



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

120 South Riverside Plaza • Suite 1016 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MINUTES

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Tuesday, October 9, 2007
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016
Chicago, Illinois 60606

The Authority's Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee met on October 9, 2007, at the Authority offices to discuss funding recommendations for the use of the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant funds in the State of Illinois in consideration of the recent cuts in the federal funding for both of these programs.

Call to Order and Roll Call

Committee Chair Becky Jansen (Clerk of the Circuit Court of Effingham County) called the meeting to order at 9:26 a.m. The Authority's Associate Director of the Federal and State Grants Unit, John Chojnacki, called the roll. Members present were:

Kathleen Argentino – Chicago Police Department
Vernie Boerkrem – Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council
Kim Donahue – Illinois State Police (via teleconference)
Barbara Engel – Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Cherri Gass – Illinois Department of Corrections (via teleconference)
Norbert Goetten – Office of the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor (via teleconference)
Bridget Healy Ryan – Office of the Cook County State's Attorney
Cheryl Howard – Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Leslie Landis – Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence, City of Chicago
Billie Larkin – Children's Advocacy Centers of Illinois
Ellen Mandeltort – Illinois Attorney General's Office
Lois Moorman – Illinois Department on Aging
Polly Poskin – Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Ana Romero – Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network
Lori Saleh (for Idetal Shalabi) – Arab American Family Services

Barbara Shaw – Illinois Violence Prevention Authority

Members unable to participate were:

David Bradford – Chief, Glen Carbon Police Department
Barbara Brooks – Illinois Department of Human Services
Cynthia Cobbs - Administrative Office of Illinois Courts
Sheriff Dawson – Macon County Sheriff’s Department
Thomas Jurkanin – Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board
Jennifer Welch – Office of the Illinois Attorney General

Also in attendance were Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Program Supervisor Ron Reichgelt, and other Authority staff.

Executive Director’s Comments

Director Levin said that the main purpose of this meeting was to discuss the VAWA and VOCA funding situations. She said that the FFY07 VOCA federal award, which the Authority received after last year’s Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting, was approximately \$1 million less than staff had anticipated. Also, the FFY07 VAWA federal award was approximately \$500,000 less than those of previous years. Director Levin said that staff will present information regarding the current states of VAWA and VOCA programs and funding and after the lunch break staff will introduce its recommendations to the committee.

Director Levin said that the Budget Committee would convene on October 24, 2007 to discuss the recommendations produced by this committee at this meeting. This meeting is an effort to plan ahead for any possible “doomsday” scenarios before it becomes too late to plan effectively. Director Levin explained that the Authority experienced a similar situation last year with the Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) program. As it turned out, after the federal government had reduced its JAG awards to the Authority from \$14.3 million in FFY05 down to \$8.5 million in FFY06, the federal government increased the FFY07 award to \$12.4 million. Approximately \$1 million of the JAG FFY07 award was used to cover some of the Authority’s and the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office’s VOCA grants temporarily until a new VOCA funding plan could be established.

Director Levin thanked the committee members for attending and she thanked them in advance for the work that the committee was about to undertake.

Purpose of the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee

Associate Director Chojnacki said that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss funding recommendations for the use of the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant funds in the State of Illinois in consideration of the recent cuts in the federal funding for both of these programs.

Program Supervisor Reichgelt said that the purpose of last year's meeting was to devise a plan for the use of VOCA and VAWA funds. The purpose of this meeting is not to revisit the issues addressed at last year's meeting. Instead, this committee should focus on how to work within the priorities established at last year's meeting while addressing funding reductions. Staff will present information on specific VAWA- and VOCA-funded programs. The goal of this meeting is for the committee to provide the Authority's staff with direction as to how funds should be designated over the next two years. In two years, we will meet again to develop another three-year plan.

Minutes of the September 18 and 19, 2006 Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Ms. Healy Ryan moved to approve the minutes of the September 18 and 19, 2006 Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting. Ms. Poskin seconded the motion and the minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Poskin wisely noted that the individual who had prepared the minutes had done an excellent job.

Minutes of the October 6, 2006 Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Ms. Saleh moved to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2006 Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee Meeting. Ms. Poskin seconded the motion and the minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Research and Analysis Unit Presentation

Mr. Chojnacki introduced the memo and charts contained at Tab 4 and he said that the data contained therein was collected from VAWA-funded programs. He said that the data was divided by program type and by type of service provided by the programs.

VAWA

Research Analyst Adriana Perez delivered a PowerPoint presentation that incorporated the VAWA data charts that were included in the meeting materials. She said that the data being presented was derived from currently-funded VAWA programs.

Ms. Perez called attention to a chart in the meeting materials indicating that of the four S.T.O.P. VAWA programs, the Services to Female Inmates Program was operated by the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) and the sexual assault and domestic violence prosecution program grant is operated by the Cook County State's Attorney's Office (CCSAO). She said that the CCSAO uses its funds to support a felony review specialist, a prosecution advocate, and the CCSAO's resource center. She said that the CCSAO's program is similar to the multi-disciplinary team (MDT) response programs.

Ms. Perez called attention to a chart in the meeting materials showing that of clients served by VAWA service-provider-funded programs, 71 percent of those clients were served by the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence (ICADV) and 29 percent were served by the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault (ICASA).

Ms. Perez presented a slide showing that transitional housing programs are funded by three types of grants: VOCA grants, VAWA grants, and Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant Program (VAWA Rural) grants. She said that VAWA Rural is a competitive grant program and the Authority may only apply for VAWA Rural funds every other year. She said that there are no VAWA Rural grants funded at this time because the most recent VAWA Rural federal award has been exhausted, but the transitional housing programs that usually receive VAWA Rural funds are being funded with VOCA dollars. She said that transitional housing programs are very client-intense services and that the primary outcome is the securing of safe housing for domestic violence victims.

In response to a question by Ms. Shaw, Ms. Perez said that a list of implementing agencies for transitional housing programs was included in the meeting materials. She also showed a slide indicating the geographic locations of the transitional housing programs.

In response to a question by Ms. Landis, Ms. Perez said that VOCA funds cover the costs of staffing the transitional housing programs. VAWA funds pay for the facilities-related costs.

In response to a question by Ms. Engel, Authority Staff Member Maureen Brennan said that the amount of time clients stay in transitional housing units varies from one program to another; there is no standard model. Ms. Landis added that the only way transitional housing programs in Chicago can receive funds from the city is if the clients stay in the

units, and that probably influences Chicago transitional housing providers' policies on the amount of time clients can stay in the units.

Ms. Perez explained that MDT programs combine and simplify the process of administering victim services, law enforcement services, and prosecution services. She said that the MDTs in Peoria, McLean, and St. Clair Counties offer services to domestic violence victims and that Kankakee County's MDT program differs from the others in that it offers services to sexual assault victims. Referring to the chart in the meeting materials describing clients served by MDT programs, she explained that the reason for Kankakee County's relatively small percentage of the overall number of clients is due to the fact that it is a sexual assault program and while there tend to be fewer sexual assault victims than domestic violence victims, sexual assault victims require more intensive care. Ms. Perez then called attention to a chart in the meeting materials indicating what services were provided by the individual MDT programs.

In response to a question by Ms. Poskin, Mr. Reichgelt said that VOCA is in more of a crisis now than VAWA is. VAWA FFY07 funds have not been touched yet, while virtually all of the VOCA FFY07 award has been designated. Any decisions reached at this meeting would affect future designations, whether they are from FFY07 or FFY08 funds.

VOCA

Research Analyst Erica Hughes delivered a PowerPoint presentation that incorporated the VOCA data charts that were included in the meeting materials.

Ms. Hughes called attention to the chart in the meeting materials describing victim service program types supported by VOCA funds. The program types included domestic violence, child abuse, sexual assault, law enforcement / prosecution (advocates), and services provided to victims of violent crime. She then called attention to a chart in the meeting materials that described the number of victims served by each program type during SFY07. She then called attention to a chart in the meeting materials that described the type of services provided by the programs. She said that some clients might receive more than one service.

In response to a question by Ms. Poskin, Ms. Hughes said that some discrepancies between the figures presented in the meeting materials and figures presented in other documents might be due to the fact that some data might have been miscategorized if it was not properly identified. Mr. Reichgelt added that, as staff was assembling data for this meeting, it became apparent that some agencies use InfoNet to report their data while also using older methods, so there is a chance that some data was entered twice.

Ms. Poskin said that an effort should be made to clean up the data because the Authority might provide data to the federal government, for example, and grantees might report contradictory data to the federal government for the same programs.

Ms. Landis said it would be useful to know if, or to what degree, the referrals being made by law enforcement- and prosecution-based programs are effective in steering victims toward the other services. The chart indicates that 54,000 referrals were issued, and only 44,000 individuals received case management or follow-up services. It would be useful to understand that discrepancy.

Ms. Hughes called attention to the chart in the meeting materials describing the types of services administered by domestic violence programs. She said that the majority of the domestic violence services administered are for advocacy and counseling.

