

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FUNDING MEETING
July 28, 2012
Department of Public Safety Building
450 Whittier, Juneau, AK – Teleconference

Call to order: By Chair Cushing at 1:01 p.m.

Council Members Present by Phone: **Chair Susan Cushing** (Public Member); **Kelly Howell** (delegated by **Commissioner Joseph Masters**, Department of Public Safety); **Melissa Stone** (Department of Health and Social Services); **Richard Irwin** (Public Member); **Carmen Gutierrez** (Department of Corrections); **Jackie Hill** (Public Member); **Rick Svobodny** (Department of Law).

Council Members Not Present: **Patricia Owen** (Department of Education and Early Development); **Stephanie McFadden-Evans** (Public Member)

CDVSA Staff Present: **Lauree Morton, Diane Lanuza, Linda Hoven, Freda Westman and Angela Wells**

Others Present: Cheri Smith (LSC); Vicki D'Amico and Michelle (SAFV); Rosemary (STAR); Samaria Ross (BSWG); Mandy (AWARE); Edith (AWIC); Nicole Songer (CFRC); Keeley Olson (STAR); Nora (SCS); Ginger Baim (SAFE)

Council Conflict Inquiry: Susan Cushing stated that since she was unavailable to participate in the second Program Evaluation Committee review and due to personal interests as a Public Member from Homer, she will abstain from voting on Funding for South Peninsula Haven House. Chair Cushing asked that the Council vote by yeah or nay to accept her statement.

Yeah = 3

Nay = 0

Melissa Stone has no conflicts.

Carmen Gutierrez mentioned that she has known the Director of Victims For Justice, but feels that there is no conflict. No other conflicts were addressed.

Richard Irwin has no conflicts.

Public Comment:

Chair Cushing asked all on line for any public comments.

Ginger Baim (SAFE) commented that everyone was waiting to hear the results and that comments should be taken afterward.

Review Recommendations Given by the Proposal Evaluation Committee:

Lauree Morton introduced the PEC members: Susan Cushing (CDVSA Chair); Patricia Owen (CDVSA Board member); Wendy Lyford (Alaska Court System); Kate Hudson (Violent Crimes Compensation Board); Michelle Lyons Brown (HSS); Todd Brocious (EED).

Ms. Morton provided a short overview of the process to date:

The committee members met with council staff prior to the PEC meeting to review their responsibilities. They received the request for proposal and all attachments, the proposals themselves and scoring sheets, in advance of their face to face meeting.

They were responsible for reading and scoring the proposals prior to meeting in person. The PEC met twice and followed the same process during each meeting.

Each PEC member during the meeting announced scores for each proposal. The scores were recorded and available for everyone to see. Each PEC member had an opportunity to bring up strengths and challenges they noted for each proposal. Each proposal was separately discussed. After discussion each PEC member was given an opportunity to change scores. The final scores were averaged and weighted. Members considered scores, need for services, geographical distribution and points raised in their discussions to arrive at the recommended funding amounts for each program. Neither the Prison Based nor the Community Based Batterers Intervention Program allocations had an increment added to the FY12 based. Each Prison Batters Program was recommended to be funded at an equivalent to the FY12 level of funding.

During the first discussion of the Community Based Programs, it was noted that LeeShore had asked for \$20K while their FY12 amount was \$24,979.00. The FY12 award amount had been amended to increase the initial award after another program returned funding. That amendment happened after the proposal had been submitted. The PEC decided to recommend that Leeshore be funded at their \$20K request which made available the \$4,979 for distribution to other programs. The PEC decided to recommend the funding go to AWARE Community Based Program and the remaining programs were recommended to be funded at an equivalent to their FY12 awards.

Review Recommendations Given by the Proposal Evaluation Committee Continued:

There was a \$475K increment available for Victim Service allocation in addition to the FY12 base during the first PEC meeting. Members decided to start programs at their FY12 base amount. They were asked if there were any proposals from which they wanted to subtract funds and none were identified. Members then agreed to recommend a 3% across the board increment to all programs, discussion followed on distributing the remaining funds available. The members agreed to recommend those funds be distributed by a formula that would allow each program to have some money to put towards their first priorities for increased funds as identified in their proposals. An increment was not available for distribution during the second meeting and each program was recommended to be funded at an equivalent to their FY12 awards.

The Council members have before them, 3 different tables; one for Victim Service Programs, which has each program listed, the FY12 grant award, the FY13 requests, the weighted scores from the PEC, the PEC recommendations, and a column to approve funding amounts for the Council.

In addition to that, Council members were also provided a summary of the PEC identified strengths and weaknesses as they went through each program. And the Council also had the abstracts from each of the proposals.

Chair Cushing asked for discussion from Council members and also asked Mr. Svobodny if we vote on each program and their amount individually, or should we do it as an entire slate.

Mr. Svobodny advised that there was no rule and it was up to the Council as to how they do it. Chair Cushing leads a general discussion to answer questions from the Council about the process.

Mr. Svobodny asked Ms. Morton about the 16 responsive Victim Service proposals and whether the 3% was shown on the document. Ms. Morton clarified that the 3% was part of the \$475K increment so was included in the total PEC recommendation.

Mr. Svobodny suggested that we keep the BIP/PBP separate from the Victim Services when we vote.

Mr. Svobodny moves that we fund the Victim Service Programs, 1-16 and 1-4 at the amounts recommended by the PEC as identified.

Ms. Stone seconds the motion.

Chair Cushing calls for discussion on the motion.

Ms. Gutierrez asked Ms. Morton with regards to programs on the second table 1-4, I see that they are being funded at the FY12 level. Is there funding available to add the 3% increase?

