



**ILLINOIS  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

---

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

**MINUTES**

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority  
**Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee / American Recovery and Reinvestment Act  
Planning Meeting**

Wednesday, March 11, 2009  
300 West Adams, Second Floor Conference Room  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

The Authority's Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee met on March 11, 2009, at the Authority's offices to discuss priorities, goals, and other issues relating to the allocation of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds that the Authority would receive in the forms of a Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) federal award and a Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) federal award.

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

Committee Vice Chair Cynthia Hora (representing the Office of the Illinois Attorney General) called the meeting to order at 1:17 p.m. The Authority's Associate Director of the Federal and State Grants Unit, John Chojnacki, called the roll. Members present were:

Ida Anger – Metropolitan Family Services  
Vernie Boerkrem – Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council  
David Bradford – Chief, Glen Carbon Police Department (via teleconference)  
Barbara Brooks – Illinois Department of Human Services (via teleconference)  
Patrick Delfino – State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor (via teleconference)  
Kim Donahue – Illinois State Police (via teleconference)  
Barbara Engel – Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority  
Bridget Healy Ryan – Office of the Cook County State's Attorney  
Leslie Landis – Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence, City of Chicago  
Billie Larkin – Children's Advocacy Centers of Illinois  
Lois Moorman – Illinois Department on Aging (via teleconference)  
Mark Parr – Children's Advocacy Center for North and Northwest Cook County  
Polly Poskin – Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault  
Reshma Desai (for Barbara Shaw) – Illinois Violence Prevention Authority

Vickie Smith – Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence  
Holly Zielke – Illinois Department on Aging

Also in attendance were Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Authority General Counsel Jack Cutrone, Rick Krause (of the Illinois Department of Corrections), and other Authority staff.

### **Executive Director's Comments**

Director Levin said that the last time the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee (VSAHC) met, it was to discuss bad news and funding cuts. She said that ARRA funds will provide a little over \$5 million dollars in VAWA funds and \$1.3 millions dollars in VOCA recovery funds. She said that these funds would not be allowed deadline extensions and the fund allocations would have to be made in a competitive manner. She thanked the VSAHC members for their time, attention, and hard work. She said that this committee is an ad hoc committee its recommendations would be brought before the Authority's Budget Committee meeting, at which point recommendations made by this panel would be ratified or tweaked.

Director Levin invited members of the audience to feel free to participate in any of the discussions occurring around the table. She acknowledged the presences of Dawn Dolton and Doris Garrett in the audience.

Director Levin introduced VSAHC Vice Chair Cindy Hora from the Crime Victims Services Division of the office of the Attorney General. She said that the former Vice Chair, Ellen Mandeltort, had been chosen to be an associate judge and Ms. Hora was designated by Attorney General Lisa Madigan to be the designee in court. She said that Ms. Hora has a background in victim services in the state of Alaska and she has a wealth of knowledge.

### **Explanation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009**

General Counsel Cutrone said that due to late-arriving information, some changes had to be made to the forthcoming PowerPoint presentation and updated hard copies are at the members' places. He said that ARRA was an unprecedented effort to jump start our economy and to create or save millions of jobs and improve the well-being of our citizens. A key feature of that act is transparency and accountability. Funds must be awarded promptly, fairly, and reasonably and the use and the identification of the recipients of the funds are going to be made available to the public. Funds must only be

used for authorized purposes. He said that staff would try to apply or otherwise get these funds distributed without unnecessary delays.

General Counsel Cutrone said that because of the Transparency Act of 2006, all recipients of federal monies, grant monies, and federal contractors are required to have a Dunn and Bradstreet DUNS number. DUNS numbers are available from the Dunn and Bradstreet website. He said all entities other than individuals must register with the Central Contractor Registration database, which requires a DUNS number to register. Under the Transparency Act people will be able to go to the USA Spending.gov website and track who is getting federal funding, for what purposes, and what locations are getting funding. The site is searchable in any number of ways.

General Counsel Cutrone said that ARRA fund recipients would need to file quarterly reports. These reports would detail:

1. the total amount of ARRA funds received;
2. the amount of ARRA funds that were obligated or expended for particular projects or activities;
3. unobligated balances;
4. a detailed list of all projects or activities for which recovery funds were obligated and expended;
5. the name, description, and evaluation of the completion status of the project or activity;
6. an estimate of the number of jobs created and/or the number of the jobs retained by the project or activity;
7. and detailed information on sub-contracts and sub-grants.

General Counsel Cutrone said that although this ARRA funding is similar to other funding streams that panel members here might be receiving, it is required that the Authority keep separate tracking and that staff report separately on ARRA funding. The allocation of the \$787 billion under the bill includes \$288 billion in tax relief and \$499 billion in spending. He said that ARRA funding included: \$144 billion for state and local relief; \$111 billion for infrastructure and science; \$81 billion for protecting the vulnerable; \$59 billion for healthcare; \$53 billion for education and training; \$43 billion for education.

General Counsel Cutrone said that the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) would receive \$2.7 billion and that would primarily support the Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) program. He also said that the COPS program would receive \$1 billion, VAWA would receive \$275 million, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives would get some funding too. He said that of the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC)

funding, \$47.5 million would go to victim's compensation and another \$47.5 million to victim services.

General Counsel Cutrone said that Illinois would receive about \$1,353,000 in VOCA funding via ARRA.