Ms. Hughes called attention to the chart in the meeting materials describing the types of services administered by programs catering to child abuse victims. She said that information / referral and case management were the types of services most often administered.

Ms. Engel said that the types of services represented in this chart might well address the question asked earlier, "What constitutes 'Follow-Up' services?" The term *follow-up* describes consistent guidance of a victim through the court system, as opposed to simply calling victims to remind them of court dates.

Ms. Hughes said that *follow-up* is a category on the data collection report. Authority Research Analyst Jennifer Hiselman said that about half of the Authority's VOCA grantees report data via InfoNet and half do not. Many of the programs that use InfoNet participated in determining what services and related data would be reported via InfoNet and, as a result, their reporting is more consistent. Programs that do not use InfoNet generally use service definitions as defined by the federal Office for Victims of Crime.

Director Levin said that, for example, in the case of the prosecution-based victim services program provided by the CCSAO, follow-up involved much more than mere phone calls. It would be safe to assume that in most cases, the term *follow-up* describes activities beyond simple phone calls.

Ms. Hughes said that some of the data categories in the reports were collapsed to simplify the charts in this presentation; otherwise the charts would have so many categories as to render them ineffective. If necessary, that data could be broken down further.

In response to a question by Ms. Landis, Ms. Hughes said that the information presented here represents data relating only to the various VOCA-funded positions and programs.

Ms. Landis said that the level of interaction should be apparent by determining what is paid for by VOCA funds. It is useful to know what the VOCA dollars actually buy.

Ms. Howard said that sometimes a call might result in the discussion of a problem, and then that might be reported as a case management issue or a counseling issue, and not be reported as follow-up.

Ms. Hughes called attention to the chart in the meeting materials describing the types of services administered by programs catering to sexual assault victims. Services included referrals, advocacy, follow-up and case management service, and counseling.

Ms. Hughes called attention to the chart in the meeting materials describing the types of services administered by programs catering to violent crime victims. Services included advocacy, counseling and therapy, and other services such as filing compensation claims.

Ms. Hughes called attention to the chart in the meeting materials describing the types of services administered by law enforcement- and prosecution-based programs. Services included referrals, advocacy, follow-up and case management service, and counseling.

Ms. Hughes presented slides showing the conclusions derived from the VOCA program data:

- 1) The most funded programs were law enforcement/prosecution based, followed by domestic violence programs.
- 2) The majority of clients used these types domestic violence or law enforcement/prosecution-based programs
- 3) Advocacy was the most common service provided across all program types.
- 4) The most common services provided by program type are:
 - a) Domestic Violence: advocacy and counseling/therapy.
 - b) Child Abuse: information and referral and advocacy.
 - c) Sexual Assault: information and referral and advocacy.
 - d) Violent Crime: counseling/therapy.
 - e) Law Enforcement/Prosecution: advocacy.

Many committee members said that it would be helpful if data relating to the Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault HelpLine could be identified separately.

Ms. Poskin said that she would not categorize sexual assault programs as providing information and referral, but as providing crisis intervention.

Ms. Landis said that the ICASA's position has been to defer to the ICADV to define what services, exactly, the HelpLine provides. The HelpLine provides a core of support, but she said that she would not consider it crisis intervention.

Ms. Howard said that it would be particularly nice to have HelpLine data broken out now that it is available statewide. Such data would be useful in determining who is calling domestic violence or sexual assault programs directly and who is finding the information that they need via the HelpLine. It would also be worth it to determine what services referrals are issued for by the HelpLine. She also said that the HelpLine plays a role in a sort of balancing act; it is great to have a statewide system for people to call in to, but that is really only going to be effective if needed services are available in all localities. Ms. Landis added that the issue of underserved populations is impacted by the availability of the HelpLine.

Ms. Hughes said that residents in certain parts of the state are considered underserved populations because they are geographically isolated – the nearest service provider might be three counties away. It would be interesting to see where, geographically, victims are calling from.

Ms. Engel said that a number of counties throughout the state have reported no sexual assaults having been committed. One such county even reported the highest number of domestic violence cases. It is unforgivable that there are areas in Illinois that misreport such vital statistics.

Ms. Hughes said that part of the problem is that the Illinois State Police (ISP) collects supplemental Universal Crime Reporting (UCR) data. Domestic-related offenses is one category of data collected. However, there is no follow-up. One large city (Rockford?) reports zero domestic violence offenses on an annual basis, but the ISP never stop to ask if there really were zero domestic violence offenses. If a large municipality like Rockford reports zero domestic violence offenses, then that is a very different misrepresentation than a small sparsely populated downstate county that reports zero domestic violence offenses.

Director Levin said that the Illinois Bar Foundation is now focusing on victims' issues. The foundation has approximately \$250,000 to distribute. However, the foundation had fewer applicants this year than last year. The Authority will post application information for next year's awards.

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Program Descriptions

Mr. Chojnacki introduced the memo contained at Tab 5 describing VAWA and VOCA program descriptions. This memo describes the seven major programs supported by VAWA and VOCA grants. Mr. Reichgelt explained the contents of the memo.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the background information contained in this memo had been presented to the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee at its last meeting, but with updated figures. These general program categories reflect how the subgrants are categorized in the Authority's database.

Revised S.T.O.P. VAWA Implementation Plan

Mr. Reichgelt introduced the revised S.T.O.P. VAWA Implementation Plan. This year, because of changes to the requirements mandated by the 2005 reauthorization of VAWA, the Authority is required to qualify report on underserved populations in its victim service funding. Changes have been made to section III. Services Overview, subsection E. Unserved and Underserved Areas & Populations. Specifically, the third paragraph on page 55 through the top of page 60 has been added to address the use of VAWA victim service funds for culturally specific underserved populations. A minimum of 10 percent of VAWA victim service funds must be set aside for culturally specific underserved populations. In actuality, 90 to 100 percent of the Authority's victim service funds go toward underserved populations and the plan was revised to reflect that fact.

Director Levin said that statistics on primary languages spoken by clients would be corrected. The original draft identifies Latin as a language spoken by clients; obviously that needed to change. Other parts of the text identify clients as Spanish, as opposed to Hispanic or Spanish-speaking. Spanish, obviously, describes someone from Spain specifically, and not the Americas.

Ms. Engel noted that the Age of First Contact chart at the bottom of Page 51 of the plan was unclear. The left column indicates age ranges as low as zero-to-one year old, but then the second column indicates adults as having made contact in all age groups down through the zero-to-one year old level. Mr. Reichgelt said that the table should show nine adults for that data item, not 923 adults. He said that in this case, adult referred to a parent or guardian, but that was not made clear in the chart. He said that the noted issues would be addressed before the final draft is submitted to the Office for Violence Against Women (OVW).

Ms. Shaw called attention to the rate data presented on Pages 6 through 12 of the plan. She said that perhaps data for Chicago should be presented separately, or at least separated from the data for Cook County.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the information is presented on these pages in a fashion consistent with how it has been presented in the past.

Ms. Shaw said that to separate Chicago data from Cook County data would generate a very different view of the data.

Ms. Poskin said that to separate Chicago from Cook County might affect the rate statistics for each. Perhaps Chicago would have different crime rate data when that data is separated from Cook County's data.

Ms. Engel said that it might be worthwhile to note on the maps themselves that the rates for Cook County would change if the data for the Chicago rates was removed. Doing so might help identify where needs are greatest.

Ms. Shaw said that it would be beneficial to know what the data for Chicago alone is.

Ms. Landis said that it would be beneficial to present the differences between the reported offenses and the arrests for each county.

Ms. Poskin, in response to a question by Ms. Shaw, said that a reported offense is one in which the victim comes forward to report an incident.

Ms. Landis said that the data show the number of reports, which means police reports, which might not be equal to the number of actual offenses.

Mr. Chojnacki said that arrest data might be misleading. The data does not indicate the specific charges relating to the reported arrests. The actual charges might differ from the original offenses as reported. For example, in criminal sexual assault cases, some arrests might be made for aggravated criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual assault, or for a lesser offense. If arrests are made in 80 percent of the cases, for example, they might not all be for the reported offense.

Ms. Shaw said that her desire was to see the data specific to Chicago separated from the existing data sets presented in the meeting materials.

Director Levin said that research staff would work on separating Chicago-specific data from the rest of the data.

Ms. Poskin said that the charts in the meeting materials provided a county-by-county overview of the data. If Chicago data is separated from Cook County data, then the same should be done for other large urban areas such as Rockford, Peoria, or East St. Louis.

Ms. Shaw said that when the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority presents statewide data, Chicago data is always presented separately.

Ms. Poskin said that it is important to remember that this data has been reported to the ISP by various law enforcement agencies, and not reported by victims to local police departments.

Ms. Howard said that this data presentation should be considered carefully. Regarding the Rate of Reported Domestic Violence Offenses and Services Available map on Page 8, Stephenson County and Livingston County are represented as having high offense rates, but that information doesn't support what we know about those counties. We know that the statistics in the map for those two counties does not accurately reflect the counties' offense rates. The information presented here should be measured against all of the other information that we have.

