

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

**MINUTES OF FUNDING MEETING  
May 4, 5, 6, 2009**

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

**Monday, May 4, 2009**

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

Chair Ann House called the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault meeting to order at 8:45 a.m. on Wednesday, May 4, 2009. Five Council members or their proxies were present at roll call to form a quorum; Stephanie McFadden joined the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

**Council members present:** **Ann House** (chair - public member); **Stephanie McFadden** (vice chair, public member); **Colonel Audie Holloway** (Department of Public Safety, AST); **Cynthia Curran** (Department of Education & Early Development); **Cathy Satterfield** (for Richard Svobodny - Department of Law); **Jayne Andreen** (for Beverly Wooley, Department of Health & Social Services)

**Council members absent:** None - there is one vacant seat

**Council staff present** (in person or by telephone): **Chris Ashenbrenner**, Executive Director; **Lauree Morton**, Program Specialist/Grant Writer (by teleconference); **Jo Griggs**, Administrative Officer; **Ella Nierra**, Administrative Assistant; **Ann Rausch**, Associate Coordinator; **Linda Hoven**, Associate Coordinator

**Others present** (in person or by telephone): **Peggy Brown**, Alaska Network on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault; **Judy Cordell**, **Suzi Pearson** and **Tim Dee**, Abused Women's Aid In Crisis (AWAIC) in Anchorage; **Ginger Baim**, Safe and Fear-Free Environment (SAFE) in Dillingham; **Brenda Stanfill**, Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living (IAC) in Fairbanks; **Bernie Jarriel** and **Tammy Jarriel**, Seaview Community Services (SCS) in Seward; **Beth Adams** (ACS); **Chris Bauman**, Sitkans Against Family Violence (SAFV) in Sitka; **Naomi Michalsen**, Women in Safe Homes (WISH) in Ketchikan; **Cheri Smith**, **Sue Best** and **Barbara Waters**, The LeeShore Center (LSC) in Kenai; **Virginia Walsh** and **Cheryl Humme**, Arctic Women In Crisis (AWIC) in Barrow; **Saralyn Tabachnick** and **Rachael Helf**, Aiding Women in Abuse and Rape Emergencies (AWARE) in Juneau; **Michelle DeWitt**, Tundra Women's Coalition (TWC) in Bethel; **Rebecca Shields**, Kodiak Women's Resource & Crisis Center (KWRCC); **Nancy Haag**, Standing Together Against Rape (STAR) in Anchorage; **Peg**

**Coleman**, South Peninsula Haven House (SPHH) in Homer; **Janet Bogard** and **Michelle Dakai**, Maniilaq Family Crisis Center (MFCC) in Kotzebue; **Nicole Songer** and **Melanie Mattson**, Cordova Family Resource Center (CFRC); **Carolyn Quan** and **Susan Pickrell**, Ketchikan Indian Corporation Tribal Clinic; **Susan Sullivan**, Victims For Justice (VFJ) in Anchorage; **Susan Whitefeather**, Providence Valdez Behavioral Health; **Samaria Ross**, Bering Sea Women's Group (BSWG) in Nome; **Octavia Thompson**, Advocates for Victims of Violence (AVV) in Valdez; **Judy Gette** and **Jeannie Warden**, Alaska Family Services (AFS) in Palmer; **Lynn Crane**, Unalaskans Against Sexual Assault & Family Violence (USAFV)

### **COUNCIL CONFLICT INQUIRY**

Chair House inquired if Council members had a potential conflict of interest with any items on this meeting's agenda.

There were no conflict-of-interest disclosures.

### **APPROVE MINUTES**

Referring to the last paragraph on page 8, Col. Holloway clarified that he did not have trouble with the Rape Prevention Education Planning Group's partnership with the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). His only concern had been with the strategic planning process, and he had wanted to make sure the group got something out of it. He thought the planning process turned out very well.

JAYNE ANDREEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 2009 REGULAR MEETING, AS AMENDED. (No audible second) The motion passed unanimously.