General Counsel Cutrone said that OVC would provide \$143 million in ARRA funds via VAWA, including \$8.34 million in grants to coalitions, \$43 million for transitional housing, \$20.8 million to tribal governments, and \$2.8 million to tribal domestic violence and sexual assault coalitions. He said that Illinois's share of the VAWA funding would be about \$5,094,000. He added that VAWA funding under ARRA is to be considered additional funding and may not be used to replace or delay the spending of normal fiscal year funding, so these funds have to be in addition to the normal funding streams that grantees are receiving. He said that per guidance provided by OVW, VAWA ARRA spending will take into account budget cuts that have resulted in the reduction of jobs and ARRA funds may support the retention of existing jobs that may otherwise be lost. He said that it was not clear at this time if VOCA ARRA funds could be used in this manner, but the Authority receives new information almost daily on these matters.

General Counsel Cutrone said that some indications have been issued from Washington, D.C. regarding how the retention of jobs is to be treated in light of the normal program rules and the guidelines appear to be reasonable. He said that OVW would require a simple VAWA ARRA implementation plan (roughly ten pages) that must describe the process used to develop the plan, the involvement of victim service providers, the involvement of diverse populations, it has to address equitable geographic distribution of grant funding, and has to address how the plan is responsive to the needs of underserved populations.

General Counsel Cutrone reminded the committee that VAWA funds must be allocated in the following manner:

- Five percent to courts;
- 25 percent to law enforcement;
- 25 percent to prosecution;
- 30 percent to victim services providers, of which ten percent is going to culturally specific community based organizations; and
- 15 percent for discretionary purposes.

General Counsel Cutrone said that generally, the ARRA guidelines provide that the recovery act funding is going to follow the same laws, principles, procedures, and practices that the Authority currently follows with respect to the normal federal fiscal year funding in each particular grant stream.

Vice Chair Hora, in an effort to clarify the differences between replacing and retaining jobs, presented a scenario and asked General Counsel Cutrone if such a scenario would be valid under the ARRA rules: Hypothetically, currently under VAWA a program gets \$500,000 and last year it got \$750,000 so it had to cut a couple of positions. That program can't use any of the money for this \$500,000 project but it can pay to kind of replace or retain somebody from a prior fiscal year.

General Counsel Cutrone said that, if because of budget cuts in the past or the recent past, or even it appears that budget cuts are a reasonable threat, people's jobs were lost or appear about to be lost, ARRA funding can be used to either replace the people who were laid off or to save the jobs that appear to be reasonably in danger of being ended due to budget constraints.

In response to a question by Ms. Engel, General Counsel Cutrone said that what can be shown is that for the state at large right now Illinois is facing between a \$6 billion or \$9 billion budget deficit. Hard numbers like that would certainly support the notion that that jobs are about to or are reasonably about to be lost, absent the application of ARRA funding.

In response to a comment by Director Levin, General Counsel Cutrone said that there is a procedure under the statutes to apply to the attorney general for a waiver of VAWA matching funds requirements. He said that, as part of the VAWA application process, OVW asks how much matching funds each state administering agency wants to waive and that, in this case, the Authority will request that all matching funds be waived. He said that he was in the process of putting together a supporting package for the waiver request. He said that since the matching funds requirements constitutes critical information for everyone involved, staff will report to the committee members whether the waiver is approved or not as that information becomes available.

Vice Chair Hora, referring to a point raised by Ms. Engel, offered the following hypothetical example of using ARRA funds to replace or retain jobs: Determine how much a program's funding was in (for example) January of 2009 and how many people were employed. Then determine the program's anticipated cash flow for March of 2009. Theoretically, a program could project a \$100,000 decrease in spending as a result of a reduced award, forcing the layoffs of A, B, and C. She said that such a description would be a much more potent argument for a program's funding than simply declaring that said program needs more money.

General Counsel Cutrone said that the impression he got from all these ARRA programs is that the federal administering agencies are very sensitive to the fact that everyone is looking at the same miserable financial future outlook.

## **Federal and State Grants Unite Presentation – Funding History**

Program Supervisor Ron Reichgelt, referring to a PowerPoint presentation that he was about to deliver, said that the presentation was actually made for a 2007 VSAHC Meeting. He said that the percentages never change and, likewise, most recent funding cuts were in proportion to program percentages as they pertain to the five VAWA funding categories. He recapped the VAWA categories:

- Five percent to courts;
- 25 percent to law enforcement;
- 25 percent to prosecution;
- 30 percent to victim services providers, of which ten percent is going to culturally specific community based organizations; and
- 15 percent for discretionary purposes.

Mr. Reichgelt said that, in this case, “discretionary” means the funds can be used for any of those other pots, but not literally whatever we want to use it for. He said that victim services funds are traditionally split in half, with half going to the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault (ICASA) and half to the Illinois Coalition of Against Domestic Violence (ICADV).

Mr. Reichgelt proceeded to deliver the PowerPoint presentation, describing charts and graphs in the presentation. (See meeting materials for details.)

In response to a question by Vice Chair Hora, Mr. Reichgelt said that the most recent VAWA federal award to the Authority was approximately \$5 million. He said that with VAWA funds, there is still money available in older federal fiscal year awards. He said that VAWA awards are valid for the year of the award plus an additional year, and thereafter extensions must be applied for. He said that because the Authority had money remaining from past awards, staff was able to increase program funding in different program areas using older money that was slated for expiration. Then, suddenly, the Authority got hit with these giant cuts in 2007 and 2008 and any surplus was expended. Now the Authority has a bit of money in older VAWA awards and that is one of the reasons staff was able to bring the domestic violence hotline program over from VOCA; VOCA funds were exhausted, so the hotline program was moved to VAWA law enforcement funds, of which the Authority had a lot of extra money.

