without proper funding, and it cannot be done without adequate training. It sends a really bad message when everyone steps up, when there is a dangerous situation of domestic violence in a family, when an officer responds to what he knows is probably the most volatile situation, when everybody does their job, and the disposition of the court is to go to a batterers program — and for the man to not be in compliance and for there to be no response. That totally undermines everything that everybody does. So there is some work needed to tighten it up.

## **PRISON BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS**

### **Juneau - JBAP (AWARE)**

#### **Juneau Batterers Accountability Program**

Presenter: Saralyn Tabachnick (executive director) and Anne Roth (program director who coordinates and co-facilitates the community-based batterers accountability program)

FY07 Prison BIP Award.....	\$ 0
FY08 Prison BIP Grant Request .....	\$45,450

#### *Questions/answers after presentation:*

Satterfield applauded JBAP for running a 48-week batterers program and said she wished the programs could be even longer than that. Roth said that having seen these people over a long period of time, it sometimes takes 10, 20, maybe even 30 weeks, so it helpful to have the program Juneau has.

House praised the Southeast people for continually doing a great job.

Holloway asked if JBAP intended to work the community-based batterers program and the prison program together so they will complement each other, similar to what the programs in Palmer and Fairbanks do. Roth said yes, but they will do an additional class or two, depending on need, in the Glacier Manor Community Residential Center (CRC).

Satterfield asked how frequently JBAP does safety checks. Roth said they offer them weekly, so when she leaves for class an advocate at the women's shelter does the safety checks every week. However, not every woman opts in for every week. Some do it every other week, some monthly, and others don't want to be called. Many of the women are no longer in a relationship with the batterer, but others she personally checks with at least quarterly to see how they are doing. Satterfield asked if JBAP would continue the same monitoring for the prison program once the batterer has completed the program or terminated. Roth said yes. She added that they are still in the early stages of monitoring, but they have plans to check for re-offenses every quarter using the same methods that other presenters identified earlier. JBAP will also talk to the participant and their partner every quarter for at least a year.

Hogan inquired about the relationship that is outlined in the MOA between Gastineau Human Services, the Department of Corrections, and JBAP. Tabachnick stated that the prison in Juneau is Lemon Creek Correctional Center, and there is also the Community Residential Center (CRC) that Gastineau Human Services runs, which is currently where JBAP holds the community-based batterers accountability group. JBAP contacted both Gastineau Human Services and the superintendent at the Lemon Creek Correctional Center to see if they were interested in prison BIPs, and they both were. The hesitation with the superintendent at the Correctional Center was that he did not feel he had the authority to move forward with it, so he referred Tabachnick to someone else, who also referred her to someone else. Ultimately the state could not make a determination — although they were interested in talking more about it with the CDVSA, and Tabachnick referred them to Ashenbrenner. So JBAP moved forward with Gastineau Human Services, also because they hold men for a longer time period. Men are often at Lemon Creek for a very short term and then move on to another facility. So given the choice, JBAP thought that Gastineau Human Services would be a better way to go in terms of making an impact with men and being able to have contact with victims.

Hogan asked if that meant JBAP would not be doing anything with the Lemon Creek Correctional Center in the future. Tabachnick replied that they presently will not be doing groups at the Center. Some of the men who start at Lemon Creek get transferred to Gastineau Human Services, so JBAP will see those men. But JBAP will not be going into the prison.

Holloway requested more information about the professional services contract with Dr. Mander, something he had not seen in the other proposals. Tabachnick explained that Dr. Mander is a licensed psychologist who co-facilitates the community-based group that JBAP does now. He does the initial intake and assessment with the men to make sure that they are appropriate for a group and to assess if they need alcohol treatment, for example, or something else to coincide. JBAP pays Dr. Mander \$100 an hour for his services, which is a 10% in-kind, so that explains the fees in the proposal.

Williams said she was trying to picture how a prison BIP would work if JBAP was not going into Lemon Creek Correctional Center, which is the prison. She needed more of an explanation of how the program would work. Tabachnick stated that Gastineau Human Services has a contract with the Department of Corrections and has a correctional center as part of their programming.

Chair Stewart asked if JBAP takes self-referrals or if all the referrals are court-ordered. She further asked about the model JBAP uses for getting the court to require compliance. Roth stated that the vast majority are court referrals, but JBAP also gets referrals from the Office of Children's Services. JBAP is getting an increasing number of self-referrals, they think because people are in custody disputes, and as part of the new statutes they are taking batterer accountability programs. The court has a standard line if it is a domestic violence situation, and they refer people to JBAP. The court does not refer people for different lengths of time; they simply refer people to the program, and the people are supposed to comply with JBAP's recommendations, which by and large is the 48-week program. If a person does not attend group, JBAP files an affidavit of non-compliance with the city or district attorney. The person is then summoned to court, and judges generally give them a few additional days of jail time and then they are re-referred to JBAP.

For the two-minute closing, Tabachnick said she wanted to echo the previous comments about how important victim safety is. One of the advantages of having JBAP is having access to women who would otherwise not be using AWARE services. AWARE would not know these women were out there and would not be able to offer safety checks and safety planning. That is a tremendous boon, aside from offering services to men who can have an opportunity to change their behavior. She stated that the proposal budget did not include a 20%-plus health insurance premium increase that both the AWARE and JBAP programs received, which put her into a state of shock.

Chair Stewart called a break from 2:07 until 2:29 p.m. When they reconvened, she indicated the Council would return to items skipped over on Thursday's agenda due to the executive director's absence because of illness. After that, the Council would address the batterers intervention program funding requests. They would begin Saturday morning with deliberations on the victim services funding requests.

### **CDVSA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

CDVSA Executive Director Chris Ashenbrenner said that she was glad to have listened to the presentations yesterday prior to giving her report because it reminded her how much she appreciated what the program people do. She said she was honored to be hired permanently as the executive director and to be working with everyone on the issues. It has been almost five months since she started at CDVSA, and it has been really busy. CDVSA staff, the Council chair, and Peggy Brown at the Network have all stepped up to help train her, and she appreciated that.

Ashenbrenner next reviewed the following list of topics in her report:

- Legislation: There were some crime bills that affected CDVSA issues. One was House Bill 213 that made it an aggravating factor at sentencing for crimes committed at domestic violence or sexual assault shelters. HB 90 was an omnibus crime bill that wrapped in quite a few pieces from other bills that affect domestic violence and sexual assault. The bill makes it a separate crime for sex offenders to violate their conditions of parole, it makes failure to report a violent crime against a person a crime, it adds the crime of online enticement of a minor and electronic distribution of indecent materials, it increases penalties for promoting prostitution, it eliminates the defense of saying they did not know a person was under 18, it allows for DNA collection from persons charged with felonies and crimes against persons, and it includes a fiscal note to increase the Crime Lab services. There were a number of legislative resolutions related to victims — Sexual Assault Awareness Month, condemning the so-called rapist doll action figure, and Victim's Crime Week. People get a little jaded about resolutions, but it is important because at every single committee those resolutions went through it gave the CDVSA a chance to go talk about these issues, raise awareness, and reach the people who are making the policies and laws - and eventually acting on the CDVSA budget. There are 11 or 12 bills on domestic violence and sexual assault (dv/sa) issues still in committee. Plus some VAWA compliance legislation will have to be introduced next year. So next year will probably be another busy session.
- She would be talking to the Council at its next meeting about having a legislation subcommittee to give staff some guidance on the myriad of things that come up around dv/sa issues.
- The budgets passed that gave the CDVSA the \$5 million earmark, another \$300,000 in victim services money, and small amounts of capital funds for some programs. Both of those budgets are waiting action by the Governor.
- The bill passed that extends the CDVSA through 2011. As a companion to that, HB 215 passed that creates a task force to answer the many questions that came up over the time period when authorization of the CDVSA was being discussed. The task force will consider and make recommendations by March 1, 2008 on the Council's relationship in consultation with other state agencies, its statutory responsibilities and priorities, the employment process, which department is appropriate for the CDVSA to be in, compliance with grant management requirements, the mission and focus, and examination of the Centers for Disease Control's document called "Preventing Intimate Partner Violence, Sexual Violence, and Child Maltreatment." The task force will have an opportunity for public comment, and a lot of people will be involved. Ashenbrenner said she saw it as an opportunity for many of the issues that have come up here to be included in the framework of the task force's purpose, in order to draw attention to these issues, whether it is batterer accountability or prevention or what is needed for crisis intervention. The task force is not specifically to look at those issues, but she encouraged everybody to pay

attention and have input. There will be four meetings in Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and one rural community yet to be named. The task force will be staffed by legislative staff.

- The 2006 annual report is finally finished, extremely late. Next year the report will be done by the due date, January 15. Staff is willing to hear suggestions about revamping the format for next year.
- Staff has compiled a history of the CDVSA database (available at the CDVSA office). Ashenbrenner said the database probably consumed as much of her time as the Legislature did over her first few months at CDVSA. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) confidentiality requirements are driving the CDVSA to a different data gathering method. Staff is 90-99% sure that CDVSA will partner with the Network on the distributed Access-based database that the Network is starting to build. It is based on the Department of Justice VAWA database, and it should be sufficient for CDVSA's needs and good for the programs. The state loses a little bit because it does not have a fully relational database at the state level. The reporting forms, affectionately known as "the pinks and the blues," have been revamped and are at the printer for a prototype. The forms now include a lot of the VAWA requirements that were not in there before, in anticipation of victim service programs starting to use VAWA earmark money in their programs. Implementation of both the new forms and the data system needs to start on the same date. The time frame is October 1, 2007 for implementation. This allows delivery of the product in July, testing and training curriculum development done in August, and training for programs in September. CDVSA has hired an IT contractor for advice, because staff does not have the IT expertise to know what to do on the state side to integrate all of this.

Hogan asked if the programs were generally okay with the data that CDVSA would be receiving, and if the CDVSA was generally okay that the data and information that it will be getting will be adequate to report not only for the Council's purposes but to the federal agencies.