Review Recommendations Given by the Proposal Evaluation Committee Continued:

Ms. Morton said 3% increase would be an addition of \$55,541 to the total amount. FVPSA funding could be brought into state FY13 to cover the addition. Ms. Morton reminded Council members of the agreement the Council had with the department regarding expenditures of federal funds. The Council agreed to spread the use of federal funds across the state fiscal years included in the federal award period. This is necessary to ensure federal funds are available for distribution at the beginning of each state fiscal year. Prior to the agreement, the Council granted the full amount of each federal award in a single state fiscal year and the department would not allow for the distribution of federal funds until the actual award was in hand so programs were not getting funds until well into the start of the first quarter of each state fiscal year. This \$55,541 could be brought into state FY13 without negatively affecting our agreement but we would be getting to the amount needed for FY14.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there were any other liabilities that come to mind as a result of that.

Ms. Morton answered, no.

Ms. Hill then inquired about the 4 non-responsive proposals, what made them be non-responsive?

Chair Cushing asked Ms. Hill about Conflict Inquiry. Ms. Hill stated that she had no conflicts and no longer works for MFCC.

Ms. Morton stated, at the Council meeting in Palmer, the Council was made aware that there were programs, both victim service and batterer intervention applications that had been deemed non-responsive and had not been forwarded to the PEC. The Council made the decision at the meeting in Palmer to give those programs an opportunity to provide the missing information in order to bring them into responsiveness, and asked that the PEC hold another meeting to review those proposals. That is why the PEC met twice and considered the 4 Victim Service Programs, 1 Prison-Based Program and 3 Community-Based Batterers' Intervention Programs.

Ms. Gutierrez elaborated on her question. We want to endorse programs for following the process. At the same time Ms. Gutierrez doesn't want to place form over process. If the Council were to consider giving them the 3% increase but not funding them for amounts that were listed on their first priorities, it will make the point of importance of following the process by which these grant proposals are submitted and processed. The real issue being, to what extent should these 4 Victim Service Programs be penalized for not complying completely with the process?

Mr. Svobodny feels it is the 16 programs that are the ones being penalized. They didn't know that there was potentially another pot of more money. There has to be more accountability for the programs in making their applications.

Ms. Stone asked Ms. Morton the reason that 4 programs were deemed non-responsive. Ms. Morton replied that there were missing forms; budget form and federal indirect cost rate. Ms. Morton explained that the federal indirect cost rate is documentation to support the rate that they have requested.

Review Recommendations Given by the Proposal Evaluation Committee Continued:

Chair Cushing added that the budget form was the Budget Summary Form and as this is a new process we should be mindful of that.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if this was a new requirement, to which Ms. Morton replied “No”.

Ms. Morton then clarified what “first priorities” are and how those would be affected if monies had gone to all 20 programs.

Ms. Stone asked how much was the total amount of the 3% across the board and how much was remaining after that 3% was distributed using the formula for first priorities.

Ms. Morton replied that the total 3% was \$273,150. After the 3% was distributed out, \$201,850 was left for distribution for first priorities.

Ms. Stone then asked if the remainder was distributed equally.

Ms. Morton stated that after the 3% was distributed equally, the PEC members had discussions about first priorities and about each program, what they wanted to fund and how they wanted to fund it. Ms. Lyford came up with another formula to distribute that remaining money so that each program could get some funds to try to work toward implementing their first priority.

Looking at the first priority, if the amount of money necessary to grant that first priority was over \$40K she didn't consider the excess, so the PEC arbitrarily decided \$40k would be the top amount they would award for anybody's first priority. Then there was a formula that pro-rated and distributed the rest of that \$201,850.

Chair Cushing reminded the Council that this formula was presented at the meeting in Palmer.

Ms. Stone then inquired where the extra \$55,541 would come from if we were to give the 4 programs their 3%, and what this money would be used for if we did not distribute it to the 4 programs.

Ms. Morton replied that this would be FVPSA money, which is a federal grant to be used over 3 years.

Chair Cushing stated that if there was no more discussion and everyone is clear on the motion that we will take a vote.

Mr. Svobodny moves that we fund the Victim Service Programs, 1-16 and 1-4 at the amounts recommended by the PEC as identified.

Ms. Stone seconds the motion.

6 votes in favor.

Chair Cushing; abstains from voting on South Peninsula Haven House, but votes in opposition. Motion passes 6-1.

Review Recommendations Given by the Proposal Evaluation Committee Continued:

Ms. Morton then read the amounts granted to each program for the record.

Chair Cushing then goes to the FY13 Batterers Intervention Program and reads off the programs and amounts recommended by the PEC, and ask for a motion.

Ms. Stone moves to accept these funding amounts as proposed by the PEC for the FY13 Batterer's Intervention Program.

Mr. Irwin seconds the motion.

Chair Cushing abstains from voting on South Peninsula Haven House.

Motion passes unanimously.

Chair Cushing next goes to FY13 Prison Batterers Programs and asks for a motion.

Motion made by Kelly Howell to fund the Prison Batters Programs at the FY13 PEC recommended amount.

Mr. Svobodny seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

Chair Cushing inquired about any other comments.

Ms. Morton thanked all the programs and the PEC committee.

Ms. Stone asked how we will address the challenges that were identified in this new process and if the process allows for special conditions. Ms. Morton assured the Council that a survey would be sent out to all the programs and to the PEC committee members and used to better streamline the process. Also, that they would report the survey information at the next Council meeting. Ms. Morton stated that the process did have provisions for special conditions.

Chair Cushing adjourns the meeting 2:10 pm.