Mr. Reichgelt said that with regard to VOCA funds, the FFY08 award was the most recent and it has been entirely expended. All older open federal fiscal year awards for VOCA have minimal amounts of remaining funds. He said that the total amount for all of the Authority’s VOCA grants is about \$14 million, rounding up. He said that the

Authority's FFY08 award was \$12 million. He said that staff had used some older funds to augment the FFY08 award in efforts to support continuing programs, but at this point all older VOCA funds are basically spent.

Director Levin said that the last time the VSAHC met, the Authority had had a number of fairly abundant VOCA federal awards and so there was enough money available to effectively issue seven percent raises to VOCA programs. She said that at that time, future reductions in federal award amounts were not anticipated. She said that some JAG funds had been used to supplement the first VOCA federal award reduction, but when the JAG federal award was reduced by 67 percent staff was forced to cut VOCA programs by 27 percent at the same time.

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff has submitted the Authority's application for the FFY09 VAWA federal award. He said that moderate increases are expected for both the VAWA and VOCA FFY09 federal awards.

Director Levin, in response to a comment by Ms. Engel, said that OVW has mandated that VAWA ARRA funds be expended in a competitive manner, despite the fact that recent funding cuts may have resulted in lay-offs, for which ARRA might otherwise be used to re-hire the laid-off employees. She said that she would much prefer to have the ability to restore those jobs.

Mr. Reichgelt, in response to a question by Ms. Poskin, said that the cuts that were made to VAWA programs were not because our awards were reduced (the last award actually went up), but because the Authority had over-spent and there was no way to maintain funding at those levels for all programs. He said that was why VAWA awards were reduced by the same percentage.

Mr. Reichgelt, in response to a question by Vice Chair Hora, said that staff had considered simply not funding VAWA programs with regular federal award money and using ARRA funds to support those programs, but OVW has mandated that such a practice would be unallowable.

Ms. Poskin, in response to Mr. Reichgelt's suggestion that a request for proposals (RFP) be employed to ensure competitive distribution of ARRA funds, said that the OVW website, under the section on program priorities and compliance with ARRA priorities, declared, "States and territories must promote a competitive process to the maximum extent possible. Continuation or renewal applications maybe considered for funding, however, states and territories must track an account separately for the use of the recovery act funding." She said that she did not interpret that to mean that a competitive process was necessary if a pre-existing fund distribution process is in place.

Ms. Poskin said that ICASA has received VAWA money for 15 years consistent with the statutory requirement for uses of the money and ICASA has a process in place to distribute money statewide to the extent that the money allows funding of sexual assault services. She noted that with the ARRA funds, OVW appears to be suggesting that this process be suspended in lieu of a competitive process. She said that given the requirements for the money and the uses for which ICASA has used the money, ICASA would probably be the most likely candidate, without saying it is the candidate. She said that the direction from OVW is not definitive in terms of how ARRA funds should be used; therefore it is up to the Authority to determine how ARRA funds should be used.

Director Levin said that OVW basically told the Authority that ARRA funds could be used for the same programs, but only as long as the process for securing those funds was competitive. She said that this created issues with the coalitions, however. She said that to further confuse matters, ARRA VAWA funds would be available for two years, but apparently ARRA VOCA funds would be available for four years (the year of the award plus three years), while the entire Act is set to expire in September of 2010.

Ms. Poskin said that ICASA's VAWA funds are distributed in a competitive process. She said that it is a little disconcerting to get time-limited money, which is expected to stimulate the economy through the retention and creation of jobs, which is tied to a specific competitive process when a competitive system or structure already exists, but hasn't been able to provide funding for the entire state.

### **Research and Analysis Unit Presentation – General Data**

Research Analyst Adriana Perez delivered a PowerPoint presentation detailing data relating to victims served by the Authority's VAWA-funded programs. (See meeting materials for details.)

Research Analyst Erica Hughes delivered a PowerPoint presentation detailing data relating to victims served by the Authority's VOCA-funded programs. She asked the committee members to refer to updated materials at their places. (See meeting materials for details.)

### **Discussion - VAWA**

Vice Chair Hora said that one possible interpretation of OVW's instructions for the use of ARRA VAWA funds is that they don't want the money just to come into the state and go to existing programs; that is, if there is another program out there that maybe had their funds cut, even if from another source, then such a program should be a priority.



Ms. Poskin said that because OVW has demonstrated a lack of definitiveness, then the Authority is somewhat pressed into making some kind of decision, if only to be in keeping with OVW's request for very timely and swift allocations of these funds. She said that there is a time limit to these funds and the Authority should work to demonstrate that, as a state, Illinois did what the Recovery Act asked it to do because there is a chance that the federal government might issue another stimulus plan in the future and it would behoove the Authority to ensure that it is in good standing with the federal government so as to maximize any future potential awards to Illinois.

#### *Victim Services and Discretionary Funds*

Ms. Poskin requested that, at least for sexual assault services, any RFP is written to require that the services are keeping within the standards that at least have been set for sexual assault services in Illinois and that have been adopted by the state. Such programs should, at a minimum, provide a 24-hour hotline with go-out advocacy and in-person supportive advocacy. Potential grantees would have to demonstrate a documented history of having been able to perform those services. She said that the Authority shouldn't spend time deciding whether this is competitive or not, but it's a little odd that an additional \$500,000 to a program that only has \$500,000 and which has 33 programs, 19 of which are underserved by this program, wouldn't be in line to receive any ARRA money, given ICASA's history and standards. However, if that's the case, then the least the RFP should contain the requirements that this program has set for sexual assault services in this state.