Ashenbrenner said yes. She added that overall the programs gain at the local level because each program will contain all the information in a relational database, so they can run all sorts of different queries on their own database that they cannot do now without doing a special request to ServicePoint, which is a bit clunky. Another gain for the programs is that they don't have to deal with database response time, which can be really difficult in outlying areas especially, and a limited number of licenses and things like that. The state still gets the aggregate data to report to the federal agencies and gets the high level numbers. But the state loses the ability to do a fully relational inquiry. An example is that she asked the statistical technician to look at the fiscal 2006 data for how many incidents involved drug or alcohol use by the perpetrator, and it came out at 55% reported. They also looked at the relationship of reported injuries to drugs or alcohol and was able to pull those numbers. That type of inquiry is used to answer a question or to address some myth that doesn't sound right, and the state loses the

ability to pull that information in the new database. CDVSA can contact the programs and ask them to each run the query and send it to the CDVSA office, but executive directors are busy, and Ashenbrenner said she would think long and hard before putting too many of those requests out because they will impact everybody's time. So that is what the CDVSA loses with a distributed database system. But she is excited that a decision has been made about the database and things are moving on. The Network basically is going to do the development and then pass the database over to the CDVSA to maintain.

- CDVSA received a Grants to Encourage Arrest federal grant, which is a continuation of past funding that paid for 11 tribal state forums in the last couple of years. Sherrie Goll was hired as a coordinator, and she did the other forums as a state employee so she is experienced and ready to go. Those tribal state forums should be starting in late summer or early fall, with the goal to hold nine of them over the next two years.
- The same grant is also paying for six court-based legal advocates that are placed in programs around the state. CDVSA is working on an initiative with the Network to do some additional training for those legal advocates.
- Staffing: Lauree (Hugonin) Morton will start June 15 as program administrator/grant writer. She will not be the supervisor but will be the lead of the program staff. Lauree ran the Bethel program for a number of years and was the executive director of the Network for about ten years. Lauree knows the CDVSA issues, the state administration, and the federal grants. She will give some needed relief to the other professional staff so they can focus on some projects that are badly in need of attention (BIPs, grants management, etc.)
- VAWA earmark: At its March meeting the Council voted to have a subcommittee to make decisions on what to do with the VAWA money, to discuss combining the VAWA earmark with the regular formula VAWA funding, and how the money should be put out, etc. The subcommittee did that, and staff sent a memo to the full Council in May outlining the subcommittee's recommendations (available at the CDVSA office). The Council agreed with the subcommittee's work. The discretionary component, which is 15% of the VAWA formula grants and 15% of the earmark grant, will be combined. There will be an RFP issued later this month for about \$300,000 in discretionary funding. The Council voted to target the funding on the following areas: support for Native women victims of violence, to serve rural areas, to provide services to immigrant victims of violence, and to provide programs where teens have been exposed to dating or sexual violence. The victim services part of the earmark grant is about \$475,000 each year for the next three years, and the RFP will go out around mid-July. While the CDVSA does not want to inundate programs with RFPs, after listening to the needs expressed over the last two days, it is important to get the money out on the street as soon as possible. This timetable would allow starting the discretionary projects on September 1 and the victim services projects on October 1.

Ginger Baim of SAFE asked if the VAWA victim services RFP would be open to anyone

or only to victim services programs. Ashenbrenner replied that the funding is targeted toward providing services for victims, but the RFP will not be open just to the victim services programs that the CDVSA currently serves.

Ashenbrenner continued explaining the VAWA grant distribution, saying that the CDVSA plans to use a bit of the earmark money for administrative funds. It will go toward financing the data reporting system, as well as to analyze community resources, needs and core services that will help the Council with funding decisions. She said that since starting at the CDVSA she has become aware that there is no comprehensive statewide studies on sexual assault or domestic violence, but there are bits and pieces here and there. She proposes a project to start compiling that data so that the Council can get some useful information to be able to advocate for the needs of victims across the state.

Ashenbrenner asked for and received some feedback from the program directors about the timeline for issuing the VAWA grant RFPs. She indicated that based on the comments staff would try to get both RFPs out at roughly the same time.

Responding to a question from the audience, Ashenbrenner stated that staff has been working to compile FY07 data on incidents and services that was not reported when programs stopped using the prior database system.

Regarding Baim's earlier question, Hogan said he thought the rationale for allowing any organization to apply for VAWA victim services funding was related to procurement regulations. If the CDVSA were to restrict the number of providers that could respond to an RFP, there would probably be some procurement issues. Having said that, he guessed that people who have been providing victim services for a number of years are going to have a significant leg up on anyone who all of a sudden wants to get in the business.

Williams asked if the RFP scoring would give preference points to programs that offer victim services. Ashenbrenner replied that staff has not developed the scoring criteria yet, but, in her background with the state, experience is usually given weight in evaluating proposals.

Ashenbrenner said that reminded her to ask the Council to consider establishing a proposal evaluation committee comprised of some Council members, some CDVSA staff, and possibly others who are experts at evaluation, to review the grant proposals and make the awards.

Chair Stewart stated that a PEC (proposal evaluation committee) is common practice in other agencies. She indicated that she had agreed, for the sake of continuity, to participate in the VAWA grant evaluation process, regardless of what her status might be on the Council at the time.

Williams said that of her two years on the Council this last year has been horrendous in

terms of her exposure to domestic violence, with two deaths and the beating of her daughter. Her daughter attends University of Alaska Anchorage, and the two women who were killed were from rural Alaska, but they were all Native women. She asked how the RFP would help both populations. One of the women killed had used the CDVSA programs, but she lived in a rural community that does not have a shelter or the presence of a victim services program. So Williams was wondering how to build the RFP so it is not just for a 24-hour crisis line but gives more to the areas in need.

Ashenbrenner stated that that was one of the reasons the VAWA discretionary funds were targeted to specific needs, including services to both Native women and rural areas. There are 14 areas that VAWA money can be used for, and the RFP for the discretionary component will really target it down. An RFP can be designed to indicate the Council is looking for success in a certain area and to consider programs that address these needs. Since 40% of the people that programs serve are Natives, that is pretty significant.

Williams stated that she knew the existing victim services programs are really strapped in trying to keep their core services, but she wanted the VAWA funding proposals to not only help the core services but pay for projects that really go to the heart — that when people call they don't just get a 24-hour crisis line. In the grant proposals heard over the last two days, the budgets for travel to remote communities was almost nonexistent. She said her concern was how to put that into the VAWA RFPs.

Hogan said he hoped that program people in the audience were listening to Williams because he thought the Council was looking for some creative ways to meet the needs as Williams has outlined. He said he understood that programs need enough funding for core services, but the Council's expectation here is for creative and innovative thinking to better meet the needs of the Alaska Native population.

Judy Cordell of AWAIC in Anchorage clarified that just because travel money does not show up in a program's CDVSA budget does not mean that it doesn't exist. AWAIC just got \$300,000 that they will spend a substantial portion of flying people into Anchorage from rural areas, flying people out of state, flying people all over the place.

Williams said that maybe that information has to be captured because when she looks at proposals it looks like the CDVSA is not providing a service that is greatly needed. Cordell stated that another piece of information that does not show up in the CDVSA data is that AWAIC runs an 18-bed Native women and children only shelter program. They have run it for 11 years, and it is 100% full with a wait list. AWAIC is also working to negotiate with the Alaska Native Justice Center to designate five of the Harmony House transitional housing beds to strictly Native women. That is in addition to the one-third in the shelter who are Native. AWAIC has strong partnerships with the Native corporations, and Cordell guessed that a lot of her sister agencies do that as well, but the Council is not going to see that showing up statistically.

Ashenbrenner said another thing that doesn't show up that she is trying to get a handle on is that there are quite a few STOP Violence Against Indian Women grants around the state. While the Network is probably coordinating those grants, the CDVSA does not know about it at the state level.

### **BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS - FY08 FUNDING DECISIONS**

Chair Stewart summarized the FY08 funding available for both the community-based batterers intervention programs and the prison batterers intervention programs, and the sum of the grant requests, as follows:

FY08 funding available for community-based BIPs:	\$200,000
Total grant requests:	<u>\$231,653</u>
Shortfall	\$ 31,653

FY08 funding available for prison BIPs:	\$ 98,237
Total grant requests:	<u>\$144,272</u>
Shortfall	\$ 46,035

Chair Stewart noted that a total of \$54,573 of the sum of the two shortfall numbers are requested for new programs. The remaining shortfall represents requested funding increases from existing batterers programs. So if the Council wants to fund any amount of a new BIP, the only place the money can come from is out of the funding that had previously been allocated to existing programs. She asked fellow Council members if they wanted to first decide whether to fund any new programs in part or in full.

Williams asked why not fund the BIPs at the FY07 funding levels. Chair Stewart said that was possible, and it would mean giving no funding to new programs.

Satterfield recommended funding Providence Valdez Counseling Center (PVCC) in Valdez because their request of \$9,123 was a small amount of money. PVCC is a very good program in that community, and it is very difficult to get state approval and operate a program as well as they are doing in the Valdez area. She suggested possibly taking 5% off the funding for the four currently funded programs as an option for giving a grant to PVCC.

Chair Stewart asked Griggs to run those numbers.

While she was doing that, Hogan said that if the Council was leaning towards adding new BIPs he would have a hard time choosing PVCC over giving Ketchikan Indian Community (KIC) the \$13,000 increase they requested.

Williams said she had a problem with that because, for example, IAC in Fairbanks indicated they knew there was no new money so they requested the same funding as FY07 just in order to keep doing what they are doing. IAC may have had great ideas to

expand their services and needed more money, but they didn't put that into this RFP, knowing that there was no new money. So she felt that it was penalizing the existing programs, using Hogan's logic.

Satterfield said she was still interested in funding a new batterers program in Valdez and not increasing funding for other programs because PVCC's request of \$9,123 is a small amount of money, and the impact on the other programs would not be too significant. But if Hogan is concerned about Ketchikan Indian Community being impacted, perhaps the small amount to fund PVCC could be taken from the other three existing community-based BIPs and leave KIC at the FY07 funding level (with no increase).

Responding to the Chair, Hogan stated that \$10,500 of KIC's requested increase was for a pretty innovative way to try to do outreach to rural areas by using the telemedicine notion. He suggested giving KIC something like an additional \$3,000-\$4,000 and asking them to pilot the outreach project and give the Council some feedback on the participation rates and the outcomes they got as a result of using that technology. He said he did not know if \$3,000-\$4,000 was adequate to do a pilot project, but he liked the idea KIC was proposing. He didn't know if it would work, but it was worth exploring. His suggestion was to take the funding from existing programs because that is the only option.

