

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

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL TELECONFERENCE MEETING
VOCA RECOVERY ACT FUNDING
August 31, 2009**

**Location
Department of Public Safety Building
450 Whittier Street
Juneau, Alaska**

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Stephanie McFadden called the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault meeting to order at _____ p.m. on Monday, August 31, 2009. Eight Council members were present at roll call to form a quorum.

Council members present: Colonel Audie Holloway (Department of Public Safety, AST); Richard Svobodny (Department of Law); Sam Edwards (Department of Corrections); Cynthia Curran (Department of Education & Early Development); Stephanie McFadden (public member/vice chair); Kristine Norbert (public member); Melissa Stone (Department of Health & Social Services); Susan Cushing (public member)

Council members absent: Anne House (public member/chair)

Council staff present: Joanne Griggs (Administrative Officer); Lauree Morton (Program Coordinator)

Others present (in person or by telephone): None.

Vice Chair McFadden said the Council had to deal with some old agenda items that were not closed out at the last meeting.

BYLAWS COMMITTEE AND APPEALS COMMITTEE

CDVSA Administrative Officer Jo Griggs stated that Chair Ann House had assigned herself, Col. Holloway and Melissa Stone to the Appeals Committee, but the Council also had to set up a Bylaws Committee.

Vice Chair McFadden asked Mr. Svobodny, Ms. Norbert, and Mr. Edwards if they would serve on a Bylaws Committee. They all agreed.

DISCUSS SEPTEMBER MEETING IN KODIAK

Council members discussed and agreed upon the format for the public testimony portion of the quarterly meeting scheduled for September 16-17, 2009 in Kodiak.

VOCA RECOVERY ACT FUNDING

Ms. Griggs stated that the Council members should all have a spreadsheet showing the programs and their funding requests for the VOCA Recovery Act grant *[on file at the CDVSA offices]*. The total grant available was \$517,750.

Explanation of acronyms used:

VOCA:	Violence Against Crime Act
SAFE:	Safe and Fear-Free Environment (Dillingham)
VFJ:	Victims For Justice (Anchorage - statewide services)
STAR:	Standing Together Against Rape (Anchorage)
LSC:	The LeeShore Center (Kenai)
WISH:	Women In Safe Homes (Ketchikan)
SAFV:	Sitkans Against Family Violence (Sitka)
IAC:	Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living (Fairbanks)
AWARE:	Aiding Women in Abuse and Rape Emergencies (Juneau)
AVV:	Advocates for Victims of Violence (Valdez)
TWC:	Tundra Women's Coalition (Bethel)
AWAIC:	Abused Women's Aid In Crisis (Anchorage)

Vice Chair McFadden said that if the Council granted SAFE, VFJ, STAR, LSC, WISH, SAFV, IAC, AWARE, and AVV what they requested, that award would total \$334,559. Ms. Griggs said that would leave \$183,191 to award. Vice Chair McFadden suggested splitting that between TWC and AWAIC, to give them each \$91,595.50. She asked if anyone objected to dispersing the grant money that way.

Mr. Svobodny said he objected because there were some applications that did not meet the federal stimulus recovery criteria. When he was scoring the requests, he thought VFJ did not qualify. They were requesting a server, which does not relate to any [inaudible], does not relate to security, and does not relate to ongoing personnel maintenance. To him, there was no argument at all that VFJ did not qualify for this grant. Secondly, he wondered why they needed a server instead of using a computer like most people do.

CDVSA Program Coordinator Lauree Morton related that Susan Sullivan of VFJ called the CDVSA office and asked about the applicability of the server. In Ms. Sullivan's description of using it as the basis for entering all their client information to be able to contact clients and keep up with the different activities they do, it seemed to staff that

the request fell within the scope of providing some direct service for crime victims. That is why CDVSA staff sent the request forward to the Council, and it was within the Council's purview to not fund the request.