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

CDVSA Executive Director Chris Ashenbrenner gave a PowerPoint slide presentation, saying the visual aid was to make it easier for Council members to see the funding dollars available for award at this meeting and for distribution from future grants. The Council also has decisions to make regarding disbursements of the next round of funds coming in. She provided copies of the slides to Council members (*a copy is on file at the CDVSA office.*)

Ms. Ashenbrenner thanked every program person and community member - and their friends, who testified in support of the CDVSA FY2010 budget. There was powerful testimony, and it really made a difference. The original budget request was an increment of approximately \$1.7 million, and the Legislature approved just under \$1.2 million. The Legislature reduced the grants line by \$381,900, which is where most of the shelter funding comes from. The other item included in the grants line increment was \$159,273 for prevention activities. The \$290,000 for data and research was not reduced. This is the first time in her experience that prevention

projects and data research were specifically funded in the CDVSA budget, an exciting step when increases were provided for shelter and non-shelter programs at the same time. The final CDVSA budget had a \$1,167,900 increment for program grant increases, bringing the total CDVSA budget to a record \$12,566,200. *[Ms. Ashenbrenner corrected this statement later in the minutes. See "FY10 Budget Discussion" following lunch on May 5.]* Domestic violence and sexual assault programs will be receiving about 77% of that, and maybe slightly more when prevention activities are included.

Ms. Ashenbrenner reviewed the goals set out in the strategic plan that the CDVSA met by the FY2010 budget: (almost) adequate funding for victim services; funding for prevention; and funding for a research project to define and describe the scope and impact of domestic violence and sexual assault in Alaska.

The data and research money is one-year funding from the state, so there will be no extensions. An initial planning meeting has already been held to make sure the project hits the ground running on July 1, 2009. A fuller meeting is planned in Anchorage to develop what is envisioned as a statewide survey that will incorporate aspects from a Violence Against Women national survey on the incidents and consequences of intimate partner violence (to maybe get some state-to-national comparisons), as well as questions that are Alaska-specific, for instance about substance abuse. The plan for the data and research project needs the Council's input on the direction being contemplated to use this short-term funding.

The funding for prevention activities is also one-year money, and the CDVSA must move very quickly. Staff and others have testified to part of that money being used for a statewide campaign, with the remainder to support local initiatives around Alaska. The Network on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault is well-placed to lead this, through a grant to them. They have a prevention specialist in place, and they have been working on prevention with the Delta Project through the Centers for Disease Control. The Delta strategic plan and the Rape Prevention Education Plan should guide them and the CDVSA in what the prevention projects will look like. The Council's input and approval are also needed on the planned use for the prevention funding.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said that another upcoming project is implementation of the provisions in HB 63, the CDVSA bill that came out of the CDVSA Task Force Report. The biggest task administratively is changing staff from exempt status to classified, and management is already working on writing position descriptions and getting them through Human Resources classification, etc. Two new Council members will come on board July 1 — possibly the Department of Corrections deputy commissioner and a public member designated to be from a rural area off the road system. The term for public members has changed from two to three years, a measure that was broadly supported because of the complexity of Council work.

Ms. Ashenbrenner mentioned a batterers intervention program review and improvement project that is paid for by the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) earmark funding (using some of

the administrative money and a bit of the discretionary component). A strategic plan goal is to determine the effectiveness of batterers intervention programs. That question arises from various sources: Legislative Budget and Audit in 2007 strongly recommended that CDVSA get something meaningful, and it came up again in the CDVSA Task Force Report. CDVSA will procure some professional services to facilitate the meetings and to compile recommendations for the Council. A limited request for proposal (RFP) should be released by May 25.

Another large project that started in February is to improve how the child welfare system and the domestic violence and sexual assault system work together to support women and children who have experience abuse in their homes. This involves understanding how one other's systems work, developing protocols, and training. Participants include Office of Children's Services, Indian Child Welfare representatives, the Network, and CDVSA. Another meeting is planned for this summer. Everyone agrees the process is off to a good start, but things have moved slower than hoped because the Office of Children's Services is dealing with the results of a federal review.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 economic stimulus funding is coming. The Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant award of \$545,000 was announced last week, 5% of which is allowed for administrative expenses. Sometimes CDVSA takes up to 5% and sometimes not, depending on the administrative work happening in the office. Ms. Ashenbrenner said the office will probably use the administrative portion because the Recovery Act has some in-depth reporting requirements and a short time frame. The Department of Public Safety commissioner is expected to sign acceptance of the VOCA grant award this week.

The stimulus funding from a Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) STOP grant will be just over \$804,000 for one year, of which 10% is an administrative allowance. The VAWA grant designation is 25% to law enforcement (Alaska State Troopers), 25% to the Department of Law, 5% to the Alaska Court System, 30% to victim services, and 15% is discretionary. The Council, acting as the VAWA Committee, allocates the discretionary component, with advice from the Network. Alaska State Troopers plan to focus on sexual assault response and law enforcement activities with their portion. The Department of Law is going to continue paying for two half-time prosecutors in Palmer whose funding would otherwise end. Both the Alaska Legislature and the administration are being careful not to fund anything new that will have to be sustained when the stimulus funding has run out, but paying for positions that would otherwise be going away is one place that is more acceptable.