Williams related that she serves on the executive committee of the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation (BBAHC), and they use telemedicine all the time. She thought some innovation can already happen by partnering that doesn't cost any money. She said she did not know much about Southeast Alaska, but in Bristol Bay if a program approached the BBAHC to do the outreach that KIC was proposing, the Health Corporation would be really excited to open up and utilize the telemedicine and videoconferencing. The Health Corporation's behavioral health department is using that equipment. So, given her experience, she did not see giving KIC the additional \$10,500 they requested for this type of project.

Hogan stated that part of KIC's request was to have somebody on site, either in Metlakatla or in Craig, so that when the persons came to the batterers program there was somebody at least in the building to make sure that things were safe, etc. So it was not just paying for the technology itself; it would be paying for a person on site in the communities.

Williams stated that the behavioral health program monies at Bristol Bay pay for a health aide, a family service worker, and sometimes a community health representative in the community who could help. So a partnership needs to happen in Ketchikan to make using the telemedicine technology a reality.

House indicated she supported taking a small percentage (5%) from the existing four community-based programs to fund the new BIP in Valdez at \$9,000 because it was

even across the board. She clarified that she was not supporting any amount of additional funding for KIC.

Hogan commented that Providence is a huge organization. PVCC is requesting the funding to pay for a co-facilitator for the batterers intervention group, and he believed Providence could find that money somewhere in their organization, either in Alaska or Washington or wherever else they are providing services. So although he understood the need, he was not really in favor of the \$9,000 to PVCC. When queried by the chair, he added that he would only be in favor of a little money to Providence if KIC also got additional funding.

Chair Stewart stated that she was thinking about \$4,000-\$5,000 to PVCC in Valdez and \$4,000-\$5,000 additional to KIC in Ketchikan, and getting that money out of Palmer, Fairbanks, and Homer — but proportionate to the dollar amount that each of those three BIP programs already get in funding. She added that 5% from a program that is only getting \$25,000 is a bigger hit than 5% from a program that is funded at \$55,000. She proposed giving \$4,000 to PVCC and \$4,000 to KIC and getting that \$8,000 in new dollars proportionately out of the other three community programs.

Hogan indicated he would be in favor of that.

Williams stated that she supported the FY07 funding levels. She said she knew there was a shortage of money for batterers programs and that the Council wants to fund new programs, but it should not come at the expense of funding to existing programs. She said she could not support cuts to the existing programs.

Holloway stated that he agreed with Williams.

Chair Stewart said the core question is whether to find any funding for any new batterers intervention programs or new funding for existing programs. If the answer is yes to that, then the Council could go into the details of where to pull that funding from.

Griggs polled the Council members on that question: Satterfield, Hogan and House said yes; Holloway and Williams said no. The vote was 3-2 in favor.

There was a brief at ease while staff consulted the rules on when the chair casts a vote. Ashenbrenner reported that the chair only votes if there is a tie.

Chair Stewart summarized that the three votes in favor of identifying some funding for increases to existing programs or to pay for new programs brought back the questions of what to fund and where to get the money from. She said her original thought had been to partially fund the new requests.

Williams said she had a problem funding the new idea at KIC, given the fact that other programs, when responding to the RFP, did not ask for additional money because they

knew the funding was strapped. She indicated she meant no offense to KIC, but it created an unfair advantage for them.

Chair Stewart stated that the question was whether to fund only the request from the new BIP in Valdez. She polled the Council members: Satterfield, Holloway, House and Williams said yes. Hogan said no. The vote was 4-1 in favor.

Chair Stewart said the votes meant that the only funding shift the Council was going to make would be to fund the new program in Valdez. She said the next questions would be the amount to fund PVCC and where to draw that money from.

Satterfield suggested taking the money from the three largest programs (AFS in Palmer, IAC in Fairbanks and KIC in Ketchikan) so as not to impact the smallest funded program (Homer). She supported funding of no less than \$8,000 for PVCC in Valdez because PVCC might not be able to accomplish their objectives with much less than that.

Chair Stewart pointed out that reducing the awards to the three highest funded programs by \$3,000 each would free up \$9,000 to fund PVCC in Valdez.

Griggs outlined the proposed FY08 community-based batterers intervention program funding at this point in the deliberations:

AFS - Palmer.....	\$52,812
IAC - Fairbanks.....	\$64,312
KIC - Ketchikan.....	\$48,313
PVCC - Valdez .....	\$ 9,000
SPHH - Homer.....	\$25,563
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>

Chair Stewart polled the members on that proposal: Satterfield, Holloway, House and Williams said yes. Hogan said no. The vote was 4-1 in favor.

Moving on to the prison batterers intervention program requests for FY08 funding, Chair Stewart stated that \$98,237 was available, and the requests added up to \$144,272. There was one new program (JBAP in Juneau) requesting funding this year.

Hogan suggested starting out with the question of whether to fund a new prison BIP in FY08.

Chair Stewart polled the members on that question: Satterfield, Hogan and House said yes. Holloway and Williams said no. The vote was 3-2 in favor of funding a new prison BIP.

Chair Stewart said the next question was how much to fund JBAP in Juneau, followed

by the question of where to take the funding from.

Hogan said he had a sense during the presentations that at one point there was money going to Juneau for a batterers intervention program, and then that money was divided between the programs in Palmer and Fairbanks. Chair Stewart said that was correct, that a Juneau BIP (Tongass Community Counseling) had dissolved. Hogan asked how much extra money the other two programs received when that happened.

His question spawned a brief discussion among Council members, staff, and Brenda Stanfill of IAC. Her recollection was that Palmer and Fairbanks received an extra \$24,000 to \$28,000 between them (in 2003).

Williams said that if those numbers were correct, she could support taking \$14,000 from AFS in Palmer and \$14,000 from IAC in Fairbanks in order to fund JBAP in Juneau at \$28,000.

Holloway said he was going to suggest something along those lines but maybe a bit less than \$28,000. JBAP has to have enough money to be able to start the program, but on the other hand, the Council has to be careful not to take so much away from the existing programs in Fairbanks and Palmer that it causes them to fold.

Hogan offered his suggestion of \$20,000 for JBAP in Juneau, coming from reducing both AFS and IAC by \$10,000 each.

Satterfield said the question was whether JBAP could operate a prison batterers program on \$20,000.

Chair Stewart posed a collateral question of whether taking \$10,000 from the FY07 funding level of \$41,648 for Fairbanks would decimate that program.

Hogan stated that both IAC in Fairbanks and AFS in Palmer are fairly large organizations, multi-faceted and comprehensive. His sense was that these organizations with very creative executive directors could probably figure out a way to provide the prison batterers intervention programs on reduced dollars.

Chair Stewart observed that the Council already cut the community-based BIPs funding at both AFS and IAC by \$3,000 in the previous action.

Chair Stewart indicated that the question on the table was whether to fund the prison-based Juneau Batterers Accountability Program at AWARE in Juneau at \$20,000 for FY08. She polled the members: Satterfield, Holloway, Hogan, House and Williams voted yes.

For the record, Griggs repeated the FY08 prison-based batterers intervention program funding as a result of the Council's action:

AFS - Palmer .....	\$46,589
JBAP (AWARE) - Juneau .....	\$20,000
IAC - Fairbanks.....	\$31,648
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$98,237</b>

Brenda Stanfill of IAC spoke from the audience, saying she had never felt so good about losing money.

Williams stated that the Council needs to do more work on increasing the \$200,000 of funding for batterers intervention programs. She added that while the Council wants to fund innovation and new programs because the need is there, realistically it cannot be done with \$200,000.

Chair Stewart said she agreed and that it would take a concentrated legislative effort. The CDVSA has to be able to teach the Legislature that the money that is going to batterers programs is really having a direct impact in safety and services to victims. What was key for her was hearing from programs that the BIP was a way to get services to certain victims who would never have come in the doors directly. It is important that the Legislature get the message that the money is not going to "bad people."

Ashenbrenner commented that it is not just the Legislature, that it starts at the Administration. Before this Council has its next quarterly meeting, the state budget development will be in full tilt. It begs the question of whether the Council wants to give her some direction before the end of this meeting about working on the budget request that goes through the Department of Public Safety this summer. She added that she also needed Council action on a VAWA proposal evaluation committee.

**RECESS**

Chair Stewart recessed the meeting for the day at 3:54 p.m.

**Saturday, June 9, 2007**

**CALL BACK TO ORDER**

Chair Janna Stewart called the meeting back to order at 9:00 a.m. In addition to the Chair, Council members Hogan, Holloway, House, Satterfield (for Rick Svobodny), and Williams were present.

**VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAMS - FY08 FUNDING DECISIONS**

The following is a summary of the FY08 victim services program grant requests:

Alaska Family Services (AFS) - Palmer .....	\$ 494,975
Advocates for Victims of Violence (AVV) - Valdez .....	275,446
Abused Women's Aid in Crisis (AWAIC) - Anchorage .....	1,029,541
Aiding Women in Abuse and Rape Emergencies (AWARE) - Juneau .....	625,875
Arctic Women In Crisis - Barrow (AWIC).....	555,238
AKEELA (AWRC) - Anchorage .....	276,706
Bering Sea Women's Group (BSWG) - Nome.....	487,114
Cordova Family Resource Center (CFRC) - Cordova .....	92,362
Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living (IAC) - Fairbanks .....	945,514
Kodiak Women's Resource and Crisis Center (KWRCC) - Kodiak.....	297,669
LeeShore Center (LSC) - Kenai .....	550,928
Maniilaq Association Family Crisis Center (MFCC) - Kotzebue .....	419,983
Safe and Fear-Free Environment (SAFE) - Dillingham .....	468,380
Sitkans Against Family Violence (SAFV) - Sitka.....	376,395
Seaview Community Services (SCS) - Seward.....	88,154
South Peninsula Haven House (SPHH) - Homer .....	379,830
Standing Together Against Rape (STAR) - Anchorage .....	761,637
Tundra Women's Coalition (TWC) - Bethel .....	827,564
Unalaskans Against Sexual Assault/Family Violence (USAFV) - Unalaska.....	135,802
Women in Safe Homes (WISH) - Ketchikan.....	591,565
Catholic Social Services (CSS) - Anchorage.....	100,000
<b>Total grant requests .....</b>	<b>\$ 9,780,678</b>
 FY08 funding available for victim services programs .....	 \$ 8,523,800
Shortfall .....	\$ 1,256,878

Chair Stewart said there were some unique situations that would impact how the Council went about its decision-making. First, there was a \$200,000 designation that Senator Olson put in the budget. The Council needs to look at that in the context of Barrow's (AWIC) actual application and the actual shortages in funding they received from the North Slope Borough. So Barrow, and to some extent Nome, would be one category. Second, there are two new funding requests from Anchorage programs, one of which is sort of a continuation of AWRC, and a completely new request from Catholic Social Services. In order to look at the unique problems with coordination and the diminution of services in Anchorage, the Council has to look at the Anchorage funding requests collectively.