Ms. Smith said that it makes absolutely no sense to have a wide open competitive process for a two year grant that doesn't follow some sense of really actually putting these kinds of services in place. It defeats the purpose of the act because if you just throw money out there and, for example, let an independent operator open up a brand new shop with no connection to the larger victim services community and no understanding as to how these services need to be provided, and then the shop folds in 24 months along with the programs it provided, then there isn't much point.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the Authority would be able to place whatever restrictions it wants to on these RFP's, as long as the process is open. He said that, theoretically, if the Authority wanted ICASA to receive these funds, the RFP could be written in such a manner that ICASA would be the only logical recipient among a field of competitors.

Director Levin said that there will be two separate ARRA fund tracking systems; one federal and one via the governor's office.

Ms. Landis said that when one considers the purposes to sustain, maintain, and preserve jobs, combined with illustrations of best standards and best practices, one might consider that even a competitive transparent RFP process would put the Authority in a position where everybody is articulating how they would like to this play out. An RFP could easily be generated without saying that the intent is to award to only one state coalition. An emphasis on demonstration of adherence to best practices would almost certainly limit qualified applicants to existing practitioners.

Vice Chair Hora said that the Authority shouldn't give ARRA funds to a program that promises to use the funds to fill a position only to have said position go unfilled, as has been the case many times in the past. The Authority should ensure that not only does a potential grantee meet certain standards or guidelines or whatever, but they're actually able and capable to use the ARRA funds for the stated purpose within the set time frame.

Ms. Poskin said that it is vital that the RFP reflect adherence to standards and best practices that are tried and true. She also said that her understanding was that OVW wanted to disburse its ARRA funds to the states by May 1, 2009.

Director Levin said that the Authority might ask a lot of people around the table to assist in reviewing the RFP's, because staff cannot possibly review all of the JAG applications, on their own. She said that she has asked the governor's office for approval to hire 16 people.

Ms. Poskin said that she agreed that the RFP as should be as definitive as necessary to be in keeping with the standards and the expectations and that should also help determine how many applications end up being submitted to the Authority. The RFP's should be worded so that the coalitions would be the best applicants, as opposed to the individual coalition member agencies, for example. However, in the event that other hitherto unknown (sexual assault programs, for example) programs exist; they would be allowed to apply as well.

Ms. Poskin said that the Authority should demonstrate a statewide commitment to sexual assault services. One could interpret that is a state coalition criterion, but I think somehow a potential grantee should have to show an ability to collaborate not just with professionally related allies, but with other agencies within a statewide service delivery system.

Director Levin said that if the applicant must have a statewide reach, that would limit eligible applicants to, in this case, ICASA. She said that might raise some transparency issues.

Ms. Poskin said that she meant that an applicant would have to be able to collaborate, without necessarily having to be a coalition. She said that efforts should be taken to avoid fostering a notion that people could establish services and simply declare that they are now a sexual assault center. She said that the key aspects to VAWA funds are an emphasis on collaboration and relationships between service providers and law enforcement. She said that applicants might need to present memoranda of understanding (MOU) to illustrate the means by which they collaborate with other agencies.

Ms. Poskin said that regional duplication of services should be avoided. For example, if there is a rape crisis center in Urbana and another entity submits an application as a rape crisis center in Urbana, then that needs to be reviewed to ensure that two rape crisis centers serving the same population are not funded.

Ms. Engel said that this idea made her uncomfortable. She said that it might not be necessary to demand that every program fit within a statewide framework.

Ms. Poskin said that it is important to be able to identify the applicants and be aware of the services that they provide. It is important to know that they are willing to enter into partnerships. She said that is one of the primary purposes of MOUs.

Ms. Zielke said that it is important that the RFP reach out to all generations. She noted that none of the meeting materials specified elderly citizens as a victim group; only children, youths, and women. She said it was as if 85-year-olds are to be lumped in with 40-year-olds, but the two may have vastly different needs in relation to sexual assault or other issues.

Vice Chair Hora said that the Authority funds Shawnee and Catholic Charities that serve seniors.

Ms. Zielke said that the terminology in the meeting materials was interesting in that seniors are not specifically addressed at all. She said that she wanted any new funding to consider generational equity.

Ms. Poskin said that a number of ICASA's agencies are required to provide services to people all ages. She also said that VAWA funds are intended for services to women 13 and over, as opposed to services to children. She said that other monies exist specifically to provide services to children, so nobody is denied services by virtue of age. She said that it is simply unrealistic, given the scarcity of resources, to be so definitive in programming as to establish a sexual assault program specifically for women 65 and older; the service population would be too limited to create a viable program.

Ms. Zielke said that it was important that sexual assault programs be inclusive of the elderly.

Vice Chair Hora said that there are ways to get information to ensure that funds don't go to someone unable to provide these services.

Director Levin said that at this point she wasn't sure whether the discussion was revealing a desire on the parts of the committee members to emphasize a statewide or a regional component to the competitive process and, therefore, she said that she did not have a clear idea as to how to instruct staff.

Ms. Smith said that VAWA is very definitive about who can be served. She said that she was around when the first plan was made so she remembers the original intent and the language in that part has not changed. Thirty percent of VAWA funds are to go to domestic assault and sexual assault services, so that must be considered when determining any competitive processes. By distributing the victim services funds via the coalitions, those funds supported 67 individual programs. However, given VAWA's allocation structure, it may not be realistic to expect to be able to support many new programs.