Ms. Ashenbrenner outlined staff's recommendation that the Council combine the victim services and discretionary components of the VAWA STOP grant stimulus funding and make all that money (approximately \$300,000) available to victim services programs. The assumption is that the grant is available for one year, but it could be a little longer. CDVSA staff testified and also spoke to the administration to the effect that these funds could be for one-time projects, such as items to help program facilities be more energy efficient (maintenance, upgrades, furnaces, etc.), or for purchasing curricula or other items to support providing victim services, but that would

not require continued funding past FY2010. The reporting requirements for grantees are separate and have very short timelines. The Council office has six days after the end of a quarter to report to the federal offices. That means that grantees will have only two or three days to complete their reports and submit them to the Council office. Further, the Office of Management and Budget in the Governor's Office wants to look at the reports. So the victim services programs that apply for the economic stimulus grants must be aware of the tight reporting requirements.

*[Typist's note: I did not have Chris's PowerPoint slides to refer to, so I didn't have a clear idea of the dollars involved here. Somebody please check to make sure the figures in this section make sense. Thanks!]*

Ms. Ashenbrenner indicated that the Council could distribute the economic stimulus grants via a new competitive RFP, or the Council could consider that those programs funded through the current competitive process are eligible entities that will be allowed to request the funds for projects that meet the purpose of the funding. A new competitive RFP is a lengthier process, but an up side is that it would allow programs to apply that may not have put in a proposal for the funding being distributed at this meeting. Another positive to a separate RFP is that it would not contribute to the perception of CDVSA being a closed shop. Conversely, accepting applications from already eligible programs still requires that they outline why they need the funding and estimate the time frame, etc. It would also target the money to the primary victim services providers in the state that applied for this year's state funding and other grants. The stimulus money could help make up the gap between the requested amount for FY2010 and the funding that is available, because currently the total requests exceed the money the Council has to award this year. Staff prefers the shorter process because it is simpler, but it is the Council's decision.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that the Sexual Assault Services Program (SASP) is a new VAWA formula grant for rape crisis centers. CDVSA has submitted an application to the Office of Violence Against Women, even while the amount of the grant has not yet been exactly determined. The first year may be \$180,000 with follow up years being about \$98,000. The CDVSA Office expects award notification this summer, which would probably lead to disbursement of the funds by fall. With the Network's concurrence, CDVSA staff recommends adding the SASP grant to the CDVSA funding stream for programs providing rape crisis direct services because the amount is small for issuing a separate RFP. Further, the CDVSA already supports all the rape crisis centers in the state through regular funding streams. Again, this needs Council discussion and a decision.

Ms. Ashenbrenner apologized for inserting so much additional business into the Council's funding meeting, but the Council is not likely to meet again until its next quarterly meeting in September. With a new executive director coming on board this summer, this business needs to be taken care of so that staff can get working on the list of grants she just described.

[Stephanie McFadden joined the meeting at 9:45 a.m.]

Ms. Ashenbrenner reported that staff applied for a federal fiscal year 2008 VAWA Grants to Encourage Arrests earmark. She said she spoke with the Office of Violence Against Women directors at the March meeting in Juneau about this. The application is for \$750,000, but the grant may only be for \$500,000. The earmark was \$2.8 million and was supposed to be divided four ways, which does not result in \$500,000. Staff is pushing for the grant to be divided equitably. CDVSA polled the Network programs and Alaska Family Services in Palmer (a non-Network program) and overwhelmingly heard about the need to enhance legal advocacy in the rural areas. There will not be enough funding to put legal advocates in every victim services program, so the proposal is to put full-time advocate positions in the larger programs and to fund half-time positions in the medium-sized programs. Further, the smaller programs that are more rural focused would have a statewide advocate who would be available by telephone and who could maybe travel out to some areas to provide support. The statewide advocate would be based in the legal advocacy program that the Network runs. Staff expects the Grants to Encourage Arrest earmark award this summer or early fall. All the other funding that the Office of Violence Against Women has is being put on the back burner until the stimulus money gets out, so there are delays in getting those other grants.

Regarding the search for a new CDVSA executive director, Ms. Ashenbrenner said the recruitment will likely be published throughout the state this week. State rules preclude recruitment out of state unless an in-state recruitment does not yield enough viable candidates on which the Council can make a decision. She said she has offered her support so the Council can move quickly on this, because there is so much important CDVSA business happening right now. She is working with the Department of Public Safety to put an interim executive director in place to coordinate everything that is going on, to manage communications internally and externally, and to assist with the hiring process.