Chair Stewart proposed that the Council first take up the diminimus requests, calculate them, and put them off to the side as fundable. That would reduce the overall funding by that percentage, and the Council would only go back and invade those increases if it really encounters problems further along. As such, she proposed funding SCS (Seward) at its total request of \$88,154; AVV (Valdez) at its total request of \$275,446; CFRC

(Cordova) at its full request of \$92,362; and USAFV (Unalaska) at its total request of \$135,802. That is a total increase in the funding for those programs of \$13,499. She said she considered that a minimal request, and every one of them was related to fuel, utilities and insurance costs. She also wanted to add KWRCC (Kodiak) and AFS (Palmer) to that category. Their requested increases were slightly more: KWRCC an additional \$12,213, and AFS an additional \$21,400. Adding together the requested increases for all six of the above-listed programs totaled \$47,112. That would leave \$177,888 in additional FY08 money available to work with for the rest of the calculations. Setting the above programs and the proposed full funding for them aside for now would clear the decks in terms of the number of programs and amount of information the Council has to juggle. That would also include setting aside for now all the program requests in Anchorage and from the Nome and Barrow programs, because of particular situations with those that the Council would have to delve into later.

Chair Stewart stated that the Council could then focus on the funding requests from Kenai, Dillingham, Sitka, Ketchikan, Juneau, Fairbanks, Kotzebue, Homer and Bethel, which had requested more substantial increases.

Holloway, House and Williams indicated they were in favor of the process the Chair proposed. Hogan said he, too, was fine with starting there but wanted to know how much of the extra money available for FY08 would be left after taking \$47,112 off the table to tentatively fully fund the six programs the Chair listed.

Chair Stewart stated that the CDVSA has \$425,000 more to award to victim services programs than it had in FY07. Subtracting the \$200,000 that Senator Olson designated for Barrow and maybe Nome (and which the Council will be discussing later), leaves \$225,000 of that extra money. If the Council were to fully fund the six programs that had asked for small increases, taking \$47,112 away from the extra money available, it would leave \$177,888 in new money. She clarified that the Council might have to go back and invade some of the small requests, but at least the process of setting the small requests aside was a starting point in the decision process.

Chair Stewart put the Barrow (and to a lesser extent Nome) situation on the table for discussion.

Williams asked how sacred the FY07 funding awards were. Chair Stewart said not at all. She added that, other than the \$200,000 designation from Senator Olson, nothing was really off the table. Historically, the Council has completely defunded some programs and substantially cut funding to some programs. There is no cap on how far down the funding can go. The Council also has the authority to fund above what a program has requested, and that happens when a program takes additional funding with the understanding that they will revise their proposal and provide additional services.

Chair Stewart referred to a June 6, 2007 memorandum from Ashenbrenner to Council members that described the budget situation for AWIC in Barrow (*on file at the CDVSA*

office).

Ashenbrenner spent a couple of minutes reviewing the contents of the memorandum which had to do with the North Slope Borough Health Department notifying Senator Olson that it was cutting AWIC's domestic violence program budget by \$240,000. Senator Olson, chair of the budget subcommittee, took action to add \$200,000 to the CDVSA budget to try to help AWIC. That was added to the \$100,000 general increase in the CDVSA budget and remains in the budget that is before the Governor. AWIC's FY08 funding request to the CDVSA shows a budget decrease of \$180,000 in cash from the North Slope Borough. Ashenbrenner said she contacted Borough officials and found out that because of such steep increases in the cost of postage, health insurance, etc. they ended up not making the full \$200,000 decrease to AWIC's budget.

Ashenbrenner mentioned that over the years AWIC in Barrow has requested very small amounts from the CDVSA because the program received substantial support from the Borough amounting to 70% of their budget.

Hogan asked if AWIC's shortfall amounted to \$180,000. Ashenbrenner replied that it was the amount of AWIC's budget reduction.

Hogan inquired if there was any legislative intent language that accompanied the \$200,000 line item in the CDVSA operating budget. Ashenbrenner stated that the intent language is in a memo that transferred the budget to the Finance Committee, and it says \$200,000 is for the Barrow program.

Hogan asked if staff had any sense that Governor would or would not veto this particular item in the Department of Public Safety (DPS) budget. Ashenbrenner replied that DPS has not recommended a veto of any of the CDVSA budget. Hogan said he was just trying to get a sense for what the Governor might do, because a veto of the \$200,000 would change the whole discussion.

Ashenbrenner said she did not think the Governor would veto either the \$200,000 designated for Barrow or the \$100,000 general increase in the CDVSA budget, but the \$100,000 was not in the Governor's budget. In fact, the \$100,000 was originally in Governor Murkowski's budget, and Governor Palin backed it out, but it was put back in by the Legislature. Ashenbrenner said she did not really have a sense of what was going to happen to any of the money at the Governor's Office because of several factors. One factor is that a lot of people, including some committee members at the meeting, were pretty upset about a designated amount going to a program when other committee members felt that programs in their areas were in dire need as well. The state budget does not have earmarks like the federal budget does. The state has intent language, which is non-binding but usually honored.

There was a brief exchange about proceeding on the assumption that the Council had these budget numbers to work with.

Chair Stewart noted that while there is a \$200,000 designation in the CDVSA budget for the Barrow program, AWIC is requesting a \$305,390 increase over their FY07 funding, half again as much as the designated dollar amount. She said one thing to look at is that because the Barrow program received very healthy support from the North Slope Borough for years and years, AWIC was able to create a fairly substantial program, including some services — and particularly some personnel — that was quite beyond what other programs in the state have been able to provide. It may well be that with the reduction in Borough funding AWIC is down into the scrambling range that some of the other programs have been in for a number of years. AWIC may be trying to sustain its existing operation, and that may not be possible, given the substantial reduction in Borough funding.

Ashenbrenner explained that AWIC's personal services cost is not driven by their agency; it is driven by the Borough government. AWIC experienced PERS (Public Employees' Retirement System) employer contribution increases, and they are locked into a borough government structure. It both helps AWIC in many ways, and it also locks them in, in many ways. Ashenbrenner said it is unfortunate to say that many of the Council-funded programs have the flexibility to cut health insurance and retirement plans and to increase deductibles, but AWIC does not have the ability to do that because of the government structure.

Chair Stewart said that is why AWIC may end up literally needing to cut positions, and the executive director, Linda Stanford, has already stated that the likelihood of going back with pink slips in hand is high. AWIC may need to cut services and positions because they don't have the flexibility to cut fixed costs.

Williams stated that she would honor the \$200,000 designated for AWIC in Barrow, but the FY07 funding level of \$249,848 was up for discussion and on the table to adjust.

Satterfield said if it couldn't work that way, then she did not want to give AWIC the designated \$200,000 but just the \$180,000 that the Borough is actually cutting from AWIC's budget this year.

Chair Stewart asked Satterfield if she meant for the remaining \$20,000 to get thrown into the overall pot and that AWIC would remain in consideration for a portion of the additional money available in FY08. Satterfield said that the Chair had earlier tied BSWG in Nome into this discussion, so she thought Nome was a good place to look at putting the \$20,000.

House stated that she disagreed and thought the Council should give AWIC in Barrow the \$200,000 as allocated in the Legislature. She added that the Council was asking for a little trouble if it started playing with funds that the Legislature specifically asked to go some place.

Williams asked if House meant to cap AWIC at \$200,000 and that would be their FY08 award. House said no, that she would give AWIC the FY07 award amount of \$249,848 plus the \$200,000 designated by the Legislature, for a total of \$449,848. That would be less than the \$555,238 AWIC requested.

Williams said she could not support that because a lot of the programs are requesting increases to cover costs. She could support funding AWIC at the \$200,000, but she would strongly look at the \$249,848 awarded in FY07 and adjust that downward.

House indicated that she could look at that.

Williams stated her belief that \$212,124 in FY07 funding for AWRC (Anchorage) could be brought into the total additional funding available to give out in FY08. So that plus the \$425,000 available in the CDVSA budget for FY08 plus the \$249,848 that AWIC received in FY07 would bring the total to \$886,982.

Chair Stewart said she thought she understood Williams's proposal, and the Council hasn't done anything to evaluate AWIC in Barrow but merely given it the designated \$200,000. AWIC is then rolled back into all the other funding requests for later consideration.

Chair Stewart agreed with Williams's efforts in that the big potential for money shifting in FY08 related to the Anchorage situation. She said STAR, CSS, AWAIC and AKEELA are all individual proposals but each is providing services to the same community of victims in Anchorage. She suggested starting the discussion on the Anchorage situation by looking at the Catholic Social Services (CSS) proposal. She said she had concerns that granting funding to CSS will do no more than help the agency retain their core services. CSS's core services obviously have been beneficial to the Anchorage domestic violence community, but there is no added value to the domestic violence clientele by the Council funding CSS. It appeared that the requested funding would allow CSS to maintain the number of shelter beds, but there was no indication that the funding would in any way lift the burdens on the CDVSA-funded programs any more than they have already been benefited by CSS offering its core services. She said CSS's core services are great, but the Council is not in a position to be able to fund a new program in Anchorage at this time without seeing some added value to the domestic violence clientele. She proposed that the Council not fund CSS.

Chair Stewart asked for a vote on the proposal that no funding be allocated to Catholic Social Services in Anchorage. Satterfield, Holloway and Hogan voted yes. House and Williams voted no. The proposal passed on a 3-2 vote. Chair Stewart said that meant that CSS was off the table.

The next item for discussion was the AKEELA/AWRC proposal.

Satterfield stated that at this point she was not in favor of funding AKEELA. There have

been too many problems, and she did not think they were prepared to offer the services that AWRC was offering. She said she was very concerned about the legal advocacy program that AWRC did very well and that complemented the legal advocacy that AWAIC does. She wanted to see that continue — the services after hours and on weekends — and perhaps that additional funding could go to AWAIC to accomplish that.

House indicated that she agreed the Council should not fund AKEELA because there are too many problems. She commented that she could not understand why AKEELA wanted to take on AWRC but did not want to assume the name, that AWRC was really in debt but yet AKEELA was willing to come under the AWRC umbrella and ask for funding. She thought that was a sleight of hand and she would not endorse something like that.