Ms. Poskin said that, for example, \$760,000 in ARRA funds might be allocated for victim services over a two year period. She said that it would be upsetting if \$250,000 of this went to non-ICASA sexual assault programs because she said that she wasn't aware of any other sexual assault programs in Illinois that are qualified to meet the appropriate standards. As a state, Illinois has adopted, and Illinois submits and demonstrates such to the federal government, a set of standards that sexual assault services abide by. Care must be taken not to make a demonstrable deviation from those standards because it could be troublesome to try to defend the funding of such a deviation.

Ms. Landis said that the point of the ARRA VAWA funds is to support VAWA-related jobs. She said that she agreed with Ms. Poskin and she said that no matter how the competitive process is put together, whether it becomes a coalition-driven application on behalf of the currently funded member programs or if currently funded member programs make their own applications, they would be competitively positioned to access these limited funds.

Ms. Landis said that if the Authority stays mindful of the best practices that have been clearly established, and the concept of adherence to best practices applies for domestic violence as well as to sexual assault, then such applicants, whether coalitions or individual coalition members, would have an advantage. They would also have to illustrate that they are retaining or maintaining positions that otherwise would be cut. She said that there's a lot more money here under VAWA to be discussed today than this

limited ARRA pool. She said that the Authority would be foolish to word a competitive RFP in such a fashion that the outcome sought here is the net result.

Director Levin said that she understood the idea of creating a requirement that standards be adhered to, without directly favoring the coalitions. She said that staff could craft language to that effect. She also said that the hardest VAWA money to spend is that which is dedicated to law enforcement.

Director Levin, in response to questions by Ms. Landis, said that VAWA funds allocated to the discretionary category do not necessarily have to be put toward victim services. Director Levin said that the five funding categories for the ARRA VAWA funds are the same as for the regular VAWA awards. She said that the committee should also focus on how to expend VAWA prosecution and law enforcement funds.

Director Levin, in response to a question by Ms. Landis, said that staff would submit an application for a separate federal transitional housing program. She added that one of the purposes of this meeting was to determine a proper course for the expenditure of discretionary funds, as they are not yet dedicated to any specific purpose.

Director Levin said that it is up to this committee to determine spending priorities within the five VAWA allocation categories. She said that her primary concerns were finding a way to effectively spend law enforcement funds because that has traditionally been difficult and making sure that prosecution funds are spent effectively.

Ms. Landis said that some programs receive direct federal funding, such as Safe Havens for the supervised visitation services, which have experienced significantly reduced federal direct awards recently. She said that she didn't want to cut into existing victim services dollars within the context of the coalitions in light of the fact of all those victim services did take VOCA and VAWA cuts recently. She added that the visitation centers are going to see layoffs of staff based on reduced federal direct awards.

Ms. Landis said that Chicago has three visitation centers. She said that it would be important, given funding reductions for these programs, for them to document how that loss of funding would result in service and / or job losses. She said that she wanted to be on record saying that visitation centers provide vital victim services in that they are unique and permanent funding streams should be found to support them. She said that the use of stimulus funds during this period of reduced direct federal funding would enable the visitation centers to survive this economic crisis.

Director Levin, in response to a question by Ms. Smith, said she did not know if the Authority would apply for the transitional housing line item program. She said that the Authority had already submitted its annual budget to the governor's office so that staff

could apply for the Authority's \$2 million that is being deferred to transitional housing so that we can expand it. She said that the Authority plans on working with the coalitions as partners to address this issue.

### *Law Enforcement Funds*

Ms. Engel said that the Authority has always had trouble getting law enforcement funds spent and there is no reason to think necessarily that ARRA funds are going to be particularly different in this respect.

Director Levin, in response to a question by Ms. Engel, said that the hotline is funded by VAWA law enforcement dollars.

Ms. Engel said that the hotline is an example of a program that could be continued. She said that it would be hard to prove that it is not a statewide domestic violence hotline with the ability to speak 141 languages with current staff and an enormous data collection component. In response to a comment by Ms. Healy Ryan, Ms. Engel said that the hotline would have a good chance of being one of the things to get funded because it is a really important program and has a solid track record. She said that competitiveness might not be an issue regarding law enforcement funds because of the traditional difficulties the Authority has had in spending those funds.

Director Levin said that she was sorry to see that the sheriff's office didn't show up because they are really anxious to get involved and get some VAWA money.

Ms. Smith asked if there is an issue with spending law enforcement funds, if that was due to a lack of applications for those funds or if the grantees simply weren't spending their designations.

Director Levin said that part of the problem with spending law enforcement funds has to do with match issues, part has to do with grantees having trouble filling positions, part might be the use of the protocols, and there are other reasons. This difficulty in spending law enforcement funds is one of the reasons why the Authority began to use these funds to support the hotline and the Cook County State's Attorney's Office's (CCSAO) investigators. She suggested that the Authority might be able to fund other state's attorney's offices in this fashion. She said that this arrangement was initially so that the CCSAO would not need to be cut more than necessary. She said that OVW had granted the Authority permission to fund the CCSAO and maybe other state's attorney's offices, including ones that are involved in multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs), could be treated the same way. She also said that Mr. Reichgelt had thought about opening up this for a

competitive process all the way around for MDTs but I don't know how it could be sustained.

Mr. Reichgelt said that one of the things that VAWA really focuses on and one of its primary efforts is coordination. He said that if the Authority does an RFP that brings in these agencies and makes them coordinate, that would represent one application that we would have to review with maybe four or five agencies.

Vice Chair Hora said that the RFPs could be tied to individual members of the coalitions. She also said that individual grantees' track records should be considered. She said that there may be shorter term projects that need funding that would result in short-term big spending and have a longer-term effect in some areas.