Ms. Engel said that the problem is that many decision-making people don't have any other information to rely on other than what is presented here. In that manner, graphic representations of data such as these are very powerful and they have an impact on people who influence policy decisions. Every effort should be made to make this data as accurate and useful as possible.

Ms. Poskin said that it would be great to provide rates by city in addition to providing rates by county, but to simply remove urban data from the larger counties might skew the results.

Committee Chair Jansen said that the Authority can only really use the data that has been provided by grantees via their reporting. Ms. Poskin added that there might be crimes reported in Johnson County, for example, that are not later reported to the ISP's statisticians.

Ms. Landis said that the data that InfoNet provides reflects the data that has been entered into InfoNet. Bad data in means bad data out. She also said that she wanted clarification on the elder abuse data presented in the chart on Page 12; specifically whether or not the data was reported to the mandatory elder abuse reporting system run by the Illinois Department on Aging. There is a distinction here between domestic violence and elder abuse. It would be helpful to know where the data is being reported from and who the service providers are for elder abuse as distinct from domestic violence.

Discussions revealed that domestic violence cases involving intimate partners, at least one of whom is a senior, are not represented as elder abuse, unless a report was made via the elder abuse hotline.

Ms. Moorman said that the data would reflect reports that came into either the statewide elder abuse hotline or the local elder abuse service providers. If the chart on Page 12 reflects Illinois Department on Aging data, then it would be a combination of data from those two sources.

Mr. Reichgelt said that it is mandated that the revised plan be submitted in a timely manner lest the Authority's VAWA funds be frozen by OVW. This is the same data that was provided in last year's draft plan submission. For the sake of continuity, we should not revise this data at this point. That could be a discussion for the next Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting when it will be time to start considering the next VAWA three-year plan.

Ms. Landis said that she wanted to know if VOCA and VAWA dollars are earmarked for elder abuse services that are reported in these charts.

Director Levin said that VOCA funds do support elder abuse services in southern Illinois.

Ms. Landis said that she wanted to get a sense of where the VOCA and VAWA dollars are being spent and why elder abuse was being reported here in the VAWA plan if, in fact, it is not funded by VOCA and VAWA dollars.

Director Levin said that there was some funding of underserved populations with older monies. Funds have supported follow-up services for elder abuse in southern Illinois.

Ms. Hughes provided an update on some of the data that had been in question. She said that she refigured the domestic violence and sexual assault data for Chicago and Cook County separately. She said that she was not able at this time to determine which agencies in Cook County reported domestic violence data. She said that in calendar year 2004:

- 68,995 domestic violence offenses were reported in Chicago, or 2,382 per 100,000 residents.
- 11,063 domestic violence offenses were reported in suburban Cook County, or 455 per 100,000 residents.
- 2,915 arrests for criminal sexual assaults were reported in Chicago, or 19 per 100,00 residents.
- 593 arrests for criminal sexual assaults were reported in suburban Cook County, or 8 per 100,000 residents.

Ms. Hughes said that Cook County's domestic violence numbers might be low because not all agencies have reported.

Funding Issues

VAWA

Mr. Reichgelt delivered a PowerPoint presentation that addressed VAWA and VOCA funding issues.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing that VAWA federal awards are subdivided into five separate, non-interchangeable program funding categories according to the following percentages:

- 30 percent to service providers.
- 25 percent to law enforcement programs.
- 25 percent to prosecution programs.
- 15 percent for discretionary spending.
- 5 percent to court programs.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing that the service provider program funds have traditionally been divided evenly between the ICADV and the ICASA.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing that law enforcement fund percentage distribution by grantee. St. Clair, Peoria, and Mc Lean Counties, and the Cities of Peoria, Kankakee, and Bloomington are all MDT participants that receive VAWA law enforcement funds. Law enforcement funds also go to the City of Chicago and the Attorney General's Office for training. Mr. Reichgelt then presented a slide indicating the percentage distribution of law enforcement funds by program type. He noted that over 66 percent of VAWA law enforcement funds were designated to MDT programs.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing prosecution fund percentage distribution by grantee. Upon presenting this slide, he noticed that data for St. Clair, Peoria, and Mc Lean Counties was represented, but data for Kankakee's MDT program had been accidentally omitted, thus all of the percentage figures were inaccurate. He said that the CCSAO uses prosecution funds for a domestic violence and sexual assault prosecution program. Mr. Reichgelt then introduced a slide showing prosecution fund distribution by program type.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing discretionary fund percentage distribution by grantee. He said that most of these programs were transitional housing. Mr. Reichgelt then introduced a slide showing discretionary fund distribution by program type.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing court fund percentage distribution by grantee. He said that the court funds support specialized probation officers as part of the MDT programs. Mr. Reichgelt then introduced a slide showing court fund distribution by program type.

VOCA

Mr. Reichgelt said that the information presented in the meeting materials is rather broad owing to the manner in which it is entered into the Authority's data system.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing VOCA fund percentage distribution by program type.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing VOCA fund percentage distribution to domestic violence programs by service type.

In response to a question by Ms. Shaw, Mr. Reichgelt said that VOCA program titles indicate whether the program serves underserved populations, but that would only be reflected in the title if the implementing agency indicated that the program would specifically serve such a population. For example, a program might specifically provide bi-lingual services might be called Services to Bi-Lingual Victims of Crime, whereas a program simply entitled Services to Victims of Crime might provide services to a population that includes, but is not limited to, underserved populations. Therefore, a large portion of the programs simply listed as "domestic violence" could be to underserved populations.

In response to a question by Ms. Landis, Mr. Reichgelt explained that there is a difference between the VAWA and VOCA definitions of an underserved population:

- VAWA – This definition is very close to what the Authority has always considered underserved: geographically isolated, linguistically isolated, or minority populations.
- VOCA – This program defines underserved as: robbery victims, victims of drunk drivers, homicide victims, violent crime victims, and adults abused as children.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the Authority is mandated by the federal government to report that at least ten percent of its VOCA funds support underserved populations.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing VOCA fund percentage distribution to sexual assault programs by service type.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing VOCA fund percentage distribution to child advocacy center (CAC) programs by service type.

In response to a question by Ms. Landis, Ms. Larkin said that a significant number of CAC services receive funding from the Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS), but that funding has not increased since 2000. While there is money, its influence is dwindling quickly. Ms. Poskin added that ICASA gets many cases from DCFS because the cases are unfounded; that is to say that the evidence does not meet the standard. Most of ICASA's underserved programs focus on children. Ms. Landis added that when she directed the Mc Lean County CAC, approximately 40 percent of the clients were not DCFS clients.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing VOCA fund percentage distribution to programs serving victims of violent crime by service type.

Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide showing VOCA fund percentage distribution by program title.

Ms. Brennan said that the program titles reflect the VOCA Purpose Area titles since each program funded must fall under one of the VOCA Purpose Areas provided by the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC).

Mr. Reichgelt said that when staff reports to OVC, data is reported in a more precise fashion that clearly identifies what is and is not related to underserved populations.

Ms. Landis said that the data presented in the VAWA plan regarding client languages, for instance, indicated that there were 446 clients who spoke Korean, which isn't surprising because access to Korean language services is available. However, the OVC's analysts might misinterpret that as indicative of the local Korean community having a disproportionately large domestic violence problem.

Ms. Engel said that if the Authority wants to make an effective argument to OVC or to Congress, it would help tremendously to show what programs are actually being funded and what those programs are really doing. The Authority's applications would be more effective if we included information such as the fact that the Authority funds a hotline that can operate in 145 languages; that the Authority does fund specialized programs that attract clients from diverse and underserved communities. The Authority might be able to do a better job of representing the work that it does and the programs that it supports.

Director Levin said that Ms. Engel raised some good points that perhaps should be incorporated into any letters that Authority members might write to Congress; it would make a clearer case to Congress that the Authority's funds are reaching underserved populations. Ms. Engel added that when efforts are made to reach out to minority or non-English-speaking communities, enormous numbers of people in need of services are uncovered. Bringing this to Congress's attention would enhance the Authority's requests for increased funding.

Ms. Brennan said that the Authority also submits regular reports to the federal government and those reports differ significantly from VAWA to VOCA. The VOCA reports allow staff to report anecdotal information and other details so staff can highlight what works and what makes the programs worth supporting. VAWA reporting, on the other hand, is very limited and is virtually only statistical in nature.

Ms. Poskin said that it is very important that people (Congress) know that gaps are being addressed in Illinois. The reports to the federal government for sexual assault in Illinois are probably more revealing regarding activities in Illinois than almost any other state's reports. However, that does not seem to have been effective in channeling more funds to Illinois. She said that the lack of increased funding probably has much to do with the current administration's commitment to funding the war and that is something that is beyond our control. When more funds become available, these ideas will become more critical, but right now the comprehensiveness of these reports is not getting the Authority any more or less money.