Ms. Ashenbrenner thanked the Council members for their support, saying her time as executive director has been a great experience. She also thanked staff and the Network people, saying she was lucky that in the last couple of years there was a confluence of things, such as a big permanent fund dividend, where more money came available to pay for things like prevention and bring about big improvements.

Her final recommendation to the Council was to replace the official Council member picture.

Chair House indicated she would schedule the items that the executive director brought up later in this meeting. She then led everyone in applause for Ms. Ashenbrenner.

### **ALASKA NETWORK ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE & SEXUAL ASSAULT REPORT**

Peggy Brown, executive director for the Network, commended Ms. Ashenbrenner, as CDVSA director, and the Council members for the past two to three years because of what can happen when the Network and the CDVSA are working together. Both organizations gained a lot of ground and did some amazing things. This can be attributed to the Council and the CDVSA Task

Force and especially Ms. Ashenbrenner's amazing leadership in turning around perceptions and getting things going. Even within the federal system, a lot of grants now are requiring that coalitions work in tandem with VAWA state administrators. At meetings she hears from some states that do not have the relationships that the Network has, and they ask how to start something like that. The reputation of the Council and the Network in the state is probably at an all-time high right now.

Ms. Brown stated that with the coalition's economic stimulus money directly from the federal government they plan to recruit and hire a part-time communications director. That position, in conjunction with the director of prevention, sets the Network and the CDVSA up to do some wonderful things around prevention that is not at any real cost to the programs or their funding but is very inclusive of them. One concern when work on prevention first started was that it would become the poster child, and the crisis intervention work would be forgotten. In some ways, the federal economic stimulus is a good way to get prevention work moving to see what can happen.

Ms. Brown commented that it was an interesting legislative session. The CDVSA received its largest increment in its FY2010 budget, which was the result of hard work from the programs, the Network, and the Council — but particularly because the Council and the Department of Public Safety put the money in the budget on behalf of the Governor in the first place. She thanked everyone and said the money was worth fighting for.

Regarding how the Council ultimately decides to distribute the economic stimulus grant funding, Ms. Brown said that during much of her testimony to House and Senate Finance Committees she said that the entities were being good stewards of the Legislature's funding. Her impression is that being good stewards is basically keeping the programs that the CDVSA currently funds highly functional, not just in providing services but their capital projects, renovations, and repairs. Being good stewards and using the money efficiently is much more significant than a perception that the CDVSA is a closed shop. It is a good argument for not going through a huge RFP process for new programs to get stimulus grant funding.

Ms. Brown reported that most of the CDVSA funding goes toward victim services core operating expenses. Many programs have alternative sources of funding for various projects. This year has been very hard on many programs, ranging from the rural areas around Nome having 12 storms and two staff who were homeless to AWAIC in Anchorage, which has been in lockdown and over capacity. She testified to the Legislature that as the economy gets worse the demand for services goes up, and the need for law enforcement increases. It may not just be the number of shelter nights or the number of beds filled described in the grant proposals, but it is the constant flow of people in and out of shelters. The funding requests are predominantly based on the fact that about a year and a half ago Brenda Stanfill, the executive director of IAC in Fairbanks and an accountant, helped the Network programs develop basic operating costs. It turned out that rural programs were requesting about a 20% increase in operating costs and that more urban programs were needing at least a 13% increase. The Network used those numbers when talking

to the Legislature. Some of the programs have requested less than those amounts in their proposals, while some have requested more. She asked that the Council keep in mind that programs are not accustomed to asking for operating cost increases of that size.

Ms. Brown expressed the programs' appreciation to Ms. Ashenbrenner and said the executive director has turned around the functioning and impression of the Council in the eyes of many people who had been observant and very critical. Ms. Ashenbrenner did so with grace and aplomb, and it has been an honor and privilege to watch her work. Everyone is sad that she is leaving.

Chair House thanked Ms. Brown for explaining the Network's efforts to calculate hard and fast shelter operating expenses. She asked how they were operating salary-wise. Ms. Brown replied that for the past 10-15 years program directors and advocates have come into this type of work because they care about it. But as more alternative funding has come in, the Network has not seen that advocates across the board are getting the salaries that are competitive in the regions. There is no reason that two advocates working at a shelter should be homeless because they cannot pay rent. Salary levels vary across programs: those that are more heavily resourced can actually pay a more competitive wage and health insurance. Health insurance costs have risen, and what employees get for that insurance has gone down. Advocates are highly trained people who constantly get more training, and they are doing emotional triage with victims. A seasoned advocate is worth as much as a trained medical professional in an emergency room. Salaries are something to take a serious look at and to do something about. The Council and the Network have the power to do something about that, to at least make advocate salaries minimally competitive.