Ms. Engel said that, in relation to programs such as Safe Havens, the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program are trying to coordinate a different system for sexual assault survivors in the metropolitan area, but larger than Chicago. This effort is under way and it has been supported by the Authority. The SANE nurses are forensic examiners, so they would fall under law enforcement because they're doing the forensics in preparation for prosecution.

Vice Chair Hora said that the SANE project, which is currently endeavoring to make training available on-line, is something which would spend that money in a shorter period of time, but it would continue to be beneficial over a longer term. She said that on-line training would mean that nurses would only have to be going maybe two days rather than an entire week. She said that, conceivable, such a program could use law enforcement or prosecution funds and either way, the funds would be spent relatively quickly.

Ms. Beorkrem said that she and others, such as Pat Delfino and the coalitions, have identified five MDT sites across the state that don't already have MDTs. She said that there is funding at the state level for providing support for those programs that encourage making arrests, but there's no funding for those local MDTs to provide any staff coverage, such as a dedicated prosecutor or a dedicated probation officer. The RFP could be written in such a way as to favor applicant programs that have been proven to work and that would expand on an existing program. She said that arrest grants to local agencies were made available by the appellate prosecutor's office.

Ms. Poskin said that the ICASA arrest grant has several levels. On one level, the program would be hiring two prosecutors in the near future and then another level the program sought to create five MDTs in five different counties focusing on sexual assault and domestic violence.

Director Levin said that perhaps those five counties could apply, thus creating a creative process, and perhaps not all five would receive awards, but the competitive requirement would be satisfied.

Ms. Poskin said that it is difficult to figure out what to do with new money. She said that in many ways the law enforcement community has shown some of the greatest leaps and greatest efforts toward collaboration in relation to sexual assault; however, such programs that are primarily law enforcement could perhaps be more successful in utilizing VAWA law enforcement money if somehow an entity other than a law enforcement agency could be the grant administrator. She said that in her experiences with law enforcement, those agencies are geared toward working on the streets and conducting investigations, but they do not have a great infrastructure for administration of projects and programs. She suggested that if the Authority could find a way to utilize law enforcement as the focal point of a grant without the grant going through a law enforcement office, the programs might be more successful.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that the two-year time limit makes funding for personnel an issue, unless the funding would be to maintain personnel already in place. She said that two more years of having extra prosecutors for sexual assault and domestic violence is better than none at all. She said that funds could easily be put to use quickly if they are spent on training. She said that what most state's attorney's office probably need is more staff to actually prosecute cases, and training would be a large component of that. She said that the creation of specialized units with the proper sensitivities and coordination with other agencies involved (sexual assault crisis centers or domestic violence shelters, for example) are integral to proper prosecution of these cases.

Vice Chair Hora said that she was concerned about the ease of spending money on such programs given the two-year time frame. She said that it could easily take a year to hire and train a person. She asked if such a program would need to be sustainable.

Ms. Poskin said that if these programs were started, then something would be in place to be sustained. She said that eventually the nation's economic situation would improve and at that point there might be more funding available. She said that the Authority should try some new ideas and new projects because they might be sustainable in the future.

Vice Chair Hora said that such grants could be used to duplicate programs that have proven effective elsewhere.

Ms. Landis said that there have been a number of pieces of legislation that have been passed or may be passed in relatively short order that would be fine for a large amount of training in a number different criminal justice arenas from probation to parole, prosecutors, and the judiciary. Jurisdictions that can feel that they can submit something



to add personnel or they feel that that's worthy of doing in a two year period, should be able to do that, but those opportunities shouldn't be limited to prosecution. She said that there probably would not be many prosecution units that would want to hire personnel for only two years, but there's no shortage of uses of prosecution dollars to support training. Mr. Reichgelt said that training is a very good idea. He said that he has encountered training in virtually every conversation regarding needs that he has had with all sorts of agencies, particularly victim services, domestic violence, and sexual assault agencies. He said that he was concerned about tying training into job creation / maintenance.

Ms. Poskin, in response to a question by Ms. Smith, said that training could be considered an economic stimulant because if a training session is arranged in whatever locality, people are employed by the host facilities, the trainees stay in local hotels, and purchase other goods and services locally.

Ms. Engel said that there has been a lot of training on issues relating to the care of victims and that has been going on for many years, but perhaps it would be beneficial to create a group of uber-trainers or consultants. She said that some regions in southern Illinois have only one prosecutor, so they would not have a specialized prosecution unit. It would be beneficial to have training programs available to all of these prosecutors as well.

Ms. Boerkrem said that funding consultants might not be a bad idea, especially if there is another stimulus in another year or two that would allow those jobs to continue after these grants would end.

Ms. Poskin suggested using prosecutor or law enforcement money available to the Attorney General's Office (AGO) to hire an assistant to Cindy Hora to do the work that they have started on the SANE program because that could definitely be tied in. She said that the SANE project is related to evidence collection as it's relating to increasing positive outcomes in the court has probably been the most service-significant boost in response to victims and to prosecution that in the history of the anti-rape movement in the last five years.

Vice Chair Hora said that another valid use of ARRA funds might be to hire an information technology consultant to create a database. The database could be used to track where SANE nurses are, what shifts are covered, where they practice, and track training needs.

Director Levin said that if spending law enforcement funds proves difficult then it might be wise to pursue other eligible spending avenues, particularly for collaborative efforts.

Vice Chair Hora said that she did not foresee many applications being submitted. If five applications came in and were reviewed in an open and competitive manner then the Authority will have met its requirements, but not really progressed.