Ms. Engel said that if Authority members made an absolutely sterling case for additional funds, they might find some surprising allies in Congress.

Mr. Reichgelt said that when VAWA began to require the Authority to provide separate data for underserved populations,

We went through our VOCA and we had an issue with that because their definition of underserved is different from our definition in Illinois. When we learned the OVW's definition of underserved, I was elated because 95 to 100 percent of the Authority's VAWA funds goes to underserved populations. There might be some confusion in this presentation as to what constitutes a program. For example, something might simply be labeled a domestic violence program when, in fact, it serves a large underserved population.

Director Levin said that when a letter is drafted, a better picture of ICADV and ICASA activities must be painted so that it is clearer what those funds support.

Mr. Reichgelt said that at one point, many of the programs were consolidated, so some that may have been dedicated to underserved populations exclusively at first have been subsumed into larger programs that now go by the larger programs' titles. Services are still provided to underserved populations.

Director Levin asked for confirmation that the committee agrees that when this is presented to the Budget Committee, no matter what the recommendations are, that the ICADV's and ICASA's activities are explained. The Authority has some relatively new board members and neither they nor the Blagojevich administration has faced these issues before. It might be wise to explain to the newer people what the coalitions do with these funds.

Ms. Howard said that the ICADV is listed in the Victims of Crime Act Programs and Grantees chart in the meeting materials as providing services to victims of domestic violence, but then two of the three programs listed as providing services to non-English speaking or bi-lingual domestic violence victims are also funded by the ICADV. The chart does not indicate that these programs receive funds from both the Authority and the ICADV. Another thing that the materials do not reflect is that when VAWA was first passed, the ICADV decided what its own definitions of unmet needs were. Then, because the ICADV funded a significant number of latina programs at a time when there were only two other latina programs (Chicago Abused Women Coalition and Mujeres Latinas en Accion; other programs provided services to Latinas, but very poorly) the result was that as a program funded specifically for the latina population became better at doing business and then the number of latinias served by the VOCA-funded personnel also grew. The VAWA program had a positive influence on the VOCA program, but that is not reflected, or at least easily identified, in the data.

Mr. Reichgelt said that it is very difficult to separate data relating to underserved populations when that service is part of a larger program.

Ms. Shaw said that in this instance, it is worth noting that domestic violence services include a significant percentage of services to underserved populations.

Ms. Landis suggested showing what percentage of domestic violence programs that serve non-English speaking populations. She said that a similar thing should be done to identify services to children. As people who are discussing these issues at the policy level, this committee needs to know what these funds are purchasing. If ICADV funds listed as victim services are purchasing services for adults and children, but the program is not categorized distinctly, the committee loses track of how many of those VOCA funds support services for children. In Chicago VOCA dollars are being provided to non-English speaking or culturally identified populations. This should be reflected in InfoNet data.

Mr. Reichgelt said that when the funding information is combined with the information presented by the Research and Analysis staff, some of these issues should be cleared up. Dollar amounts will be shown in relationship to the victim services that are using those dollars.

Ms. Poskin said that, first, a clear picture of the Authority's VAWA- and VOCA-funded programs must be created. Secondly, it is important not to define underserved populations too narrowly in a state as large and geographically diverse as Illinois. If that happens, for example, a county that is all Caucasian and English-speaking could be considered an underserved area. Many parts of the state and many neighborhoods are uncovered. "Underserved" must be carefully defined; it must relate to geography, population, race, color, ethnicity, language, or the lack of previous services. A previously unserved area would constitute an underserved population.

(Lunch Break)

Committee Chair Jansen declared a recess for lunch at 11:50 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

Rural Domestic Violence / Transitional Housing

Mr. Chojnacki introduced the program briefs contained at Tab 6, one for the Rural Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, Stalking, and Child Abuse Enforcement Assistance Program (VAWA Rural) and one for the Transitional Housing Assistance Grants for Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, or Sexual Assault Program.

Mr. Reichgelt said that in addition to the VOCA and VAWA programs that the Authority administers every year, which are both formula-based, the Authority has discretionary grants. These competitive grants are made available by OVC or OVW. The applications are graded and evaluated, which means that Illinois might or might not receive an award. The Authority has applied for both of these programs in the past. The Authority received VAWA Rural funds until about a year ago. The Authority has applied for the Transitional Housing program funds, but that application has been denied. Staff would like to receive input from this committee regarding the types of programs the committee would like the Authority to apply for. Please also consider which entities should be involved in the application process. The Authority is not a programming agency, it is a funding agency, so it needs the stakeholders to assist in assembling applications in accordance with the

directions described in the program briefs. Staff would then submit the application and receive the program funds and administer those funds appropriately.

VAWA / VOCA Funding Recommendations

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to new documents that had been placed at committee members' places before the meeting reconvened after the lunch break.

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to a recreation of the VAWA prosecution fund chart that had been the subject of scrutiny earlier in this meeting because data for Kankakee's MDT program had inadvertently been omitted.

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to a document describing VAWA and VOCA program descriptions. This should address Ms. Landis's earlier concerns regarding funds spent per service. He called attention to a similar document relating to VAWA funds.

VAWA Funding Recommendations

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to the memo that had been placed at the committee members' places regarding VAWA Proposed Funding Reductions. He then delivered a brief PowerPoint presentation on the topic.

Mr. Reichgelt presented a slide showing the mandatory federal award percentage breakdown per the five program areas.

Mr. Reichgelt presented a slide showing a comparison of current spending per program area versus funds available per the VAWA FFY07 federal award. He noted that the largest discrepancies existed in prosecution and discretionary funds. He also explained that, in the case of service provider funding, the coalitions have traditionally simply split those funds, whatever that total amount happened to be in any given federal fiscal year, and so although the chart depicts a difference between current spending and available FFY07 funds, that difference does not indicate the impending funding problems that it does in other program areas. He reminded the committee that funds in these program areas are not interchangeable; for example, law enforcement funds cannot be used to support prosecution programs. The only program area that allows any flexibility is the discretionary area, and that has traditionally been used to fund transitional housing programs.

Mr. Reichgelt presented a slide showing a comparison of current spending per program area versus funds available per the VAWA FFY07 federal award versus a 20 percent cut across the board for all VAWA programs. He said that this slide shows that a 20 percent

cut would solve the problems in law enforcement and court spending, victim services spending would not be an issue, for reasons described earlier, but prosecution and court program areas would still be overspent. He then presented a slide showing the same relationships, but with a 25 percent across-the-board cut.

Mr. Reichgelt said that a 25 percent cut would be a very drastic step, and one that would not solve all of the problems. Therefore, staff began to investigate what would happen if matching funds requirements were adjusted. He said that when the VAWA FFY00 funds were first administered, the intent was to fund programs for a limited time. In spite of that, MDT programs that were originally intended to be funded for three years recently received a fourth year of funding. VAWA funds were never intended to continue programs indefinitely. At some point this committee will choose to shift the focus of VAWA funding to other programs. However, if funds, to the MDT programs, for example, were simply terminated entirely, the programs would end. The MDT programs that are currently funded have been successful. Staff has been considering ways to wean programs like these off of the federal funds and one way to do that is to increase the matching funds requirements.

Mr. Reichgelt presented a slide showing relationships of VAWA federal program dollars to suggested potential required matching funds for the following situations:

1. Total current federal program spending with the current 25 percent match requirement.
2. FFY07 federal funds available for programming with the current 25 percent match requirement.
3. Federal program funds that would be needed to continue current funding assuming a 30 percent match requirement.
4. Federal program funds that would be needed to continue current funding assuming a 40 percent match requirement.

Mr. Reichgelt said that if the matching funds requirement was increased to 30 percent for next year's designations, then some of the projected deficit would be recovered. If the match was increased to 40 percent the following year, parity with available funds would be achieved. This assumes, however, that the next two VAWA federal awards, (FFY08 and FFY09) are at least equal to the FFY07 award. This would help to maintain current programming for two more years with funds that staff estimates would be available and it would begin to wean the program off of the federal funds and shift the funding responsibilities to local governments or county government. This way, when the Authority does stop funding the programs, the local governments or county governments have vested interests in finding funding sources to maintain the programs. He reminded the committee that this is simply a recommendation and that the actual decision on a funding plan will be left to them.

In response to a question by Ms. Shaw, Mr. Reichgelt said that at this point, no designations have been made using VAWA FFY07 funds. He also said that different grantees have different contract periods so continuing programs would need FFY07 funds at different points throughout 2008.

In response to a question by Ms. Poskin, Mr. Reichgelt said that the coalitions' (FFY07) funds for designation in 2008 are secure.