Hogan said that, rather than talk specifically about AKEELA and AWRC, he had a question about whether it is possible to look at consolidating some of the administrative functions among the Anchorage grantees. He was struck by separate human resource functions and separate development functions. He thought there might be some savings gained through combined purchasing, front desk functions, and that sort of thing. Recognizing that people's costs are going up substantially, the CDVSA has to be more creative with administrative savings, with the idea that there would be more dollars for direct services. He said he realized that was not a discussion for today. But looking at fairly substantial funding requests, he thought things needed to be done differently in Anchorage. Separate from that, he said everyone knows that AWRC has struggled. He thought that AKEELA had done the best they could in the short term, but their proposal needed some work.

Chair Stewart recalled that in the last year or two there had been a review of that same consolidation question among the Anchorage programs. She indicated that Judy Cordell of AWAIC could probably give the Council some information on that.

Cordell informed the Council that AWAIC participated in eight months of PhD-facilitated, United Way-sponsored discussion identifying possible duplication of services, best practice models, how to potentially consolidate, all the way on the continuum to merger. In those participations one of the challenges was identifying that some of the agencies had dissimilar missions and how to combine those. The five participating agencies were STAR, AWRC, Mary Magdalene Center (that provides services to prior prostitutes), Victims For Justice (that provides services to crime victims, primarily homicide victims), and AWAIC. The outcome of those discussions were that it was not an appropriate time to merger. AWAIC did step forward and ask for United Way's help when they saw that AWRC might be entertaining the merger idea with AKEELA. AWAIC did not know some of the liabilities that AWRC had, but with board support they were looking at doing that. For whatever reason, the AWRC board at that time did not return to AWAIC and did not enter into any kind of negotiations, either directly or through United Way. Then the AWRC board came out several months later with the transition plan with AKEELA,

which is where things are today. STAR and AWAIC continue to look at a potential down-the-road merger, but one of the challenges is the significant turnover in the executive directors in that region. Cordell said she has only been in her job not even three years, and she has worked with three executive directors at AWRC in that time. STAR is on their second executive director during that same period. AWAIC had three executive directors in 2004 — Cordell renewed a four-year contract so she is going to stick around. Cordell said she also participated with STAR's board in interviewing and selecting Nancy Haag from a good pool of applicants. So the two closest agencies to share administrative duties would be probably STAR and AWAIC at this point. Mary Magdalene they were open to — STAR very actively asked them if they would come under the administrative umbrella of STAR, and Mary Magdalene declined. Their board president point-blank said no. Cordell said that AWAIC is open to consolidation, and she hears what Hogan is saying. She said it takes two years to learn the executive director job, then she can start taking on those collaborations, and it takes time. AWAIC has potential United Way and/or Foraker support. She said she is willing as an executive director to consider that. Nancy Haag is fairly progressive and very experienced, probably leading the way in human resources functions, and probably something they could look at administratively. They have put a lot of time into this so far, and it is still on the table.

Chair Stewart stated that, given Cordell's information, consolidation will continue to be something the Council discusses. Legislators and others continue to ask the CDVSA about it, and right now the Council is certainly not in a position or interested in directing any of those efforts beyond what is already on the table.

Chair Stewart said the Council recognizes that AWRC/AKEELA provided services that were critical to STAR and AWAIC to keep the whole package of services together. She proposed taking a look at the FY07 award to AWRC and reducing it to maybe \$150,000, considering that it included administrative services to an independent organization that would be folded into existing organizations, so that \$150,000 could be split between STAR and AWAIC for those programs to pick up what were AWRC complementary services. The extra money would be in addition to their budgets, and the CDVSA would be requesting that STAR and AWAIC modify their proposals to indicate which of the AWRC services those two existing programs would be able to step up and provide with that additional funding. It is a way to try and ensure that those services continue to exist in Anchorage. She recalled that Cordell clearly stated that AWAIC is not interested in trying to expand their core services. But AWAIC, and to some extent STAR, already provide some of the legal advocacy services. It would increase the demands made on these two programs, but it is not so dissimilar to their existing core services and existing missions. She asked for some discussion on the idea.

Ashenbrenner pointed out that the CDVSA FY07 award to AWRC did not pay for any legal advocacy services. AWRC's legal advocacy program was part of the Grants To Encourage Arrest (GTEA) grant that the Court System had, and it ended in December 2006. That program provided the night and weekend court advocates. When the Court

System gave up that grant, the CDVSA applied for it. AWRC, for whatever reason, did not respond to participate in the grant to continue the court-based legal advocate. The FY07 CDVSA grant to AWRC pays for personnel to do domestic violence counseling, domestic violence groups, information and referral, etc.

Satterfield said she agreed that the current CDVSA grant is paying for domestic violence-related services. She added that AWRC had a legal advocacy program prior to them receiving the GTEA funding but it was through volunteers. Managing volunteers requires a paid staff person. She noted that AWRC provided services to domestic violence victims primarily. For that reason, she suggested that the division of extra money between AWAIC and STAR be more like a 60/40 or 75/25 split, with the larger portion going to AWAIC because they are the DV program.

Chair Stewart stated that STAR and AWAIC would need to collaborate and identify for the CDVSA which services that AWRC provided are essential to their organizations and that they would be willing to pick up with a limited amount of additional money. She clarified that she used the term legal advocacy loosely, knowing that AWRC provided more than that, but she was not in a position right now to designate exact dollar amounts and exact services.

Prompted by a question from Hogan, Chair Stewart explained that she was proposing zero funding for AKEELA. The AWRC FY07 grant amount was \$212,134, and she was suggesting that the amount left after splitting \$150,000 between AWAIC and STAR to pick up former AWRC services would go into the larger pot of FY08 money available to all the programs. She said AWAIC and STAR would also be competing for part of that additional FY08 money.

Cordell of AWAIC informed the Council that she just told Nancy Haag of STAR that she was open to a 50/50 split of the \$150,000 that the Chair was proposing. She said STAR has legal advocates as well, and rape is a spiked issue in Anchorage. She reported that Haag answered that she was fine with a 70/30 split if AWAIC took the lead on legal advocacy.

House complimented Cordell and Haag for doing a fabulous job. She said that when she was reading the AKEELA proposal she wrote a note to herself, "Why don't we consolidate some Anchorage businesses together?" So she was proud that the idea was acceptable because she wanted to see change in this area — prevention, everything that can possibly be done to make this state look better.

Holloway recommended giving the whole \$212,134 that AWRC got in FY07 to AWAIC and STAR to pick up the services that AWRC provided. It is still serving the same group of people, and these programs are already at bare bones.

Satterfield said she agreed with Holloway on that. She also proposed the 70/30 split of the funding that Cordell and Haag had indicated was agreeable to them.

Williams said that was fine with her too.

Chair Stewart called a break from 9:48 to 10:04 a.m. She said that during the break staff would display on the board what funding levels the Council had tentatively agreed upon so far and the dollar amount available above the FY07 awards.

After the break, the Chair had Griggs verbally review the information on the board so far:

Additional FY08 funds available .....	\$425,000
Add: AWRC (Anchorage) FY07 award amount .....	212,134
Add: AWIC (Barrow) FY07 award amount .....	<u>249,848</u>
Total additional money to award in FY08 .....	\$886,982

Tentative *additional* FY08 funding above the FY07 award:

AFS	\$ 21,400
AVV	5,870
AWAIC	148,494
AWIC	200,000
CFRC	43,098
KWRCC	12,213
SCS	0
USAFV	<u>3,231</u>
Total	\$395,606

Leaving total additional money to award in FY08 ..... \$491,376

Holloway stated that the Council heard about some programs that are having some problems, some of them maybe due to their organization or due to other circumstances that they can't control. He proposed that the Council list those programs and not give new money to locations unless there is a specific instance where the Council believes that additional money in FY08 will help the program out of their problem. He said he thought the CDVSA would not get as much for the money by putting it into a troubled area as it would by putting the money into very efficient operating systems that also need the funding.

Chair Stewart asked Holloway to identify the programs he was referring to. Holloway said he had some concerns about BSWG in Nome and SAFV in Sitka, and the Council had already discussed and eliminated some of the other programs with problems.

House said she, too, had concerns regarding the Nome and Sitka programs. However, she recommended funding BSWG (Nome) but holding the money back until such time as BSWG has their operation in order and that can be confirmed by whomever from the CDVSA. When an executive director is absent for six months, things are going to fall

apart no matter how capable the people are. The condition on SAFV would be to dispatch someone to go there and help the program do the networking. She thought SAFV needed some outside help. So the FY08 funding would be contingent upon those things happening.

Satterfield recommended funding BSWG and SAFV for perhaps six months, and then continued funding after that would be based on whether or not they got their houses in order.

Hogan asked what dollar amounts House and Satterfield were talking about for BSWG and SAFV. Satterfield said she meant at the FY07 funding levels. Hogan said that would be \$465,406 for BSWG (Nome) and \$336,503 for SAFV (Sitka).

Satterfield said the CDVSA would have to go back in prior to the January meeting and identify whether or not the programs were compliant, which would require a thorough audit of the programs. She commented that she did not see how BSWG and SAFV could get their houses in order if they don't have money to pay staff. However, if the programs don't get their houses in order, then the CDVSA would not continue funding them, or the CDVSA could work out another option. Nome needs a shelter, there's no question about that, and the Council does not want to see them go under and will do everything it can to help the program there.

When queried by the Chair, Griggs confirmed that funding is released to the programs quarterly. Chair Stewart commented that there is already a mechanism in place that segments the fund awards. She said it was incumbent upon the Council to provide some specifics about what the CDVSA wanted to see from BSWG and SAFV in six months. That will require some clear vision on the Council's part.

Ashenbrenner stated that CDVSA staff needs to visit BSWG in Nome and see what is going on up there. She said from the BSWG's grant proposal and the verbal testimony, along with the quarterly reports from BSWG, she did not know one way or the other whether the program was really in management disarray and whether they really weren't providing services. She said it is kind of a radical move of the Council to talk about suspending payments at this point until CDVSA staff can make an on-site visit. She proposed making that visit so CDVSA staff can do an audit and report back to the Council at the next quarterly meeting.

When Hogan asked for clarification, Ashenbrenner stated that if CDVSA staff's audit of BSWG finds an agency that is in substantial noncompliance, the Council can take action to hold grant payments. So there are administrative mechanisms already in place to deal with this. She suggested funding BSWG at least at the FY07 level.