Mr. Reichgelt reminded the committee that the ARRA funds would be available for 24 months. He said that the award would break down to roughly \$1.53 million for victim services, law enforcement and prosecution would get \$1.28 million each, and discretionary would end up being \$765,000. He also said that, generally, it has not been easy to fund positions with law enforcement money.

Vice Chair Hora said that hiring timeframes must be considered. Many counties and municipalities have their own bureaucratic procedures. This might lead to hiring difficulties. In a case where two applications are competing for these funds and one is for training that can easily be completed within six months and one is for a full-time hire, the hire might be delayed by up to six months depending on an entity's internal processes.

Ms. Landis said that \$600,000 is nothing to spend in a year, even if it would be spent solely on training.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that law enforcement and prosecution were two separate pots of money and they need to be kept separate. She said that she could use prosecution funds immediately; she would hire more prosecutors and then use the next two years to secure other funding streams in order to keep them on. She said the focus should be on programs that are willing to take chances on new hires.

Ms. Poskin said that funds could be provided to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board to expand its Mobile Training Units to include domestic violence and sexual assault and the trainings could include emphasis on consent and force or stalking. This could be an expedient way of spending the money and getting some training done.

Ms. Zielke said that, given the different entities of different groups being served, maybe it would be best to ensure that whatever is done is done consistently for each and every group. If trainings are conducted, they could include child abuse, domestic violence, and elderly abuse. Trainings should include as much as possible to provide a comprehensive package deal versus separate trainings for domestic violence, sexual assault, etc.

Ms. Anger said that an RFP could stipulate that applicants demonstrate a collaborative approach so as to avoid serving only one discipline while ignoring the others.

Ms. Engel suggested promoting probation training on domestic violence, sexual assault, and elder abuse.

Ms. Poskin said that there is not much in the way of sexual assault probation; most offenders end up being paroled.

Ms. Landis said that many people know that there is a group that is looking at the domestic violence court house in Chicago that was convened by the presiding judge in Cook County, and there may be things that come forward that are court-based improvements, such as production of a video to be shown in the waiting room that would describe court house judiciary-led endeavors.

Ms. Poskin said that she liked the idea of disseminating training through existing structures. She said that entities such as the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board, the Cook County courts, and the Administrative Offices of the Illinois Courts should be notified that this money is available and if they can put proposals together it seems that it would simplify staff work and it would also be the widest distribution of funds.

Director Levin said that presiding judges and chief judges in the counties could be included in the notification.

Mr. Reichgelt said that it sounded like everyone liked the idea of training and that can be done within each category. He suggested setting aside a certain percentage within each category to devote to training and identify specific types of training.

Ms. Engel said that in addition to training, consideration should be given to new hires for specialized units.

Mr. Reichgelt asked if there were a specific percentage of funds that should be dedicated to specialized units within prosecution.

Ms. Poskin said that adhering to specific percentages might hamstring efforts to spend the money. The money must be expended quickly. Funding should be considered for all manner of things that are in keeping with the established priorities.

Mr. Reichgelt, in response to a question from Ms. Poskin regarding VOCA, said that the funds were available for a three-year period, so with regard to personnel issues it would be easier to tell a potential grantee that funds would be available for three years since chances are slim that a grantee would want to hire somebody for only one year.

Ms. Poskin said that her office would gladly add an employee for a year and that the committee should not sell short the idea that other programs would take on additional

help, if only briefly. Given the severity of recent funding cuts, the closer this committee can come to helping to restore those cuts, the better.

Mr. Reichgelt said that in this area, the committee would want to review research showing the types/areas of crime that receive funding and the services provided and then an RFP could be focused in those areas. That could produce a lot of one-year programs or fewer three-year programs. Elder abuse, CACs, sexual assault, domestic violence, or whatever it is, the RFP should focus on that looking into these categories. The RFP can be structured to promote hiring. Mr. Reichgelt added that the Authority will have to submit quarterly reports on these funds to the federal government and the reports will be due on the 10th day after the end of each quarter. Every grantee will have to submit a report to the Authority. Delinquency in the reporting process could lead to the Authority having funds frozen at the federal level. Therefore, agencies with histories of delinquency should not be considered for ARRA funding because their failure to comply with reporting deadlines could jeopardize funding for all ARRA grantees.

Ms. Poskin said that, regarding the \$1.353 million available, she would like to put the funds toward restoration since, unlike VAWA, VOCA took major funding cuts. She suggested proportionately resting current VOCA grantees. She said many programs could simply re-hire personnel who had recently been laid off or restore personnel who had their hours reduced back to full-time employment. She also noted that she did not see any language that indicated that VOCA funds must be distributed via a competitive process.

Ms. Engel suggested making VOCA funds competitive among the groups that have already lost money. She said that the \$1.3 available would not fully restore the ICASA funding, much less ICADV's funding, much less the CACs, much less elder abuse, etc.

Mr. Reichgelt said that, while nothing in the VOCA ARRA application mentions competitive processes, applicants were advised to continually check the Office of Justice Programs's Recovery Act website for additional information. The implication was that the requirement could change or be updated. He said that the committee should consider a back-up plan in the event that a competitive process becomes a requirement.

Ms. Poskin said that, as Ms. Engel pointed out, the VOCA award would barely restore ICASA, so it is not fair for ICASA to ask disproportionately for those funds.

Director Levin said that using the funds for the restoration of lost jobs would be ideal.