Mr. Reichgelt presented five slides showing relationships of VAWA federal program dollars to required matching funds for the four situations listed above; one for each individual program area:

- Law Enforcement – Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide demonstrating that current law enforcement spending is not significantly different from the amount of law enforcement funds available per the VAWA FFY07 federal award. In this case, 30 or 40 percent matching funds requirements for continuing programs would reduce the burden on the federal funds to a point well below the amount of funds available.
- Prosecution – Mr. Reichgelt introduced a slide demonstrating that even with a 40 percent matching funds requirement, the prosecution program area funds would still be overspent relative to the prosecution funds available per the VAWA FFY07 federal award. He said that staff expects to have the VAWA FFY08 award in hand by the time any VAWA FFY07 designations need to be made. That means that there should be enough funds between those to awards to get by.
- Mr. Reichgelt briefly displayed three slides demonstrating the relationships between the four potential matching fund requirement scenarios described above for victim services, court, and discretionary program area funds.

Mr. Reichgelt said that, basically, VAWA as been overspent. The Authority had used old money to fund more programs than any single federal fiscal year award would support. However, not every program area has been overspent.

Mr. Reichgelt said that, even if the 40 percent matching funds requirements are adopted, such a plan would still effectively borrow against future federal awards. Between the funds that are in hand and anticipated FFY08 funds, there should be enough to support all continuing programs. These plans also increase the fiscal responsibilities for local governments so that if and/or when the Authority does eliminate funds for these specific grantees altogether, the local governments will be better prepared to assume full funding responsibility for these programs. This all assumes, 1) that this committee will reconvene in two years funding priorities will shift as a new three-year plan is developed, and 2) this

committee supports continued funding of all existing programs throughout that two-year period with these types of requirements. At that point, there will be very little, if any, old money. Right now, the Authority is using a combination of old and newer monies to reduce the burdens that funding cuts would likely inflict on current grantees.

Director Levin reiterated that this committee will not designate any funds. These recommendations will be presented to the Budget Committee and that committee will determine actual designations.

In response to a question by Ms. Engel, Mr. Reichgelt said that the Authority cannot place VAWA funds in an interest-bearing account.

Ms. Poskin said that she would like to hear from the (Cook?) county representatives what they think the impact of raising the matching funds requirement would be and what the match fund sources would likely be.

Ms. Howard said that matching funds could be comprised of general revenue funds that are not allocated to providing matching funds in other areas. For law enforcement or prosecution grants, matching funds could come from the counties, general revenue, foundations... Those matching funds could be any money except money that has already been designated for federal match or money from another federal source.

Mr. Reichgelt said that if the Authority simply cuts funds to its grantees, that would probably translate into numerous staff cuts. If the Authority mandates that matching funds increase as the federal funds are cut back, then the programs have a better chance of staying fully funded.

Ms. Poskin expressed concern that some grantees might not be able to generate sufficient matching funds. Mr. Reichgelt said that the hope is that grantees would be able to approach their respective county governments, for example, and show that with a relatively small investment of a few extra dollars, the programs would continue for another two years.

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff had come up with a few suggestions for the MDT programs as to how they can raise extra cash. One suggestion is that they could place a surcharge on phone calls from jail. Another is that they could raise prices at their commissaries.

Ms. Poskin said that the wrong entities are bearing the brunt of the pressure here. Pressure should be applied to the federal government. The federal government has the money, they are just spending it elsewhere. ICASA would probably look to general revenue to support increased matching fund requirements. Over the last five years, the (Blagojevich) administration has provided only \$250,000 was for sexual assault

programs at 34 agencies. There has been very little commitment to ICASA at the state level. If funds are scarce at the state level, then counties probably would not be any better able to provide more funding. MDT programs will have a tough time finding extra funds.

Director Levin said that the Authority is a planning agency. Board members cannot simply rely on lobbying Congress as a legitimate plan of action. She said that the Authority must plan for the worst and, to that end, these recommendations represent a sort of “doomsday” plan. If luck has it that the next federal awards are significantly larger than anticipated, these recommendations would be up for reconsideration. Meanwhile, the idea is to allow grantees time to plan so that a situation does not develop where grantees are notified of drastic cuts to their funding with only a month or so to secure alternate funding before their current agreements expire.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that when the JAG program was created to replace the Anti-Drug Abuse Act program and the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants program, the overall funding level was cut dramatically (from roughly \$20 million in FFY04 down to \$8.5 million in FFY05) and there was a significant lobbying effort to maintain program funding, but those efforts were ultimately unsuccessful.

Director Levin said that a few VOCA programs are currently funded with JAG dollars, but that situation can only last for one year.

Ms. Healy Ryan suggested that the Authority’s lobbying efforts might be more effective now than when lobbying was done for the JAG program because the Democrats are in control of Congress now and perhaps that was a factor in the failure of JAG lobbying efforts. At any rate, there is no guarantee of an increase in funding and it is better to receive news of potentially reduced designations now than six months or a year from now when little time would be left for grantees to develop other plans.

In response to a question by Ms. Poskin, Mr. Reichgelt called attention to the chart on Page 2 of the VAWA Funding Issues memo in the meeting materials. He said that the chart indicated what funds are available in each federal fiscal year for each program area. He said that the chart showed the older funds that contribute, along with anticipated FFY08 funds, to the overall available fund amounts for the next two years’ programming. He said that, generally, each VAWA federal fiscal year’s award funds are available for use for four years in addition to the year of the award. Mr. Reichgelt then called attention to the chart on Page 2 of the VOCA Funding Issues memo in the meeting materials which described the VOCA funds available by federal fiscal year.

VOCA

Mr. Reichgelt presented a slide showing a comparison of currently designated VOCA federal program dollars to the portion of the VOCA FFY07 federal award that was made available for programming. He said that all currently funded VOCA programs consume \$16,896,204. However, the VOCA FFY07 award was only \$14,323,150. Even though the FFY07 award was only seven percent less than the FFY06 award, the difference in real dollars is amplified due to overspending.

Mr. Reichgelt presented a slide showing the differences between currently designated VOCA federal program dollars, the portion of the VOCA FFY07 federal award that was made available for programming, and the federal funds that would be required if all VOCA programs received a 20 percent cut. A 20 percent cut would leave some money left over which could be useful if the next federal award is even smaller. He said that all indications are that the VOCA FFY08 award is likely to be slightly less than the FFY07 award. He also said that this plan would allow all currently funded programs to continue to receive funds. The caveat, however, is that the Authority's staff needs the flexibility to make program-by-program decisions regarding funding level. For example, if a program consistently returns lapsed funds year after year, or if a program incurs unnecessary expenses, those programs might warrant a larger cut than the others. On the other hand, if a 20 percent cut would result in the termination of a program that has proven to be successful, staff needs the flexibility to reduce that program's cut.

Director Levin said that funds for training or conferences might be cut out of the program designations, but staff might arrange things so that grantees could apply for training funds from whatever funds lapse or remain. Mr. Reichgelt said that this has been done recently and it allows staff more control over spending.

Ms. Landis said that VAWA provides law enforcement funds and VOCA also funds law enforcement efforts. She asked if it would be worth considering shifting some VOCA law enforcement programs to VAWA funds, given the excess of total VAWA law enforcement dollars available. The Domestic Violence HelpLine, for example, has been funded alternately by VOCA and VAWA. Mr. Reichgelt said that such a move was certainly a possibility.

In response to a question by Ms. Shaw, Mr. Reichgelt said that there are VAWA law enforcement funds that are going unspent, but there probably are not enough VAWA law enforcement funds to move all of the VOCA law enforcement programs to VAWA.

In response to a question by Ms. Poskin, Mr. Reichgelt said that VOCA and VAWA have different program funding criteria and guidelines so a program that is eligible for funding under one is not necessarily eligible under the other. VAWA funds can only be used for services to women who are victims of specific crimes.

Ms. Howard said some programs have domestic violence court dockets. Some services specific to women are funded by VOCA grants. She suggested shifting those VOCA costs over to VAWA. Mr. Reichgelt said that most of those programs are prosecution programs, and VAWA has its largest fund shortfall in the prosecution program area, so such a shift would not necessarily be beneficial. He added that law enforcement agencies are not providing such services.

Ms. Poskin said that a 14 percent cut in funds to the coalitions would result in relatively large cuts to the coalitions' grantees. If there are any services that could be funded by moving the grants to another federal program, then there is a potential for saving some programs.

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to the VOCA program listing following the VOCA memo and charts under Tab 5 of the meeting materials. He said that the law enforcement and prosecutor-based victim assistance services programs receive approximately \$1.2 million each year. Ms. Engel noted that, according to the list, very few law enforcement agencies receive those funds; most recipients are state's attorney's offices. Mr. Reichgelt, in response to ensuing discussion, said that the few law enforcement and prosecutor-based victim assistance services programs operated by law enforcement agencies did not support enough VAWA-eligible activities to warrant moving a part or all of the grants from VOCA to VAWA. He said that staff had considered such moves, but determined that they would yield little benefit. He also said that the law enforcement agencies would have to contend with VOCA and VAWA grants where they currently have only the VOCA grants, and the added administrative burden might cause friction between those agencies and the Authority or generate negative feelings toward the programs. He said that such funding shifts might affect programs to the point that law enforcement agencies might not want to maintain the programs and since VAWA funds are more specifically targeted, the result might actually be a reduction in services to people who need them.