Chair Stewart stated that if the Council is going to make that initial FY08 award to BSWG it needs to be with very clear notice to the program that this will not be business as usual, that CDVSA staff will be doing an on-site and an audit, and the program

should anticipate the requirement for additional documentation, and potentially additional controls. So giving BSWG the money but making it clear in the award that there will be some investigation and some additional monitoring.

Satterfield said she still felt the Council should set a timeline of six months. She added that she wanted to continue to fund BSWG, that Nome is an important community, and she believed strongly that the program will be able to get back on track. BSWG has been absent an executive director, and that is a huge loss. She knew in the past that programs have been put on a six-month basis and that the Council has to see improvements. It doesn't mean that additional funding would be eliminated entirely, but it could impact it.

Williams remarked that she hated to see the discussion going this way. When she looks at the on-time and performance reports she can see that BSWG has had problems in terms of getting the reports to the CDVSA. So in that respect the Council has the ability to say the program is in noncompliance and there will be an audit, which they are scheduled for later this year. She could live with that. SAFV in Sitka is on time with their reports, and they just completed an audit, so to penalize the program because they have a problem of coordinating within the community of Sitka, to her that was outside of the organization's control. For example, there are things she would like to change in the community of Dillingham too. So she could not live with penalizing the Sitka program based on issues outside of the organization.

Chair Stewart stated that she thought there was plenty of blame to go around for the problems seen in Sitka, but some of it does evolve from the organization that the CDVSA funds. There is enough notion that that may be true that the proposed Council action is not inconsistent with its obligations and the mission. One of the primary considerations when the Council looks at all the funding requests is the community coordination component. And it is very clear to the Council that the community coordination component of the work that SAFV is doing in Sitka is broken. So it is different than the Nome situation and other places where there are late reports and numbers that don't add up — the SAFV situation really goes to the core of the functioning of victim services in a community, where there is clear notice that the coordination efforts are not functioning.

House explained that when she brought up Sitka for contingent funding it was not to say that anyone was really bad. But when there is an infection in a community, it is hard to eradicate it unless there is some outside help — or some really good networking going on. Her proposal was not to deny SAFV the funding but to find a way to help the program do better in the Sitka community. As far as BSWG in Nome is concerned, she would never recommend defunding the program, but they do need some help up there. She has been to Nome and only speaks from that experience — if ever anyone needed a shoulder, it is Nome, and she would go to bat for them any time. However, the Council has to be responsible.

Hogan recommended funding BSWG (Nome) and SAFV (Sitka) at their FY07 amounts with some contingencies or special conditions that the CDVSA would write into their grant agreement. The Council can work with staff about the specifics.

Satterfield and Holloway voiced their agreement.

Chair Stewart said the proposal on the table was to approve FY07 funding levels for BSWG (Nome) and SAFV (Sitka), with the understanding that there will be special award conditions and that CDVSA staff will do on-site visits and other efforts to help solve the individual problems in those two communities. She asked for a vote on that proposal.

Satterfield, Holloway, Hogan and House voted yes. Williams voted no. The vote was 4-1 in favor.

Chair Stewart said the action did not affect the additional FY08 dollar amount available because the funding to BSWG and SAFV was not increased. The total additional money to award in FY08 remained at \$491,376.

The next topic on the table was AWIC in Barrow.

Satterfield suggested reducing AWIC's funding by \$49,848 from the FY07 level to make it \$200,000 for FY08, then adding the \$200,000 that Senator Olson designated to make it a total of \$400,000. She said it covered the amount that the North Slope Borough was not giving AWIC in FY08.

Hogan noted that AWIC got \$249,848 in FY07, and their request for FY08 is \$555,238 — that is over a 100% increase. His fundamental question was what does it cost AWIC to operate a half-way decent victim services program in Barrow. He couldn't tell from AWIC's FY07 funding versus their FY08 request, and part of that confusion was where the \$180,000 shortfall in Borough support came in. His suggestion would be to fund AWIC at \$350,000. He said he did not know what that would enable AWIC to do, but \$200,000 of the \$350,000 would be using the "legislative intent." He said he looked at the AWIC proposal but could not tell what it actually costs them to provide a good program in Barrow.

Williams said she concurred with Hogan. She said the problem is that AWIC is supposed to move on its own into a non-profit, so all the costs of a borough government are in the FY08 request, which is so different from any other victim services program. Every program would love to have a PERS retirement system and an indirect. But if AWIC moved into a non-profit status all of those costs would come down and she could really compare them. Right now she is looking at a program that is very different.

House stated that she would fund AWIC (Barrow) at \$449,000, not taking away any of the FY07 award amount, and still following through on the mission from the State

Legislature for \$200,000 in designated funds.

Hogan sought agreement that AWIC was able to run a pretty good victim services program with \$249,848 from the CDVSA in FY07. Referring to page 86 of the AWIC proposal, he said it looked like AWIC's overall budget for FY07 was \$1,447,000. AWIC had informed the Council that they were going to lose \$180,000 of funding from the Borough in FY08. So the conclusion is that in order to maintain the current program AWIC needs \$1,447,000.

Ashenbrenner reminded the Council that AWIC was experiencing fixed costs going up with the Borough.

Holloway proposed that the Council fund AWIC at the FY07 award amount of \$249,848 plus \$25,000 of new money in FY08, with another \$25,000 of new money going to Maniilaq in Kotzebue.

Chair Stewart said that would be \$274,848 for AWIC in FY08, or about \$75,000 above the legislative designation of \$200,000.

Hogan said that he had reconsidered and would now support the recommendation of \$449,848 for AWIC (Barrow). AWIC was doing a good job with the \$249,848 from the CDVSA in FY07, and they are losing money from the Borough and Senator Olson tried to recognize that. He said the Council should approve \$449,848 for FY08.

Chair Stewart asked for a vote on the proposal to grant AWIC in Barrow a total of \$449,848. Hogan and House voted yes. Satterfield, Holloway and Williams voted no. The proposal failed by a 3-2 vote.

Chair Stewart opened the floor to a second proposal.

Satterfield proposed \$389,680 for AWIC. That includes the \$200,000 designated by the Legislature and recognizing that the Borough was cutting AWIC's budget by \$180,584.

Chair Stewart called for a vote on the proposal to grant AWIC (Barrow) a total of \$389,680. Satterfield and House voted yes. Holloway, Hogan and Williams said no. The proposal failed by a 3-2 vote.

Williams noted that the Council never voted on the \$350,000 proposal.

Chair Stewart asked for a vote on the proposal to grant AWIC (Barrow) a total of \$350,000 for FY08. Satterfield, Holloway, Hogan and Williams voted yes. House voted no. The proposal passed on a 4-1 vote.

Chair Stewart pointed out that the Council's last action on AWIC's award reduced the total additional money to award in FY08 to \$341,376.

House asked if the Council retained the right to review program requests that have already been funded. Chair Stewart stated that all of it was subject to change, including re-opening the actions the Council already voted on.

Chair Stewart said Holloway had suggested taking up Kotzebue in the context of AWIC (Barrow) because of its location in the region. Maniilaq Family Crisis Center (MFCC) in Kotzebue received \$300,000 in FY07, an amount the Legislature had designated for FY06 and FY07 when MFCC got totally defunded from the Department of Health & Social Services. MFCC was requesting \$419,983 for FY08, a total increase of \$119,983. Part of the increase was to make their legal advocate position full-time. There have been problems with timeliness and accuracy for the quarterly reports to CDVSA, however, MFCC is new to the whole reporting system and has been responsive to staff when contacted.

Hogan stated that he increased MFCC's agency management score after hearing their presentation, but his score was still pretty low for the program in Kotzebue. He recommended funding MFCC at the FY07 amount of \$300,000.

Satterfield recalled that Denette Perry was going to be moving to the Kotzebue program, and she is a very good executive director. So there is high hopes that with Perry's skill level MFCC will be a very strong program.

Chair Stewart stated that her scoring for MFCC was particularly low in statement of needs, low in agency management, and low in budget and budget narrative. So there is some work to be done there.

Holloway said he had a low score for the MFCC proposal too.

Chair Stewart called for a vote on the proposal to fund Maniilaq Family Crisis Center in Kotzebue at \$300,000. Satterfield, Holloway, Hogan, House and Williams all voted yes, making it unanimous.

Hogan requested a status update of which proposals the Council had not reviewed at this point. Griggs listed AWARE, IAC, LeeShore, SAFE, SPHH, STAR, WISH, AWAIC and TWC. House asked that staff post the list on the board so the Council members could look at it. Griggs indicated that the total additional money to award in FY08 was now at \$277,736. Chair Stewart asked that staff write the requested increase amount next to each program name on the list. Staff did that and the total of the requested increases for those programs came to \$983,221.

Hogan mentioned that the Chair had prepared a spreadsheet showing the percentage increase requested by each program from FY07 to FY08. He pointed out that with the exception of LeeShore (Kenai) and STAR (Anchorage), the proposed increases were all less than 10% (ranging from 3.75% to 9.61%). He wondered if there was some way for

the Council to look at a percentage increase for most of the remaining proposals. For example, WISH (Ketchikan) asked for a 3.75% increase, from \$552,698 in FY07 to \$591,565 for FY08, a dollar increase of roughly \$38,000. He asked if there was some way to recognize that WISH needed some additional dollars and perhaps give them a 2% increase or the whole 3.75%. He said WISH has done a generally good job, and he proposed giving them some percentage increase based on what they asked for.

Satterfield suggested taking the total of \$277,736 additional money available for FY08 and dividing it by the number of programs remaining on the list, so they would all get an equal amount of \$30,859.

Chair Stewart said the only problem she had with that was the example of cutting the family budget: you don't just decrease the amount of ice cream you buy, you stop buying ice cream altogether. She did not think the across-the-board percentage was really a fair way to look at it when there is such a huge disparity in acknowledged viable budgets. She added that the assumption right now is that every program is doing a good job with the CDVSA money that they've got. If that is not the assumption, then the Council needs to scrutinize individual programs and their base budget, which is the FY07 budget.

Williams voiced her concern with STAR and AWAIC in Anchorage. The Council has awarded them money, and part of that money is administrative dollars that are built in. She said she suspected that those administrative dollars could go into victim services, because the programs already have money for administrative. So she did not see funding them at their total requests. The Council has already given STAR and AWAIC some funding, and that could go to victim services.