Ms. McFadden mentioned that she noticed in the grant proposals that salaries for program directors varied. She wondered if that was a geographic difference, or what the reason was for that. Ms. Brown replied that boards of large urban programs are competing with other nonprofits in the community to keep a director who does a great job, so those salaries are probably higher. The salaries should be market driven. If director salaries are too low, it results in turnover, which leads to whole agency turnover and being unable to keep staff. In rural areas it depends on the size of the community, what the salaries are in that region, and who the programs are competing with. Alaska tends to have directors who stay for a while, but they have to have value that is market driven and not just be motivated by their passion and how they value their work. The shelter programs are providing services and working collaboratively with everybody in their communities, so they are not isolated units.

Ms. McFadden asked how important it is for shelters to be able to provide services to children. Ms. Brown said it is crucial. In Alaska, children are getting services with their mothers and sometimes siblings. Any movement with prevention is going to be with that age group of children. Providing children's services at shelter programs is critical to what they do. She encouraged anyone who has not seen the shelter services for children to do so — they are designed to keep those kids from becoming either victims or perpetrators at some point. Services

to children in conjunction with mothers is more difficult and costs more, but it is more productive in general.

### **FINANCIAL REPORT**

CDVSA administrative officer Jo Griggs reported that the FY09 budget is 95% spent out or committed. The CDVSA spent \$8.7 million in grants to victim services programs, and approximately another \$1 million in various federal grants that went to programs. Training funds will be available to the programs in Rural Domestic and Safe Havens. She encouraged programs to act on the email messages from CDVSA coordinators as quickly as possible because the window of opportunity for these training funds is short. CDVSA staff will assist in finding out if training can be certified.

Ms. Griggs stated that at the last meeting the Council asked her to check on travel for the Council to hold a meeting in a rural Alaska community. She has calculated the travel costs and worked that into the FY10 budget.

Chair House called a scheduled break at 10:18 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

### **COUNCIL ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL TAKE UP THE ITEMS IN THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT THAT REQUIRE COUNCIL ACTION SO THAT EVERYONE KNOWS ALL THE ISSUES THAT ARE OUT THERE AND WHERE THE COUNCIL STANDS ON THEM BEFORE THE PROGRAMS GIVE THEIR PRESENTATIONS. JAYNE ANDREEN SECONDED.

The motion passed unanimously.

JAYNE ANDREEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ACCEPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR THE DATA AND RESEARCH PROJECT. COLONEL HOLLOWAY SECONDED.

The motion passed without objection.

JAYNE ANDREEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE ALASKA NETWORK ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE & SEXUAL ASSAULT WILL LEAD THE PREVENTION PROJECT THROUGH A GRANT (\$159,273). COLONEL HOLLOWAY SECONDED.

The motion passed unanimously.

For clarification, Ms. Ashenbrenner explained that the Council had two decisions to make on the VOCA and VAWA STOP economic stimulus funding. One was whether to combine the discretionary and victim services components of the VAWA STOP grant stimulus funding into one grant that would go to victim services programs in the state. The discretionary component, which is 15% of the VAWA STOP grant, can and has been used for other projects, at the Council's discretion. The second decision would be whether to issue a new RFP for disbursing those funds or to limit the applicants to those programs that are approved at this meeting for the regular two-year funding.

JAYNE ANDREEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL COMBINE INTO ONE LINE THE VICTIM SERVICES AND DISCRETIONARY COMPONENTS OF THE VAWA STOP FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE. STEPHANIE McFADDEN SECONDED.

The motion passed unanimously.

JAYNE ANDREEN MOVED, FOR THE PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION, THAT APPLICATIONS FOR THE COMBINED VOCA FUNDING AND VAWA STOP FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE, WHICH IS A TOTAL OF \$816,102, BE SOLICITED ONLY FROM THE FY2010 PROGRAMS THAT ARE FUNDED THROUGH THE GRANT PROCESS AT THIS MEETING. COLONEL HOLLOWAY SECONDED.

Ms. Ashenbrenner made it clear that it was limited to those programs that receive CDVSA funding through this meeting's award process, because there are other CDVSA grantees that are VAWA grantees that are not at this meeting.

Ms. Andreen said she appreciated staff delineating the pros and cons of doing a competitive RFP versus disbursing the funding through the existing application process. She supported a quicker disbursement of the funding because there is a short time limit. It is also important that people not be burdened with another application process. Her concern was that the economic stimulus funding needs to focus more on capital type improvements, but not all of those type requests may have been included in the FY2010 funding applications. For example, she herself would not include the need for a new shelter roof in an operating proposal. She was concerned about excluding possible needs for which the stimulus money is much more appropriate.