Ms. Landis said that the VOCA-funded law enforcement-based services are not provided by sworn officers, but by social workers and/or advocates who work within the law enforcement agencies. She said that she thought that a significant number of these programs focused on family violence and/or sexual assault cases. She said that the question is whether the services would effectively shift to a VOCA-funded dedicated victim service agency if the social workers and advocates who work within the law enforcement agencies were unable to provide services. She said that this is why it is important to know the service types being reported by VOCA-funded programs. If a program is primarily providing contact information and basic follow-up after a police response, then continued funding of that program should be reconsidered.

Mr. Reichgelt called attention to the chart under Tab 4 that illustrates the percentage of clients served by service type for law enforcement and prosecution based programs. He

said that staff has tried to monitor the programs' activities to ensure that they provide services beyond simply redirecting victims to other service providers; that they do, in fact provide advocacy services. It is not worthwhile to pay a person's salary to be nothing more than a directory. He said that placing an advocate within a law enforcement agency is often the only way to ensure that certain areas have advocacy services available. Staff conducts annual site visits to these grantees to ensure that adequate services are provided. Those visits often reveal the hard work and dedication that the advocates put into their work.

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff had only considered adjusting matching fund requirements for VAWA, not VOCA.

In response to a question by Ms. Howard, Director Levin said that she had turned down a staff-proposed solution to the funding problems. That solution called for the elimination of all of the Authority's grants to entities that also receive funds from other entities that distribute funds provided by the Authority. For example, an entity that receives both a VOCA grant from the Authority and VOCA funds that are distributed by one of the coalitions via an Authority VOCA award would have the Authority-provided funds eliminated. That might have had a devastating impact on transitional housing, among other programs.

In response to a question by Ms. Poskin, Mr. Reichgelt explained that with VOCA funds staff often used money returned from one program (law enforcement, for example) and re-uses those lapsed dollars for something very different (transitional housing, for example) because, unlike VAWA funds, VOCA funds are not required to remain in any specific program area.

In response to a comment by Ms. Shaw, Director Levin said that staff would figure out a way to expend the roughly \$2.6 million in unspent VAWA law enforcement funds.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the VAWA law enforcement funds would definitely be spent. Those funds will support things like training and printing, if nothing else. The reason that no law enforcement funds have been designated out of recent federal fiscal year awards is that staff has been using funds from older federal fiscal years. Law enforcement funds are designated at a slower rate because there are fewer programs to support.

Ms. Engel said that she had noticed that throughout this meeting the idea of cutting funds for transitional housing programs, specifically, has been presented by a few people, despite the fact that to do so is not a formal recommendation from staff.

Ms. Howard said that there are some inherent problems with transitional housing. She said that victims who enter domestic violence programs and then go on to transitional

housing programs are often people who are in shelter programs and they often have two or three serious issues. They are adult survivors of sexual assault or domestic violence or both. There are often other issues such as chemical dependency, chronic poverty, and mental health. Transitional housing addresses all of these issues to one degree or another. By the time a client reaches the point that transitional housing is a reasonable option, they often have exhausted all other resources available in the community. The transitional housing programs start at the bottom in terms of trying to get the clients to the point where they can live independently and they have dealt with the other problem issues so that they are not so vulnerable that they are likely to be re-victimized. These victims represent a very small population. In Illinois approximately 55,000 domestic violence victims are served every year, but only about 5,500 of those are using emergency shelter services. The largest population of clients served is people who are in their own homes and who primarily use walk-in services such as counseling, court services, crisis services, parenting services, etc. They do not use housing services. She said that the MDTs and the walk-in programs are in positions to make tremendous differences. If those programs are maintained properly and they are effective, then, hopefully, they will have the effect of reducing the number of clients who need transitional housing programs. The other problem with transitional housing, particularly in rural areas, is the issue of placing a client in housing and then dealing with the meth issues which are a major problem in the rural transitional housing programs. She said that she has had conversations with some program directors who would gladly abandon transitional housing because it is so problematic. Transitional housing is more difficult to supervise than emergency services because at least staff is present in the latter; transitional housing facilities are usually off-site from the program office. Transitional housing has traditionally been considered a great idea, but that is without much thought being given to challenges, issues, and problems associated with it. Also, the nature of emergency shelter services has changed over the past few decades in terms of who is using the services. In years past, there were women who had all of the problems described above, but more women were using shelter services because law enforcement and prosecution did not provide the necessary services that they do now; for example, a woman could not get an order of protection for safety in her own home. Now that law enforcement and prosecution provide more comprehensive services, more women are choosing to stay in their own homes. After all, nobody want to live in a shelter if other options are available.

Director Levin said that she would not feel comfortable presenting a recommendation to the Budget Committee that the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee made to cut or eliminate funding for transitional housing when none of the transitional housing service providers are present at this meeting to defend their programs and make an argument for continued funding. It would be difficult to explain why, for example, victim service providers such as the coalitions had supported a measure that keeps their funding intact, but reduces or eliminates funds to others who were not present.

Ms. Landis said that transitional housing services, at least in the City of Chicago, have traditionally been funded with homeless services dollars as opposed to victim services dollars. The original purpose of those monies was to keep individuals housed. Then the homeless funds began to be used for domestic violence shelters. The goal was centered on achieving or transitioning the client to permanent housing. However, the money was really being used to provide safety and crime victim assistance. VOCA and VAWA funds provided by the Authority should really be addressing the needs of crime victims, whether that is related to a criminal justice response or not. Permanent housing, beyond emergency shelters, is an issue outside the scope of victim services and is really more about affordable housing issues. This is why the City of Chicago has not developed a VAWA- or VOCA-funded transitional housing program; the city has made the determination that if transitional housing is offered, the housing must stay with the client. The client does not transition into second-stage housing, housing is achieved for clients and the housing stock is constantly rotated. If transitional housing funds are used to sustain apartments, there might be better strategies that could be applied toward meeting the needs of rental assistance and developing affordable housing. That is a much larger and more complex issue than can be properly addressed with the limited funds that the Authority can dedicate to transitional housing. Victims certainly do need housing beyond emergency shelter, but with the amount of funds available, the lack of scientific data and a clear picture of how funds should be spent and who should do the spending, these funds are not being as well spent as they would if they were dedicated to the more up-front needs of the populations that could be better served by VOCA and VAWA. Also, transitional housing funds simply do not support very many clients.

In response to Director Levin's comments above regarding presenting recommendations to cut transitional housing funds to the Budget Committee, Ms. Landis said that the Authority should not be in the business of using VOCA and VAWA dollars toward solving housing problems for crime victims. Those issues should be addressed by Housing and Urban Development, or a direct VAWA earmark, or a similar funding source, but not the Authority's VAWA funds.

Ms. Howard said that housing is an issue that needs to be addressed for multiple reasons due to its impact on domestic violence victims. However, to use VAWA funds toward these ends is perhaps not the best use of VAWA funds. She said that if she was to be forced to choose between using VAWA funds to support the MDTs and using VAWA funds to support transitional housing, then she would choose to support the MDTs.

Ms. Landis said that an agency such as Apna Ghar would never see any funds from the City of Chicago for transitional housing model that was described here today.

Committee Chair Jansen said that in some cases, the domestic violence perpetrator is convicted and sentenced to jail, but that person might also have been the sole earner. This would create a whole new kind of victimization for the domestic violence victims, who might now not be able to afford rent and might be literally out on the street.

Ms. Shaw said that the proposal is sound. Care should be taken not to suggest that transitional housing does not meet a safety need for domestic violence victims. For some clients, transitional housing is the only option. However, it is reasonable to present transitional housing as a lower priority than other types of services, particularly given the increase in resources that the Illinois Housing Development Authority IHDA has available to it to deal with affordable housing issues. Given some of the other resources available, transitional housing might not be the best use of VAWA funds from a priority perspective, which is not to say that such funding meets no victims' needs at all. Perhaps arrangements could be made with IHDA to pick up some housing-related costs.

Committee Vice Chair Mandeltort said that originally, transitional housing was funded with VOCA money, but then the OVC mandated that VOCA money not be used for rent or housing-related expenses. At that point, transitional housing programs were shifted to VAWA discretionary funds. Transitional housing was never conceptualized as coming from VAWA.