Judy Cordell of AWAIC said she had a suggestion so that it wasn't just a shell game - getting funded on the one end and then defunded on the other end, and then the CDVSA does not get the extended services. She said she and Nancy Haag of STAR talked during the break. If the Council cuts AWAIC's request for additional funding by half to \$70,000, they would still be able to provide a new legal advocate. And it may be too ambitious to have more than that today.

Nancy Haag of STAR stated that she could cut STAR's request for additional funding to \$87,000, without going into the minutiae of it. That would allow the program to have an educator using the money from AWRC to help with education.

Cordell stated that the CDVSA would be sustaining both operations. Right now AWAIC has 0.8 of a legal advocate, so it would extend that position to full time and add one additional legal advocate. That would double the legal advocacy. STAR will get an added body to do education in the schools and the court operations.

Brenda Stanfill of IAC informed the Council that if they were going to let certain programs speak about what they can do, it seemed only fair to let all the programs

under discussion speak. She said she was feeling very uncomfortable with what she was seeing right now. They are all audience participants and all have comments and suggestions, but she was feeling uncomfortable.

Chair Stewart said that she understood that, but it was a unique situation with STAR and AWAIC because the Council specifically designated the requirement of additional services from them as a result of the third victim services program in Anchorage being defunded. She agreed that ordinarily the Council did not take additional horse trading at this point. But the Council put AWAIC and STAR in a difficult position with no advance warning, and it was a very unique situation.

Williams again referred to the administrative portion of the AWRC dollars that the Council was awarding to AWAIC and STAR to provide services that AWRC had been doing previously. She said the administrative portion could go into other services. So she thought that even though STAR and AWAIC had agreed to cut their requests for additional funding in FY08 to \$87,000 and \$70,000, respectively, she did not think the programs needed that additional money.

Chair Stewart suggested analyzing the two individual programs, STAR and AWAIC, based on their grant proposals and the new set of figures the Council had to work with.

Satterfield said she was not comfortable cutting STAR's and AWAIC's requests for additional FY08 funding entirely because the Council was asking them to take on full-position responsibilities that the programs didn't budget into their requests. She asked for a vote to determine the support for cutting the programs' requests for additional money entirely.

Chair Stewart said she needed a proposed FY08 funding amount for AWAIC to start with that included the AWRC portion the Council provided earlier.

House proposed funding AWAIC (Anchorage) at the FY07 level of \$883,616 plus \$148,494 of the AWRC money plus the \$70,000 increase for FY08 (that Cordell indicated she could live with), to bring the total extra to \$218,494.

A vote was taken, and Satterfield, Holloway, Hogan and Williams said no. House said yes. The proposal failed on a 4-1 vote.

Satterfield proposed funding AWAIC (Anchorage) at the FY07 level of \$883,616 plus \$180,000 additional.

Chair Stewart polled the members. Satterfield voted yes, while Holloway, Hogan, House and Williams voted no. That proposal failed by a 4-1 vote.

Williams stated her concern that if the Council continued to take up individual program requests for additional FY08 money, they would run out of money with some proposals

still left on the table that would receive no increases.

Chair Stewart agreed that could happen and said they needed another approach to address the remaining nine programs still under consideration.

Satterfield explained that her proposal of \$180,000 additional for AWAIC was the \$148,494 of AWRC money plus an amount based on her earlier suggestion of taking the total available extra money for FY08 and dividing it by the number of programs remaining.

Hogan pointed out that Council members spent a lot of time reviewing all the program funding proposals and scoring them, and to somehow not include what the Council thinks programs deserve based on their scores seemed sort of ridiculous. So he was not in favor of dividing the money up equally, because, bluntly, not all organizations are created equal nor are they providing comparable service. He said the process has to recognize the requests from each organization, look at how they scored, and have some mechanism to fund based on that methodology.

There was a brief exchange where the Chair stated that Council members were not allowed to ask questions directly of the program people in the audience.

Williams explained that she had developed a spreadsheet for herself the night before to score the proposals and use a formula to come up with funding amounts. Her calculations resulted in the following additional amounts for FY08: KIC (Ketchikan) \$18,000; SAFE (Dillingham) \$21,000; LSC (Kenai) \$18,000; TWC (Bethel) \$36,000; IAC (Fairbanks) \$75,000; AWARE (Juneau) \$40,000; STAR (Anchorage) \$19,736; AWAIC (Anchorage) \$26,968.

Hogan said he needed to understand the methodology behind the numbers.

Chair Stewart called a 15-minute break for staff to put Williams's numbers on the board. The meeting was on break from 11:05 to 11:20 a.m.

Williams explained that she developed a formula based on the percentage increase a program requested divided by the total increase requested by all the programs. She multiplied that percentage by the additional dollars available for FY08. Using this method, there was money left over that she added back in. However, the Council actions so far today have diminished the total additional dollars available for FY08 that remain on the table. She said that under this formula a program that requested a lot of money had a higher percentage; a program that only requested what it needed was penalized. So some consideration had to be given because of that, and the numbers weren't perfect. She commented that if programs knew going into the RFP that this was the formula, they would ask for the moon.

Satterfield commented that that was exactly what the Council would be seeing in the

future.

Williams said the Council needed something to work with.

Chair Stewart stated that what was lacking in an arithmetical calculation was recognition of individual programs and individual communities. One example is IAC in Fairbanks, a tremendous program that is the "Cadillac." IAC has received an unusual amount of private funding that has allowed them to develop a great model. IAC's FY08 request to the CDVSA was still substantial. She said the Council was obligated to look at the individual proposals to assess independently whether the requests were valid and had substance — given the limitations the Council had to work with.

Williams said that throughout this funding meeting she has expressed concern about outreach and getting into the communities. If a program says they are going to provide services to rural communities then she expected to see travel amounts in the budget associated with those communities. When she read IAC's proposal she did not see travel funding. She has lived in the Interior and is married to a man from the Interior, and \$68,000 is a drop in the bucket to serve all those communities in the Interior and have an advocate to travel. She said she could not live with a 24-hour crisis line.

Ashenbrenner stated that this has been a learning year for her about funding proposals. She said one of the weaknesses of the proposals is that some programs provide the outreach services but not with CDVSA money, and it is not really clear in the proposals.

Chair Stewart recalled that some programs explained that they provided outreach services where the travel costs were paid from other funding sources. She said that Williams's point overall reflected her own thoughts to some extent, which is that the Council has to assess some of the individual proposals and it can't be done arithmetically. The Council has to be willing to do some evaluations about the community needs and the overall coordination because it is the Council's responsibility fundamentally to try to coordinate services on a statewide basis. To just do things arithmetically does not meet that obligation.

Hogan suggested that each Council member provide their scores for each of the remaining nine grantees to come up with an average score. That might help the Council move towards making a more rational decision.

Chair Stewart asked staff to write Council members' scores next to each program name on the board as they called them out (the highest possible score was 60). Staff then calculated the average of the scores, as follows:

AWAIC (Anchorage) .....	52.0
AWARE (Juneau) .....	51.6
IAC (Fairbanks) .....	50.5
LSC (Kenai) .....	50.0
SAFE (Dillingham) .....	51.6

SPHH (Homer) .....	45.0
STAR (Anchorage) .....	47.5
TWC (Bethel).....	52.1
WISH (Ketchikan) .....	45.3

Holloway said the tallies confirmed what he suspected would happen, that all the programs are worthwhile programs, and that the scoring mechanism is not that perfect. He did not think there were enough differences to make any decisions based upon those numbers.

Hogan said he appreciated his colleague's comments. But even though the tool is not that specific, it is what the Council used. Each Council member reviewed the proposals independently, which he thought accounted for what was in some cases pretty significant differences in how they viewed the proposals. He suggested that the Council use the scoring numbers somehow to help make a decision on the final nine proposals still on the table. Based on the scoring, Hogan proposed that AWAIC, AWARE, SAFE and TWC get 3% increases for FY08, that IAC and LSC get 2% increases, and that SPHH, STAR and WISH get 1% increases.

Holloway observed that the Chair had put forth one idea about looking at the specific program services in order to score the proposals and that Hogan was using another method. He suggested a third method that evened things out in one way but gave preference to agencies that serve more as geographic hubs and support the other agencies. He saw that as broken down into a group of three "hub-type" programs and the other six in another group. He noted that he was leaving IAC out of the hub group, even though Fairbanks is a hub, because IAC has a little bit better situation in some ways. He proposed giving AWAIC (Anchorage) 15% of the remaining additional money available in FY08, TWC (Bethel) 15%, and STAR (Anchorage) 16%, because they support other agencies, using the geographic hub idea. The other six agencies are all even, so he proposed giving them each 9% of the remaining additional money available in FY08. He said the Council should first decide which method it wanted to use before getting down to the nitty-gritty of it.

Satterfield indicated she agreed with Holloway's method because it was closer to what she had proposed.

Chair Stewart said she wanted to see what the actual dollar numbers would be under Holloway's proposal. Griggs calculated that 9% of the remaining additional money available in FY08 meant that six agencies would get an extra \$24,996 each, while STAR at 16% would get \$44,437, AWAIC at 15% would get \$41,660, and TWC at 15% would get \$41,660. Staff posted the numbers on the board, as follows:

AWAIC (Anchorage) .....	\$41,660
AWARE (Juneau) .....	\$24,996
IAC (Fairbanks) .....	\$24,996
LSC (Kenai) .....	\$24,996

SAFE (Dillingham) .....	\$24,996
SPHH (Homer) .....	\$24,996
STAR (Anchorage) .....	\$44,437
TWC (Bethel).....	\$41,660
WISH (Ketchikan).....	\$24,996

Williams stated that with the scores posted on the board now the Council needed to also use some scoring rationale to make the awards.

Chair Stewart said she agreed with Williams but wanted to know how she proposed to integrate the two methods.

Williams stated that, based on Hogan's methodology, it would mean moving SAFE, AWARE, AWAIC and TWC to the top of the list. IAC and LSC would be in a group. Then SPHH, STAR and WISH would be in a separate group.

Noting that \$276,373 of extra funding was still on the table for FY08, Hogan said there were four higher scoring programs that could possibly divide up a certain percentage of that total. The two middle scoring programs would get a certain percentage, and then the three lowest scoring programs would get a certain percentage. The pot would be divided based on what Holloway and others were suggesting.

Chair Stewart asked staff to identify on the board which of the three tiers each program was in.