Mr. Svobodny said he noted that VFJ was ordering 10 software programs for Windows small business server 2008. He thought they could do what they wanted using Excel in a \$600 laptop computer. It was an extraordinary amount of money for what they were asking for, and then there was the question of whether or not they qualified. He also noticed under project-specific reports that there was no history: VFJ had not turned in anything.

Ms. Morton explained that FY2010 was the first year after an absence of several years that VFJ would be funded, so CDVSA did not have reports from them in FY2009. Ms. Griggs said the last year VFJ was funded through CDVSA was FY2006.

Mr. Svobodny said maybe VFJ could be given some slack on the project reporting aspect then, but he scored their proposal seriously, along with all the other proposals, and he still could not find a way to justify their request and be consistent in the scoring. He advised going through all the applications because there were several where some staff felt that supplies were not eligible for funding and other staff did not question it.

Mr. Svobodny stated that he would like to fund all the requests, but there is a 30% shortfall in the funding available. If a proposal does not qualify, then the Council should not consider it. He thought VFJ was the only program that did not qualify on any grounds, but maybe someone could convince him that they did. He could not see paying \$9,000 for a server to keep track of victims instead of \$1,000 for a computer.

Vice Chair McFadden posed that maybe people would be entering data from multiple computers in different locations, in which case a server would make sense. Mr. Svobodny responded that VFJ should have explained that, if that was the case.

Ms. Cushing said she figured out there was a 30% shortfall across the board and so calculated reducing each program request by 30% as a general measure, without looking at the merits of each application. She thought each application seemed very reasonable and explained a need. Some requested an extraordinary amount but they serve a larger population. She saw three Anchorage agencies in the pool, and she did not know how that worked. Some estimates seemed quite high on a couple of things, and then there was the \$12,000 public service announcements (PSAs) that IAC requested. She recalled from previous minutes some discussion about statewide PSAs to educate people about the need for safe relationships. That was why she wondered about \$12,000 being a large amount of money to tell people that IAC exists. When people are asking for clean pillows, the grant did say that supplies were allowable. She hoped that a couple of the requests that were very high in proportion to the others also had other resources. People are waiting for the Anchorage city budget to come down

the line to see how the city is going to be distributing revenue sharing to the non-profits, such as AWAIC, VFJ, and STAR. She said she could use some education on the process, but she wanted to weigh in with her thoughts.

Mr. Svobodny said that maybe 30% cuts for each proposal was a legitimate approach but he had a fundamental question. For AWAIC, staff said that computers are not eligible, and then there was VFJ where the whole grant application was for a server. He did not understand how one program could be eligible for computers and another program was not.

Ms. Morton explained that VFJ and the server request was passed through to the Council for a decision because in the conversation she had with VFJ's Susan Sullivan it did not sound like they were buying computers. It sounded like they were buying software and that the portion that VOCA would pay for was specifically and only for VFJ's work in direct service. That is why the VFJ request got forwarded. There was more than one applicant that asked for computers, and computers are not an allowable expense so those did not go forward.

Mr. Svobodny said he was not sure he agreed with the distinction between a server and a computer. He noted that VFJ submitted a request for \$9,000 for a server, which includes 10 software packages.

Ms. Morton said that VFJ was prorating the cost of a server because VOCA can only pay for the portion that is actually going to be for direct service. So anything administrative or prevention, outside of direct service to clients, VOCA cannot pay for. Ms. Griggs added that VFJ would be combining the \$9,000 to purchase a server with other sources of funding. Ms. Morton reiterated that staff thought that VFJ met the minimum qualifications to forward the request to the Council.

Mr. Svobodny pointed out that VFJ's proposal talked about purchasing \$9,000 of equipment. There is a cash contribution of \$300, and \$3,400 for somebody who is volunteering hours. Then the attached documents described the equipment and a price of \$9,609. To him, it was clearly a computer. He said he was not trying to pick on VFJ, but he wanted to know what is eligible and what is not — because AWAIC did not get their computer because it was not considered eligible.