Ms. Romero said that she has 17 years of experience in working with domestic violence survivors in diverse communities within Chicago and elsewhere. She said that over the years she has noticed a tendency by veteran service providers to want to keep doing the things that they have been doing. Past efforts have worked fairly well for most domestic violence survivors, however, they have not worked well for all survivors. There has been much discussion of underserved or minority communities, but not all participants at this meeting are on the same page regarding the conceptualizing of underserved communities and their needs. There is not much representation of underserved communities at this meeting. Recipients of transitional housing are people who have so many barriers, some of which, such as the substance abuse or extreme poverty to which Ms. Howard alluded, are more properly aligned with institutional racism and/or classicism. Transitional housing issues might have more to do with structural inequalities than sheer victimization. When transitional housing was discussed for the very first time, part of the consideration was that it was very difficult for some of these organizations to get any money for transitional housing for their constituencies in their own communities. She said that Ms. Landis had mentioned that Apna Ghar would probably not see any funding come from the City of Chicago and others have commented that there is a decrease in victims' solicitation of services from the criminal justice system. Many of these victims are from underserved communities and for various reasons they are not coming forward to seek orders of protection. In many immigrant communities, especially after 9/11, there has been a reluctance to seek remedies provided by the criminal justice system. Also,

many immigrants' experiences with governments in their home countries serve to dissuade them from seeking help from law enforcement agencies here. This committee should investigate more creative and innovative ways to address domestic violence in these underserved communities. It is as if an ideal victim model has been collectively imagined by the victim services community, and as a result, there is a great resistance to change, adapt to, or infuse other victim models or to try new solutions to problems. She said that, in her experience, this is true in every domestic violence-related setting. She said that it is time to shift the focus of domestic violence victim analysis from the idealized victim to one that is more real; for example, a woman of color living in extreme poverty, an immigrant, a lesbian, etc. Models for intervention need to address the unique needs of a more diverse array of victims than they have in the past. This would increase solicitation of victim services and, therefore, demonstrate a greater need for these programs to be properly funded, thereby making them more attractive to fund providers. Also, corporate funds are very limited in today's environment and it is extremely difficult to solicit funding from corporations right now. The domestic violence service provider community needs to start thinking "outside the box" to solve some of these problems. This is an emergency. She said that representatives of the communities that she referred to could participate in these discussions and they would bring new ideas to the table.

Ms. Poskin said that the existing grants must have been made in response to a perceived need. When the Violence Against Women Act was created, the compromises were made regarding the percentages of funds were necessary. Many in the victim services community knew that law enforcement, prosecution, and courts were not adequately serving domestic violence or sexual assault victims. The idea behind spreading the funds across different program areas was to foster collaboration among the different criminal justice disciplines. Today, this committee appears to be focused on VAWA and it is concerned about where cut will have to be made when an entire program area is not spending its allotted funds at a rate anywhere even close to the other program areas. There is no ability to redistribute those funds. This committee should not consider cutting service funds away from domestic violence victims (for transitional housing) when there is a roughly \$2 million surplus in the law enforcement program area. Part of the new strategy might be to lobby the OVW to adjust the funding restrictions. The Authority (and its grantees) would benefit from having increased discretionary abilities within a statute that was created to collaboratively assist domestic violence and sexual assault victims. Cutting services to female inmates, for example, would be disastrous. Once women get to prison, the lack of supportive services there would be painful. Even without evaluation data, it is hard to imagine that the \$90,000 in VAWA funds that the IDOC receives for that program is money wasted. This committee should not be spending its energies on determining cuts to services and programs that have proven to be necessary and successful when other funds simply go unspent.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that any strategy must include planning for inevitable award reductions while addressing the federal government regarding these issues and fighting for more flexibility.

Doris Garrett of the Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS), who was in attendance, said that nobody here is suggesting that transitional housing issues are not important. They are suggesting that this committee consider alternatives to secure the necessary funds. She said that the IDHS is currently in discussions with IHDA and IHDA has requested input from IDHS as IHDA drafts its five-year plan. IHDA was surprised to discover that the Authority was funding transitional housing. It might be worth considering the possibility of IHDA working transitional housing into its five-year plan and/or having a serious conversation with HUD regarding funding these programs. These agencies regard domestic violence victims as a priority. It matters how the different agencies interact regarding the continuance of care in these communities. It would be worthwhile to consider whether these programs could be better addressed by other agencies. If so, that would open these VAWA funds up.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that even if funding for transitional housing is eliminated and the IDOC's \$90,000 program receives continued support, that means that a total of \$840,000 between VAWA and VOCA would still be needed. She said that Ms. Poskin's point regarding being forced by the fund allocation formula to leave the law enforcement funds untouched is well taken. She said that once the new OVW director is confirmed by Congress, efforts to persuade OVW to adjust its rules and guidelines might be more fruitful. In the meantime, the Authority must work with what it has.

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff understands the issues with transitional housing, but they are very important, especially in the locations that have no other such services available.

Ms. Shaw said that nobody is questioning the need for the transitional housing programs, but Ms. Garrett had a point that it would be worthwhile if transitional housing programs sought funds from other sources throughout the state.

Mr. Reichgelt said that by increasing the matching funds requirements the grantees will maintain their programs and have an incentive to seek alternate funding sources. In two years, when the new VAWA plan is developed, this committee can decide to not fund transitional housing with victim services funds and they would have established funding sources elsewhere. The MDT program funds were intended to be "seed" money and those programs were supposed to have eventually been picked up and funded by their respective county governments.

Ms. Howard said that, actually, her suggestion was to reduce federal spending on transitional housing, perhaps by increasing matching funds requirements. She said that

she wants to maintain the services because they represent the front doors to other services for the kinds of people that Ms. Romero talked about earlier. If the ICADV were to cut 50 percent of the funds from its domestic violence programs, it would have a huge impact on services to Latinas, for example. Such a cut would impact not only the Latina-specific staff, but other program staff across the board. Transitional housing should not be cut off, but it should be reduced substantially so that the MDTs and the other direct services can be maintained. The VAWA funds that ICADV receives from the Authority support underserved populations throughout Illinois. There are no alternatives for those populations.

Ms. Engel requested that staff provide target dollar amounts that would be needed to continue current programs. She also said that she shared Director Levin's discomfort because the director, Vice Chair Mandeltort, and Ms. Healy Ryan will have to contend with the Budget Committee personally. This committee is about to make an enormous decision regarding transitional housing without the input of transitional housing service providers. She said that the issues are very complicated and that she objects to all of the recommendations. She said that it would be beneficial to create a lobbying committee to engage the IHDA in the hopes of having the IHDA pick up some of the transitional housing funding, and to engage other entities as well.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that, perhaps due to the comfort level, it would be best to move away from transitional housing. The only way to comfortably cut funding to transitional housing would be to know that those programs are receiving funding from another source. She suggested convening a meeting between transitional housing program directors and IHDA to put the possibility of a funding relationship in motion.

Ms. Landis said that every emergency domestic violence shelter needs transitional housing assistance for victims who are leaving emergency domestic violence shelters. There are a fortunate few who manage to get into these transitional housing programs. Within the City of Chicago, the transitional housing model that the Authority currently funds would not be funded by either the city or HUD. For example, if \$27,000 was designated to Apna Ghar in the past and new matching funds requirements effectively reduce the amount of federal dollars that they receive, Apna Ghar will discontinue transitional housing. It isn't that transitional housing is unnecessary, but when a program serves zero clients per year in one case and eight clients per year in another case and the cost/benefit ratio of the funds for those underutilized transitional housing programs are compared to the cost/benefit ratio of other victim services, even to the underserved populations that Ms. Romero described earlier, it becomes clear that, despite its merits, transitional housing needs to be a lower priority. The VAWA funds that the Authority has available would, in the short term, better serve the interests of the domestic violence and sexual assault communities if they were directed to more pressing needs than

transitional housing. Transitional housing must be viewed in a larger context than just the providers.

Ms. Romero said the transitional housing programs should have representatives participating in these conversations because they have insights into the programs that the other participants do not. For example, Apna Ghar has been working very deliberately on developing a program that will eventually be self-sustaining. They should have an opportunity to share their concerns. She said that the provision of shelters and transitional housing would not create a solution to domestic violence. However, these programs should be given the benefit of the doubt and also given an opportunity to discuss their long term plans.

Ms. Shaw moved to adopt the staff's funding recommendations for VAWA. She said that she did so in order to put the funding recommendations on the table for discussion. Ms. Poskin said that, as a victim service provider, she could not vote for a 40 percent matching funds requirement. She said that it would be next to impossible for ICASA to raise that amount of money. That would have a similar effect on ICASA as simply eliminating its funding altogether.

Ms. Shaw suggested making this situation a basis for advocating for the use of general revenue funds. She also requested the projected dollar values of the match increases.

Ms. Howard said that if programs are cut 20 percent across the board, then programs that do not have other funds available to them would struggle.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the reason why staff recommended the 20 percent cut was because of the different situations in each VAWA program area. In the case of the victim services program area, no funding cut is necessary because the coalitions simply split that portion of the award. Ms. Poskin added that the coalitions do not really have a match requirement to begin with. Mr. Reichgelt said that the other programs, particularly prosecution and discretionary programs, are where problems are.

In response to numerous comments and questions, Mr. Reichgelt said that under the federal guidelines, the coalitions were not required to provide matching funds. He said that matching requirements being proposed would not affect the victim service program area. The Authority would not necessarily mandate something that is not mandated by the federal government. The issue of matching funds is really in the hands of this committee.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that it would be best to consider five different matching fund scenarios for each of the VAWA program areas.