Hogan posed a scenario where the top tier would get a total of 50%, the middle tier would get 30%, and the bottom tier would get 20% to divide among them. He noted that the idea would work better if there were three programs in each tier, but this way the top tier with four programs in it was being penalized. He asked if anyone else had an idea on how to cut the money evenly based on the scores.

Williams suggested giving the four programs in the top tier 15% each, the two middle-tier programs would get 10% each, and the lowest-tier programs would get 6.6% each.

Hogan said that was getting closer.

Griggs indicated that the top-scoring programs AWARE (Juneau), AWAIC (Anchorage), SAFE (Dillingham) and TWC (Bethel) would get \$41,660 each under that scenario.

Williams asked Holloway to explain why he wanted to award a bigger increase to AWAIC, TWC and STAR. Holloway said he added more to those three programs in Anchorage and Bethel because of the high populations and the fact that they are hubs and assist other agencies.

Chair Stewart commented that Holloway's proposal compared to the scoring proposal

comes out pretty consistent. AWARE got added to the top tier group AWAIC, SAFE and TWC, and the only program to suffer under the proposal is STAR, which was perceived as being a statewide service provider.

Griggs outlined the funding breakdown under the latest tiered-by-scores proposal:

Tier 1:	AWAIC (Anchorage) .....	\$41,660
	AWARE (Juneau) .....	\$41,660
	SAFE (Dillingham) .....	\$41,660
	TWC (Bethel) .....	\$41,660
Tier 2:	IAC (Fairbanks).....	\$27,773
	LSC (Kenai) .....	\$27,773
Tier 3:	SPHH (Homer).....	\$18,330
	STAR (Anchorage).....	\$18,330
	WISH (Ketchikan) .....	\$18,330

Hogan said he supported this proposal for FY08 increased funding because it took into consideration the proposal scores, and based on the previous recommendations, the dollar amounts are fairly close, with the exception of STAR which the Chair pointed out a couple of minutes ago.

Satterfield indicated that she preferred Holloway's proposal better, which provided higher percentages for the hub programs. She concurred that three of the programs were hub cities but stressed that STAR (Anchorage) was a statewide program.

Williams said she recognized Satterfield's concern with STAR and was concerned herself about IAC (Fairbanks). But considering the scores and grant proposals was moving in a better direction than throwing numbers out. It gave credibility to the Council scoring of the RFPs.

Satterfield stated that her position on the scoring was that it was too subjective. Council members' scores were all over the place.

Chair Stewart observed that individual members were consistent on scoring from program to program.

Satterfield said it is tough reading 28 grants, and doing it in a limited period of time, the scores at the beginning can be quite different than scores at the end and can be not truly reflective of the grants. So she was less inclined to go with the scoring method.

Hogan stated that for the Council members who don't really know the programs well or intimately, the scores of the proposals are what they have to go on. He acknowledged that other Council members know more about the system and the network than he

does, but he spent a lot of time looking at the proposals and took them seriously. He knew that the people in the audience spent a lot of time putting the grant proposals together. So he felt strongly that the Council needed to take into consideration the scores on the proposals.

Chair Stewart asked for a vote on the award numbers on the board (for additional funding in FY08), which were as follows:

Tier 1:	AWAIC (Anchorage) .....	\$41,660
	AWARE (Juneau) .....	\$41,660
	SAFE (Dillingham) .....	\$41,660
	TWC (Bethel) .....	\$41,660
Tier 2:	IAC (Fairbanks).....	\$27,773
	LSC (Kenai) .....	\$27,773
Tier 3:	SPHH (Homer).....	\$18,330
	STAR (Anchorage).....	\$18,330
	WISH (Ketchikan) .....	\$18,330

Hogan and House voted yes. Satterfield, Holloway and Williams voted no. The proposal failed by a 3-2 vote.

Before she voted, House said that Council members read all the proposals, and some scored high and some scored low, but an average number emerged in the end. She said that while they have complained about the system for a long time, the Council was finally using some statistics that it put together.

Before she voted, Williams said that she hated putting the proposed increased funding numbers up on the board next to the requests because her concern was with giving IAC (Fairbanks) so little of their request.

Williams said that when she looked at the scores, for example, IAC (Fairbanks) at 50.52 and AWARE (Juneau) at 51.6, there was not a lot of difference. A one-point difference (meant AWARE would get a \$41,660 increase and IAC would get \$27,773).

Satterfield noted that there was still Holloway's proposed funding numbers on the board that should be put to a vote.

House stated that IAC's verbal presentation made it clear that they were only requesting what they absolutely needed in FY08. If IAC (Fairbanks) does not get at least \$150,000 in additional funding, the program will have to let three people go.

Referring to the tiered-by-scores proposal that the Council just voted upon, Williams suggested combining the four tier 1 programs (proposed to get 15% each) with the two

tier 2 programs (proposed to get 10% each) and dividing the 80% of the FY08 additional funding available equally among them so they each got 13.3%. She said their scores were so close.

Chair Stewart reminded her that the Council was working towards a vote on Holloway's proposal so she urged looking at that first.

Satterfield stated that she did not understand IAC's proposal to be that they absolutely had to have everything they were asking for, that Stanfill recognized that IAC is a "Cadillac" operation and that she could operate with less.

Chair Stewart recalled that Stanfill mentioned her request for a maintenance person, which she understood she could not get in this funding climate. She said that House might have overstated the crisis in Fairbanks.

Williams pointed out that IAC requested an additional \$178,000 for FY08. So if one were to subtract out the money requested for a maintenance person and then look at the proposed funding of \$24,996 for IAC under Holloway's proposal, that is too much of a drop.

Chair Stewart asked for a vote on the Holloway proposal that gave higher funding to programs that served as geographic hubs and supported other programs, as follows:

AWAIC (Anchorage) .....	\$41,660	15% of FY08 increase remaining
AWARE (Juneau) .....	\$24,996	9%
IAC (Fairbanks) .....	\$24,996	9%
LSC (Kenai) .....	\$24,996	9%
SAFE (Dillingham) .....	\$24,996	9%
SPHH (Homer) .....	\$24,996	9%
STAR (Anchorage) .....	\$44,437	16%
TWC (Bethel).....	\$41,660	15%
WISH (Ketchikan).....	\$24,996	9%

Satterfield and Holloway voted yes. Hogan, House and Williams voted no. The proposal failed by a 3-2 vote.

Returning to her earlier suggestion, Williams proposed giving the six top scoring programs 13.3% of the FY08 additional funding available and the lowest scoring three programs 6.6% each.

AWAIC (Anchorage) .....	\$37,124
AWARE (Juneau) .....	\$37,126
SAFE (Dillingham) .....	\$37,124
TWC (Bethel) .....	\$37,124
IAC (Fairbanks).....	\$37,124

LSC (Kenai) .....	\$37,124
SPHH (Homer).....	\$18,330
STAR (Anchorage).....	\$18,330
WISH (Ketchikan) .....	\$18,330

Chair Stewart called for a vote on the above proposal from Williams.

Satterfield, Hogan, House and Williams voted yes. Holloway said no. The proposal was approved on a 4-1 vote.

House indicated that it was not where she wanted to be but she voted yes.

**OTHER MATTERS**

**Budget Preparation:**

Ashenbrenner requested permission for staff to pursue the same sort of analysis for budget increase possibilities through the State budget process this summer for the batterers intervention programs and the victim services programs.

Chair Stewart said the questions were whether the CDVSA should be asking for more money in the budget, and if so, should the Council develop a process by which to develop those numbers and try to roll them through the system.

There was a chorus of "yeses" from Council members.

Carrying forward the car metaphor that was used to describe a program earlier, Hogan said the CDVSA certainly does not want a system that uses strictly Yugos (cheap subcompact cars built in former Yugoslavia). So he thought the CDVSA wanted more money in the budget, but it should be tied to a greater discussion around core services. Only then would the Council know what is a realistic request for additional dollars.

Chair Stewart stated that it would enable the Council to better distinguish between funding requests for a maintenance person or a legal advocate, which are radically different core services. The Council needs to work on giving some value and priorities to those services. She mentioned that the Network was going to be working on identifying core services, and the Council needs to be active in that discussion.

Ashenbrenner said she had talked to the Network about working with them on that. She saw the challenge for CDVSA being the Network's plan to meet in August, while the CDVSA has to be working on the budget before that because of the State's budget cycle. Staff has a lot of assignments before them, with the task force and some special reviews coming up. She said staff will do as much as they can in the time frame before budget development starts.

### **CDVSA Administrative Spending:**

Ashenbrenner explained that primarily because of staff vacancies in the last couple of years the CDVSA has been able roll administrative savings into funding victim services programs. The CDVSA is almost full staffed now and expects to remain that way, so staff wanted the Council to be aware that the administrative savings of prior years are not there. She said she planned to use the CDVSA administrative money this year to get essential work done.

Chair Stewart recalled that there had been talk of using administrative money to look at tiered services in the state, which goes hand in hand with the core services review. So the Council had already anticipated taking on some of those challenges, and she thought it would take people, which means time, which means money.

### **Proposal Score Sheets:**

Chair Stewart asked Council members to turn their score sheets in to staff for filing.

### **Administrative Manager Announcements:**

Griggs stated that staff would get the insurance information out to programs for employee bonding as soon as possible, in order to figure out who needs it, who doesn't need it, and what the percentages are.

A fax cover sheet containing the FY08 grant award amount will go out immediately to be signed by the program executive director or the board, and it has to be faxed back to the CDVSA office. Griggs said she needed that to set up the encumbrances this year. This is a new requirement.

Every program will receive FVPSA (Family Violence Prevention Services Act) or VOCA (Victims of Crime Act) funding this year if they possibly can. Staff will be setting up a teleconference and emailing everyone to review how to set up the budgets and what needs to happen.

Griggs stated that also new this year is a grant timeline that requires programs to send in the first request for advance by September 15. She indicated that staff would send out an email about that.

Griggs invited anyone with questions to contact her.

Ginger Baim of SAFE requested that staff send an email listing all the FY08 reporting forms that programs are supposed to be using. Griggs agreed to do that.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There was no further business to come before the Council, and the meeting adjourned at 12:39 p.m. on June 9, 2007.

Note: These summary minutes are extracted from staff's tape recording of the meeting and are prepared by an outside contractor. For in-depth discussion and presentation details, please refer to tapes of the meeting and staff reports on file at the CDVSA office.

Confidential Office Services  
Karen Pearce Brown  
Juneau, Alaska

DRAFT