Ms. Curran stated that she scored the grant applications and ranked them as well. She had seven applications that were 35 points or above and three that were 19 points or lower. She asked if anyone else used a process like that so that they had some applications they had no issues funding versus ones they had issues with.

Mr. Svobodny indicated that he gave each application points according to how he understood the instructions.

Ms. Cushing said she also ranked the applications, although she did not know if she had all the information on the staff reviews. But her scoring showed some applications with much fewer points than others.

Ms. Stone said she explained to Ms. Morton on the phone this morning that she had misunderstood the process and the need to have the applications scored by today. Her main question was the CDVSA process for reviewing and scoring applications and how those scores are combined to make a decision. She noted that she was on the Appeals Committee and so had a special interest in the review and scoring process.

Vice Chair McFadden stated that she took her cue from the May funding meeting, where the Council evenly distributed a pocket of money left at the end among all the programs. She recalled that the Council did not give VFJ much money at that funding meeting.

Col. Holloway agreed but pointed out that VFJ was a new — or revisited — program at that time. He explained that he was out of the office last week and did not have a chance to look at the VOCA Recovery Act grant applications and score them.

Vice Chair McFadden remarked that it was almost impossible by teleconference for Council members to follow the process used at the big funding meeting because that process involved keeping track of scores and dollar amounts on a white board, etc. She opened it up for suggestions on what to do in this case.

Ms. Griggs suggested going through the list of applications and getting Council feedback on each proposal.

Ms. Stone inquired about the expectation for the scoring if the scores are not going to be used.

Ms. Griggs said the scores have been used in the past to start the discussion, and if Council members heard or realized something in discussion that they had not considered they will change their score on the score sheets. There is room to make adjustments to the score on the score sheets and a place to make notes about what happened in the discussion at the meeting to increase or decrease a score.

Ms. Stone asked if the score sheets are available for the applicants to review. Ms. Griggs said yes, that staff collects the score sheets for filing with the proposals. Ms. Stone again asked how scores are going to be used in the decision-making process.

Vice Chair McFadden remarked that it might be too tough to do this by teleconference, and she wondered if the Council should do this at the Kodiak meeting, depending on the deadline for the funding.

Ms. Griggs advised the chair to go through the list of applications and solicit comments to see if there were some that everyone agreed upon. The Council could then proceed to discuss the applications where there were perceived problems.

Vice Chair McFadden agreed and suggested starting with the programs that requested the least amount of funding. She started with SAFE's request of \$4,456 and asked if anyone had any objections.

Mr. Edwards said his question had to do with SAFE's compliance with project reporting. However, he did not have an issue with the amount that SAFE requested. He had an issue with the scores for reporting on all the applications, and down the road if the Council cannot have that, it would be pretty limiting.

Ms. Cushing stated that she agreed on the reporting timeliness and accuracy and completion and that she was unable to come up with a score. She asked if staff could do that scoring or if there could be consensus scoring from experience and history.

Ms. Morton said she would try to get Ann Rausch to join the meeting and give her perspective on SAFE's reporting compliance.

Vice Chair McFadden moved on to STAR's request for \$28,448.

Ms. Cushing's question on STAR was the very small amount for freight and install on a couch and chair, and freight and install on in-kind donation of child's table and chairs. She thought it was a lot of money to install a couch and chair in Anchorage. That was a small point, and she thought STAR's request overall was reasonable, especially for bus passes and a computer desk and chair.

Vice Chair McFadden ascertained that Council members were fine with STAR at this point. She said the next program on the list was LSC at \$33,372.

There were no comments on LSC.

Vice Chair McFadden moved on to the WISH request of \$35,540.

There were no comments on WISH.

Vice Chair McFadden said the next request was SAFV for \$41,720.

[The transcriber believes there was some confusion between SAFE (Dillingham) and SAFV (Sitka) in the following discussion. The Council already dealt with SAFE's request for \$4,456, and the chair had indicated the next discussion was for SAFV's request for \$41,720. But both Council members and staff seem to be talking about SAFE.]