Ms. Poskin said that she would not allow victim service funds to go toward the other program areas.

Mr. Reichgelt said that the committee could develop five different matching fund formulas, one for each program area.

Ms. Howard said that she wanted to maintain victim service funding at current levels. This can be done, in part, by decreasing funds to transitional housing. Other funds could be brought to bear on transitional housing. She said that she was not suggesting that transitional housing be cut off tomorrow, but rather that by decreasing funding to those programs, they would seek other revenue streams.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that all VAWA funds will be decreasing. Using discretionary funds is the only way to augment the funds in the other four program areas. She suggested zeroing out the discretionary program area to augment one program area (prosecution), and then administering cuts/match increases to the other program areas. Or, the discretionary program area could be left as-is to retain funds for transitional housing.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that the committee is faced with three basic options:

1. Do nothing and maintain the status quo.
2. Establish a matching fund percentage for each program area.
3. Reduce designation amounts.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that given the situation, the concern is that if matching funds requirements are increased, that will effectively cause some programs to shut down. The alternative is to restrict designations to the point that they remain within the funding levels that are available. She said that the trick is to figure out how to do the same amount of work with less money.

At this time, Committee Chair Jansen tabled the motion by Ms. Shaw so that formal recommendations could be made and voted upon.

Establishment of Funding Strategies

VAWA

Ms. Poskin made a motion with the following proposal: As VAWA federal awards to Illinois are decreased, all grantees endure funding cuts, per grantees' percentage representation within each of the five funding areas, in proportion to the amount of the decrease.

Director Levin said that since we know what VAWA FFY07 funds are available, the percentages and new designations can be easily figured. If the board goes along with whatever the percentage cut is, we could tell the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, based on historical amounts for all grantees, what we anticipate their new grant amounts to be as of July or September of 2008.

Ms. Healy Ryan said that the determination of the VAWA grant funds to the coalitions would be easy since they normally just split the service provider funds. However, in a program area such as prosecution, the new funding amounts would have to be pro-rated per each individual grantee.

Mr. Reichgelt said that what is needed is more complex than a simple percentage cut from FFY06 to FFY07 awards, we need to be concerned with the percentage of the amounts that we have been overspending. We will eventually get to a point when we have one year of funding and that year's funds will be insufficient to continue all programs.

Vice Chair Mandeltort suggested funding programs for fewer than the standard 12 months.

Ms. Shaw said that if Ms. Poskin's proposal were to be enacted, programs in areas that are currently more overspent would see larger cuts to their programs.

Ms. Boerkrem said that in the future, new monies should be disbursed in proportion to the federal award decrease. For example, if the FFY07 award is 14 percent less than the FFY06 award, then programs should receive a 14 percent cut.

Mr. Reichgelt said that some program areas were overspent to the point that a 14 percent funding cut would not adequately reduce spending.

Ms. Shaw said that, should Ms. Poskin's proposal be adopted, everyone should be aware that the impact would be disproportionate.

Director Levin restated Ms. Poskin's motion: Designations of VAWA FFY07 funds are to be made relative to each grantee's percentage of current spending within each program area. She said that staff would know within two weeks what those figures would be and they would be able to present those designations to the Budget Committee.

Ms. Engel said that the problem with the discretionary funds is that there is no formula determining who is entitled to those funds. If we adopt Ms. Poskin's motion, a caveat should be that a small group be appointed to engage law enforcement in discussions

about fund-use strategies to ensure that law enforcement funds are not returned to the federal government.

Mr. Reichgelt said that VAWA funds generally do not lapse back to the federal government. What program funds are not spent end up going toward training and other miscellaneous items.

Ms. Poskin moved that the designations of VAWA FFY07 funds are to be made relative to each grantee's percentage of current spending within each program area. Ms. Larkin seconded the motion. Members present passed the motion by the following votes:

| Member | Yes | No | Abstain | Absent |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|
| Kathleen Argentino | Y | | | |
| Vernie Boerkrem | Y | | | |
| Kim Donahue | | | | X |
| Barbara Engel | Y | | | |
| Cherri Gass | | | | X |
| Norbert Goetten | | | | X |
| Bridget Healy Ryan | | | A | |
| Cheryl Howard | | N | | |
| Leslie Landis | Y | | | |
| Billie Larkin | Y | | | |
| Ellen Mandeltort | Y | | | |
| Lois Moorman | Y | | | |
| Polly Poskin | Y | | | |
| Ana Romero | Y | | | |
| Lori Saleh | Y | | | |
| Barbara Shaw | Y | | | |
| Totals | 11 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

VOCA

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff recommends a 20 percent cut across the board for VOCA programs. This is the best way to ensure that no programs get eliminated. This assumes that staff retains the ability to 1) cut specific grants beyond 20 percent if merited by issues such as poor program performance or unnecessary expenses, and 2) reduce or waive the percentage cut if doing so would make the difference between the program continuing or not.

Ms. Howard asked if it would be possible for grantees with multiple grants to have a say in how the 20 percent cut is administered for all their programs. For example, could a

grantee reduce one grant more or less than another to achieve a 20 percent cut in their grant fund total?

Mr. Reichgelt said that such an arrangement might be workable on a case-by-case basis. He added that, depending on the amount of the FFY08 award compared to the FFY07 award, cuts larger than 20 percent might be necessary. At this point, VOCA programs are being funded out of single federal fiscal years. Program fund cuts would be made according to cuts to the federal award.

In reply to a question by Ms. Poskin, Mr. Reichgelt said that, all things being equal, VOCA programs would receive a 20 percent cut across the board. Mr. Reichgelt said that underperforming programs might receive greater cuts or have funding eliminated completely. He said that he would work with individual grant monitors to determine if any specific grants should be reduced. For example, for programs that regularly expend less than 90 percent of their designations, a grant monitor might request funding reductions toward the amounts that the programs regularly spend and in some cases this might constitute cuts of more than 20 percent. Other reasons to cut a grant further might be that there are an abundance of ancillary costs, such as (out-of-state) travel or equipment, that are not central to the core of the program. Individual items could be eliminated, thereby reducing program costs. Mr. Reichgelt said that a great example of this kind of cut would be our JAG grant to the CCSAO. The grant was slated to get a 20 percent cut, but we cut it by 25 percent because the CCSAO had lapsed large amounts of funds two years in a row. At a later date, Ms. Healy Ryan made a presentation explaining the lapsed funds and the reason that future lapses were unlikely to the Budget Committee in an effort to get the other five percent reinstated and the Budget Committee did increase the CCSAO's designation somewhat, but it was not ultimately restored even to the 20 percent cut. The grantees would have to make valid cases as to why they should not be cut more than the 20 percent.

Ms. Howard moved to cut all designations to current grants by 20 percent in the next round of funding, with the stipulation that Authority staff be allowed to make adjustments to that percentage per their discretion.

Vice Chair Mandeltort said that it is imperative that Authority staff communicate with grantees prior to any funding adjustments to allow the grantees the opportunity to find alternate funding sources.

Ms. Poskin asked if the fund cut percentage would decrease in relation to the federal award amounts, should those amounts be greater than expected. For example, if the goal is to reduce spending to \$13 million and the next award provides \$15 million in program funds, then the cut might only need to be eight or ten percent. Mr. Reichgelt said that this is correct.

Ms. Engel said that some of the ideas generated today - about how to talk to law enforcement; about the use of prosecution dollars; about how to talk to housing people regarding the importance of looking at domestic violence as they look at housing – these are really good ideas, but without a commitment by a dedicated group, those things are not going to happen and we would not be bringing as many resources to this arena as we could.

Ms. Saleh seconded Ms. Howard’s motion to cut all designations to current grants by 20 percent in the next round of funding, with the stipulation that the Authority’s staff be allowed to make adjustments to that percentage per their discretion.

Further Discussion

Ms. Howard said that there needs to be more discussion about transitional housing, including rural transitional housing. The Authority and DHS need to be involved in that discussion.

Ms. Poskin said representatives from the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) or HUD should participate in that discussion. The CHA is swamped with elderly and disabled poor and disabled. There is no place yet to provide services to sexual assault and domestic violence victims in these populations. There are some very strict HUD and Supreme Court rulings governing housing, so it would be beneficial to have HUD or CHA representatives involved.

Ms. Garrett said that HUD had specific definitions as to what constitutes a continuum of care. A discussion should center on that.

Ms. Howard suggested identifying areas that could play constructive roles in evaluations. It would be beneficial to have transitional housing components to measure to monitor what is and is not working. Some work has been done already regarding the rural transitional housing grants.

Mr. Reichgelt suggested creating rural MDT programs at some point in the future.

Director Levin said that the federal government is always interested in new and innovative program ideas.

Adjourn

Ms. Engel moved to adjourn. Ms. Saleh seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.