Ms. Ashenbrenner explained that staff's view was that the grant proposals for FY2010 funding would not be the actual applications for the stimulus money. But the grantees resulting from this meeting would be the ones to submit an application to the CDVSA for the VOCA and VAWA STOP economic stimulus funds, in which they would lay out a plan for how they intended to spend that money. It would not be a full-blown RFP but similar to what was done with the second round of Denali Commission grant money. The Council or a subgroup of the Council would have to determine that the proposals meet the two criteria in the federal Recovery Act,

which is to preserve jobs or stimulate the economy.

Chair House said she wanted to be sure that people who were not at this meeting would still be eligible to apply for the stimulus funds. Ms. Ashenbrenner reiterated that any program that receives a grant for funding due to this 2010-2011 fiscal years grant cycle procurement would be an eligible applicant for the stimulus funding: however, a program need not be at this meeting and make a presentation in order for the Council to award funding.

Ms. Andreen asked if the applicant pool for a limited grant specifically for federal stimulus funds was limited to victim services programs or if it also included batterers intervention programs. Ms. Ashenbrenner said the victim services organizations only.

Ms. McFadden inquired about the process to handle any federal stimulus funding that could possibly be left over after all the eligible applicants for the money have been awarded their requests. Ms. Ashenbrenner indicated that was highly unlikely, given the group of potential applicants and their crucial needs, but if it were to happen then staff would come back to the Council and ask about going out for another limited grant or an open procurement.

Ms. McFadden raised the possibility of a program not applying for funding under the 2010-2011 grant cycle procurement, but the Council is aware that their building's roof is in such disrepair that they could benefit from the federal stimulus money. Ms. Ashenbrenner replied that that type of situation is the negative aspect of doing a limited grant to applicants that are funded at this meeting. However, if a domestic violence/sexual assault services program is in that much disrepair, she would expect them to have put in an application for the 2010-2011 funding.

Ms. Andreen indicated her motion was amended to specify victim services programs, as follows:

JAYNE ANDREEN MOVED THAT APPLICATIONS FOR THE COMBINED VOCA FUNDING AND VAWA STOP FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE, WHICH IS A TOTAL OF \$816,102, BE SOLICITED ONLY FROM THE FY2010 VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAMS THAT ARE FUNDED THROUGH THE GRANT PROCESS AT THIS MEETING.

The second on the motion concurred, and the motion passed unanimously.

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ADD THE NEW SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM (SASP) GRANT TO THE FUNDING STREAM FOR THE PROGRAMS PROVIDING RAPE CRISIS DIRECT SERVICES. JAYNE ANDREEN SECONDED.

Ms. Andreen noted that although the CDVSA has an idea of the SASP funding amount for the first year (about \$180,000), she wondered what would happen if the CDVSA does not get the projected amount. Ms. Ashenbrenner replied that the sexual assault services programs would

simply get less. Ms. Griggs clarified that staff intended to distribute the SASP grant based on the percentage the programs are funded in the FY2010 grant cycle.

Ms. Andreen said the motion would not actually award the SASP grant money today, but the Council is agreeing that the amount, when it is awarded to the state, will go into the funding stream and be a funding increase for the rape crisis centers at that point. Ms. Griggs confirmed that was correct.

The motion passed unanimously.

**VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAM PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS**

Fiscal year 2010 is the first year of a CDVSA two-year funding cycle. Program applicants were allowed three minutes to make an oral presentation to the Council, followed by up to 15 minutes for Council members to ask questions of the applicants. Programs were then allowed two minutes for final comments.

The total amount of funds to be distributed was \$9,698,632.

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

Col. Holloway inquired if there were any presentations scheduled for programs that did not qualify because they did not get the necessary information in by the deadline. Ms. Ashenbrenner said that Emmonak Women's Shelter (EMS) was missing their articles of incorporation that prove they are an eligible nonprofit, and they had not sent those in yet. Unless EMS appeared at their scheduled time and brought the missing documents with them, they would not be eligible to be funded. Also, Akeela, Inc. submitted a proposal for a batterers intervention grant, but they did not have a state-approved batterers intervention program, nor had they applied. That made them ineligible for funding. She checked with Ms. Morton, who did not think there were any others that were disqualified or that risked being disqualified.