Ms. Cushing said SAFV mentioned losing a position because of the closing of Anana's House, a residential child care facility that paid for that full-time position. The request is to preserve a job, and SAFV will pursue other sustainable resources. She asked if anyone had any clarification about that.

Ms. Norbert of Dillingham said she used to work at SAFE. Anana's House is an intake for children in custody at SAFE, and the position does a lot of child care for people in the community who are trying to do [inaudible] activities. They also do after-school activities at the SAFE shelter.

Ms. Cushing said she had no objection to SAFV's request.

Mr. Svobodny stated that SAFV's was a very good application and he supported it. The budget had \$2,000 for supplies, and while staff indicated in other applications that funding for supplies was not allowed, in this application staff did not say anything. He wondered what the supplies were and why the inconsistency.

Ms. Morton explained that the supplies which SAFE in Dillingham was requesting were for craft and program supplies to be used directly by the residents. The request for office supplies in other applications had to state that the supplies would be for direct victim services; it could not be for administrative office supplies.

Mr. Svobodny voiced his support for the SAFV request.

Vice Chair McFadden said the next application was IAC's for \$51,000.

Ms. Cushing mentioned that IAC's narrative said they served 1,002 unduplicated primary and secondary victims of crime. Then IAC was asking for \$12,000 to run a PSA advertising campaign because they have heard that respondents feel they need to improve on "making sure the community is aware of the services we offer." She said she was not opposed to that idea, but it was a large amount of the \$51,000 — and it would be one way to make cuts that will be needed because there is not enough funding to fill all the requests.

Mr. Svobodny indicated he agreed with that, noting that the PSAs also did not seem to fit the two goals of the stimulus package.

Ms. Cushing said she also wondered about IAC's \$12,000 request to install play yard equipment because the volunteer group that was lined up to do it never completed it. That seemed like an amount that could be cut down a bit too. Maybe IAC could re-approach that volunteer group to do some more playground work, because that was almost one-third of what they were requesting.

Mr. Svobodny moved to approve the IAC application minus the \$12,000 for the PSA

component. The vote was all in favor, with Ms. Stone abstaining.

Ms. Griggs said that action would fund IAC for \$39,000.

Vice Chair McFadden next put AWARE's request for \$55,875 on the table.

Council members signified that they were fine with the AWARE request.

Vice Chair McFadden said the next request was from AVV for \$75,148.

Mr. Svobodny pointed out that staff's review indicated the program was requesting items that were not allowable: \$500 for office supplies and \$2,000 for education materials for outreach to outlying communities.

Ms. Morton clarified that AVV's request was for \$77,648, and staff already removed the \$2,500 that was not allowable.

Mr. Svobodny said he was for the AVV application as amended, and no one voiced any objections.

Vice Chair McFadden put TWC's request for \$121,000 before the Council.

Ms. Cushing mentioned that \$45,000 for 300 feet of sewer pipe seemed high, but she did not know much about the cost of things in Bethel. It did not look like TWC had gotten three estimates yet. She added that what TWC needed to have done seemed critical for health and sanitation, but maybe there was some wiggle room in the \$45,000 amount.

Mr. Edwards said the Department of Corrections is trying to do some renovations to the correctional facility in Bethel, and a rule of thumb is to take a high estimate and multiply it by four.

Mr. Svobodny said the figure seemed to be in the ballpark of Bethel construction costs, but it would be a case of either funding the whole project or not funding it at all. TWC cannot do just three-quarters of the sewer pipe.

Ms. Cushing mentioned the possibility of working with the contractors and in-kind. Mr. Svobodny said there is no in-kind on the sewer pipe. He agreed with Mr. Edwards' comments about costs in Bethel and recommended not decreasing the requested amount.

Ms. Cushing said she was just looking at things with a critical eye, in light of the amount of funding available to award. She thanked the two members for their perspective on construction costs in Bethel.

Vice Chair McFadden said the last program to discuss was AWAIC, which had requested \$287,921.