Ms. Landis said that she was concerned about the time period that these funds could support. She said that in talking about job restoration, we are talking about annualized figures in excess of something that we have available over a longer period of time. She said that some programs were forced to lay off some staff and close some facilities, but it

would be unlikely that a program would want to re-open a facility with only one year's worth of restorative funding. She said that restorative funding would not necessarily restore the exact same positions and services that have been cut.

Ms. Poskin said that there might well be some programs that would immediately re-hire the same persons that they had laid off, even if only for one year or part-time for two years. She noted that the Authority has a responsibility regarding this money to use it to create or retain jobs since the entire purpose of ARRA is to stimulate the economy. Since the Authority is the one giving the money out, the Authority must require grantees to use the money in a manner consistent with the President's intent.

Ms. Landis said that an RFP could be issued that would allow grantees to possibly spend down their stimulus dollars over a period shorter than the allotted time-frame for the use of the funds.

Director Levin said that another thing to consider is that perhaps the reasons that some persons were let go or that some programs closed was because they were not performing as well as expected.

Ms. Poskin said that the only fair thing to do when dealing with large numbers of programs, as the coalitions do, is to allocate funds proportionally. Since funds to member agencies were reduced proportionally, it only makes sense to restore them proportionally.

Director Levin said that it might be wise to plan on creating a reserve of funds in anticipation of possible future funding cuts, so if those cuts came, it wouldn't necessarily translate into immediate funding cuts to the grantees.

Ms. Poskin said that such a strategy has been helpful in the past.

Director Levin said that she has overheard talk of a FFY 2010 funding cut.

Ms. Poskin said that VOCA money is not taxpayer money. If the cap was just raised to \$635 million, she will not lower it. This should put the programs at the level of funding that they had in 2006.

Vice Chair Hora said that proportional restoration wouldn't do much good for some grantees if it didn't help them get to where they need to be. It might be better to assess individual programs because if the proportional gain that a given program might get isn't enough to be effective for that program, it might be better to spend it someplace where it will be more effective.

Ms. Poskin said that Ms. Hora's point was well taken, but especially for smaller programs, \$7,500 is a lot of money. She said that there would be no harm in asking potential recipients if they could actually use their proportional funding, though.

Ms. Engel said that it is important to remember that these funds are intended to preserve or create jobs, so efforts to use the funds for personnel should be the priorities.

Mr. Reichgelt said that when the VOCA cuts were made, they were first made to every other item in personnel. Trainings, conferences, supplies, and equipment were all cut so that by the time personnel was under consideration, the program was down to bare bones. The same sort of thing should be done with these funds; these funds should be for restoring the positions, but things like trips to conferences would have to be supported by other funding sources. He requested that staff have the ability to deny or adjust an increase to specific grantees based on their historical performance; we do not want to give out money just to do so.

Ms. Zielke said that it would be nice if there was some way to evaluate what these funds would support to determine the actual return on the funding. For example, elder abuse funding ultimately stops people from prematurely going into nursing homes, which in turn save a whole lot of money that would otherwise just be discounted. There should be some way to say that we're not merely handing out funds to social services to make people feel good, but there are demonstrable results. Maybe it doesn't get conveyed back to the public that these programs actually save the public money; this isn't just some charity.

Ms. Poskin said that, regarding sexual assault, for example, it can be shown what the costs to society are that result from people not going to work due to traumatic experiences that they can't cope with. With the programs in place, victims are going to work who might otherwise not be there, but that makes it difficult to calculate the cost of a rape victim not going to work. It becomes difficult to put the benefits of services into figures.

Ms. Smith said that a domestic violence homicide cost analysis had been done describing the actual costs to the community when advocates are taken out of the system and what it costs individuals to pursue a homicide prosecution on their own.

Vice Chair Hora said that it would be hard to interject such analysis on a short turn-around application. That might be better suited to longer-term projects. It would not be reasonable to require cost/benefit analyses on applications for these funds.

Director Levin said that while Ms. Zielke's idea was good, such an analysis would not be required. However, information will need to be gathered regarding the numbers of jobs created and maintained.

Vice Chair Hora said that somebody may want to put in an application for a project to determine what these costs are. That would be a short-term project that would allow us to say that we can justify our domestic violence services because of the cost savings to the public. An advocate is a lot cheaper than a murder investigation and prosecution.

Ms. Larkin said that while Illinois promotes VOCA money for services to 25 advocacy centers, there are a total of 38 advocacy centers in the state. This means that 13 advocacy centers do not receive any of this money, so that represents a funding opportunity. One goal is to be present in every county in Illinois, but today advocacy centers are only in 85 out of 102. There are 17 counties today that do not have child advocacy centers.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that given the fact that we're only talking about roughly \$3.4 million and the applications will not need to be judged competitively, then it is a good idea to think about restoring the people who got cut from the programs that have proven their worth. Restoration would happen in the proportions to the losses suffered.

Ms. Hora said that she would like applicants to explain what their awards would support and describe the differences that the awards would make.

Ms. Poskin said that if a program can't bring back staff on half-time or quarter-time, but the program can sponsor community collaborative training then that would serve to stimulate the economy as well.

Director Levin said that the Authority planned to hire additional staff with its ARRA administrative funds. The additional staff will be needed to process the added grant load. The Authority will set aside a percentage of its ARRA VOCA and ARRA VAWA awards to support these added staff members.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the administrative set-aside percentages would be five percent for VOCA and 10 percent for VAWA.

Director Levin said that information on the Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) was supposed to be sent to the Authority members in the near future as there is over \$50 million in ARRA JAG funds that the Authority needs to figure out what to do with.

## **Adjourn**

Ms. Engel moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Healy Ryan seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.