**Alaska Family Services (AFS) - Palmer**

Presenters: Judy Gette (director for dv/sa programs) and Jeannie Warden (lead case manager at the shelter)

FY09 Award.....	\$505,041
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$505,041

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Chair House asked how many people AFS sheltered in 2007. Ms. Warden said they served 427 individuals in FY07 and 426 in FY08, in an eight-room, 32-bed shelter. Chair House asked why there was a 300% increase in requests for services in the last five years. Ms. Gette replied that the Matanuska-Susitna Valley community has been the largest growing in the state, so the biggest contributor to the increase came from the population growth and thus more people

needing services. Outreach activities to let people know about AFS's services likely contributed to the increase. The program has been in Palmer so long as the former Valley Resource Center that part of the outreach has been to educate about the name change.

Responding to Chair House about \$18,750 depreciation shown under projects in-kind, Ms. Gette said that with AFS she had the luxury of having a director of administration and an executive director (Dr. Bennice) who typically do the financials. Dr. Bennice was unable to attend this meeting for a medical reason, and they are currently hiring a new director of administration. So she was unable to answer how AFS accomplished that depreciation number. Chair House indicated she would like follow-up on that question later.

Chair House asked if the part-time employees received medical benefits. Ms. Gette said no, just full-time employees. Noting that AFS had an audit in 2006, Chair House asked if they were preparing to do another audit soon. Ms. Gette responded that a fiscal audit was completed at the beginning of April, but they do not have the audit report yet to see if there are any findings.

Ms. Curran inquired about how AFS uses its evaluation process for continuous improvement. Ms. Warren explained that the evaluation process is to let AFS know what the program's survivors say the program is doing right or doing wrong. Their main focus is on safety and referral to help the women in shelter with their families to exit the shelter. AFS has a pretty low recidivism rate based on what she hears from other programs, and she believes that is because they have a strong case management program to help educationally, as well as with people's financial and housing needs.

Ms. Satterfield asked for more information about a compliance officer for council accreditation. Ms. Gette said AFS is in the process of applying for accreditation for all its programs, except for child care assistance, through the Council on Accreditation. One of the positions that a senior manager holds is as compliance monitor to oversee all of the requirements for accreditation.

Ms. Satterfield pointed out that the AFS grant application states that the program has a fiscal audit annually, but the last one was in 2006. Ms. Gette clarified that it is done every other year, not annually.

Ms. Andreen said she was unaware of any domestic violence accreditation process. Ms. Gette said the Council on Accreditation covers mostly social service or behavioral health programs, and domestic violence is specifically listed. There are general standards for domestic violence and sexual assault programs, and AFS will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with those standards. Ms. Andreen asked for the oversight entity for that, which Ms. Gette said was a national organization. Further responding, she indicated she did not know if it was an umbrella organization or who the contributing entities to the Council on Accreditation were.

Noting the reported 300% increase in requests for services over the past five years, Ms.

Satterfield inquired why AFS was not asking for increased funding in FY10. She asked if AFS believed that the amount they received last year would be sufficient with this kind of growth. Ms. Warren stated that five years ago the program moved into a larger building, raising the number of beds from 20 to 32. Part of the increase in requests for services was because they have more shelter beds to offer. However, the question about finances was Dr. Bennice's field. Ms. Gette added that Dr. Bennice had indicated to her that there was not going to be any additional funding available, so AFS submitted according to their previous budgets. They try to supplement from other available grants, so they have accessed an emergency shelter grant and been able to use that to pay increases in utilities and to replace some existing appliances and furniture, that sort of thing.

Ms. Andreen said the following was partly a question for CDVSA staff, but she was surprised that there were not more revenue sources listed in the AFS grant application. She understood from the RFP that programs were supposed to list all program funds, but she did not know if that meant agency funds or domestic violence and sexual assault funds. Ms. Ashenbrenner said the RFP was not requesting that programs provide the budget for the whole agency, just for domestic violence and sexual assault programs. Ms. Andreen said in-kind is very important to the work being done, but there was very little match provided beyond that — just \$34,000 for general funds and \$17,000 for FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). She asked if the presenters were aware of any other funding streams that are supporting the AFS dv/sa services. Ms. Gette said they are a large agency, so only a small percentage to pay for administrative staff comes from CDVSA funding. They have 25 grants from various programs, and those all feed into supporting the different positions. AFS does not need 100% funding for the dv/sa positions.

Ms. Satterfield asked for more information about the anger management class. Ms. Gette said AFS offers anger management through the family violence program, which is separate from the batterers intervention program. AFS is seeing court orders requiring people to take an anger management class, so they offer that free to any of the women who are in the shelter. It is a co-ed group, but it is not domestic violence offenders. There is also a free teen anger management class.