Mr. Svobodny commented that he found AWAIC's one of the poorer applications as far as explanation. As he understood the criteria for the stimulus money, it was to continue jobs, not create jobs. AWAIC's application had \$243,897 for creating new jobs, but it was so poorly written that he really could not tell.

Ms. Cushing indicated that she agreed with those comments.

Ms. Morton mentioned that staff had removed the request for a security manager position because it is not an allowable expense.

Mr. Svobodny asked why the security manager position was taken out but not the new case manager and direct service advocate.

Ms. Morton replied that VOCA specifically says that safety and security people are not an allowable expense, as described in AWAIC's application. Programs could request direct service advocates and a case manager, as long as they provided direct service.

Mr. Svobodny asked if the stimulus funding priority was to maintain jobs. Ms. Morton confirmed that was correct. Mr. Svobodny pointed out that AWAIC was trying to create 4-1/2 new jobs.

Ms. Morton said she could not tell from the application if these were new or retained jobs, so staff did not take those out. If the Council removed the total personal services of \$327,392 from the total AWAIC request of \$360,429, it would leave \$33,037. And the Council would have to remove the requested funding for computers, which would leave \$26,937.

Mr. Svobodny reiterated that it did not seem that AWAIC was eligible for the new positions and the computers.

Ms. Morton said that would leave funding for the security upgrades, the fence upgrades, the desks and the chairs, for \$26,937.

Mr. Svobodny suggested funding AWAIC at \$26,937 for the requested items they appeared to be eligible for — which did not include new staff, and that would leave funding left over.

Ms. Morton related that CDVSA still had the VAWA STOP Recovery Act solicitation coming out, and the Council could roll any leftover funding from the VOCA Recovery Act grant into that. CDVSA was just waiting for the Office of Violence Against Women to release the VAWA Recovery Act grant award, but the date was uncertain.

Ms. Griggs did the calculations and reported that \$56,254 of funding remained. She asked if the Council had any money on the table for Victims For Justice (VFJ). Mr. Svobodny said no decision had been made.

Vice Chair McFadden solicited input from Council members on VFJ.

Mr. Svobodny stated that he would like to give VFJ \$1,000 and ask them to buy a new computer, and he understood now that it would go to direct services for victims. But the question was how much control the Council has, because maybe VFJ did not want to spend \$1,000 on a computer and would rather get their server someplace else.

Ms. Norbert said she agreed with Mr. Svobodny, that she did a lot of legal advocate outreach with one computer and did not need a whole server. A whole server can run a whole building and is not meant for one position.

Ms. Cushing said she deferred to Ms. Norbert's experience on that point.

Ms. Griggs listed the programs and dollar amounts that the Council had decided upon, as follows:

SAFE (Dillingham)	\$ 4,456
STAR (Anchorage)	\$28,448
LSC (Kenai)	\$33,372
WISH (Ketchikan)	\$35,540
SAFV (Sitka)	\$41,720
IAC (Fairbanks)	\$39,000
AWARE (Juneau)	\$55,875
AVV (Valdez)	\$75,148
TWC (Bethel)	\$121,000
AWAIC (Anchorage)	\$26,937
VFJ (Anchorage)	0
Remaining	\$56,254

Mr. Svobodny moved that the Council not fund Victims For Justice [from the VOCA Recovery Act grant]. Mr. Edwards seconded. There was no objection, and the motion passed unanimously, with Ms. Stone abstaining.

Mr. Svobodny moved that the Council roll over the remaining VOCA Recovery Act funding of \$56,254 into the VAWA Recovery Act funding request for proposal. Mr. Edwards seconded. There was no objection, and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Griggs requested that Council members send their score sheets to the CDVSA

office for filing with the RFP.

Ms. Stone asked if there would be a summary of how decisions were made at this meeting. Mr. Svobodny briefly ran through what the Council had done in its discussion today.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at ____ p.m.

Note: An outside contractor prepared the summary minutes from staff's tape recording of the meeting. 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