For her two-minute closing, Ms. Gette stated that AFS sees a possible need for a second smaller shelter in the Big Lake/Willow area as shelter nights increase and housing and transportation issues continue to challenge victims in their pursuit of self reliance. AFS has been doing some outreach in the Talkeetna and Trapper Creek communities, and they are finding the need there. The board of directors are actively gathering information to assess community needs to this and other related areas of service. As AFS works toward accreditation, they are beginning to see the value in having documentation and standards that are common across the agency. Their goal is to complete the process around the end of the year. For most of her 31 years of working in human services she has been involved in direct client contact. As she has become more of an administrator she has had to at times stop and remember the individual lives that AFS is there to impact. They recently had a shelter resident who had been in a long-term relationship that had grown more physically violent, resulting in the need for three facial reconstruction surgeries.

This woman had maintained a good attitude and is actually an inspiration to several other women in the shelter. This woman stated that she did not know what she would have done if the shelter had not been available. Ms. Gette said sometimes she stops by the shelter just to play with the babies and toddlers, and she agreed with Ms. Brown's comment in the Network report that this is the first chance at prevention. Some children will not engage with strangers, while others are very open and want to get picked up. She likes to see the comraderie and support that the women begin to offer each other through kind words and helping with child care, rides, or just listening.

**Advocates for Victims of Violence (AVV) - Valdez**

Presenter: Octavia Thompson (executive director)

FY09 Award.....\$281,048

FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....\$294,323

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. McFadden asked, in light of the terrible housing market in that area, what people do when they have reached the limit for staying at the shelter. Ms. Thompson replied that typically 30 days is the maximum someone can stay at the shelter. However, if there is a need, they can apply for extensions. Valdez is a rural community but with high personal income due to the Alaska pipeline being there. Housing is very limited. Some rent assistance is available through Alaska Public Housing for people to move into apartments, which are sometimes quite substandard. There are seven houses that victims can sometimes move into, and they often find roommates to help pay the rent. AVV helps the victims get into the job market and get assistance for childcare so that they can afford housing in Valdez.

Ms. Curran asked how AVV is involving other service area entities with its work. Ms. Thompson said AVV works very closely with the native tribes within Valdez, as well as the Copper River Native Association and the Mount Sanford Tribal Consortium, which includes Chistochina and Mentasta. With the crisis line, if someone is not in shelter, typically they transfer it to Alaska Family Services, which is one of the in-kind things they will do for AVV. AVV also works closely with the police departments and the court system within the communities of Glennallen and Valdez. It is very difficult sometimes because Valdez does not have a district attorney or prosecutor located there, and AVV usually has to go through Palmer.

Ms. Curran inquired how AVV planned to use its evaluation to improve services and make sure they are meeting the need. Ms. Thompson replied that because they have a small, homey shelter they get direct feedback from the clients, and in fact they will walk into her office to tell her what is going on. It is a great thing. The staff held a meeting in January and included a former shelter victim and the community response team. They discussed where they wanted to go with the services, as well as being able to market and do prevention work within the community.

Ms. McFadden asked for more information about the Trust Walk Camps. Ms. Thompson said AVV's youth services coordinator, Sarah Gillmore, is amazing, and AVV has seen the youth programs grow from 3-5 children participating to having a waiting list now. Trust Walk Camp is

a week-long camping trip for youth from the Glennallen area and Valdez. This year they will be rafting from Chitna to Cordova, and special donations will pay to bring the kids back on the ferry. The youth learn conflict management skills, how to communicate, how to work within a group, and life skills for taking care of themselves. Some kids return the next year: it is a life-changing experience for them, and it is very moving to hear their stories.

Ms. Satterfield asked Ms. Thompson to identify the four full-time staff positions at AVV. Ms. Thompson listed herself as the executive director, the office coordinator who is also the bookkeeper, the youth services coordinator, and the direct services coordinator. Up country they have special grant coverage for an outreach coordinator and youth advocate, and the remaining people on the list are advocates.

Ms. Satterfield asked what AVV planned to use the requested \$13,000 increase for. Ms. Thompson said part of it is to increase advocate finances: AVV is one of the lowest-paying employers in Valdez, and they often lose their advocates to jobs at Alyeska — which pays a lot, and to tourism jobs. AVV has even lost former executive directors to Alyeska. Part of the increase would go for fuel assistance to heat the shelter in the winter months. The PetroStar refinery had a big fire, which caused a community wide increase in the cost of fuel.

Ms. Andreen mentioned that it was a pleasure reading the AVV proposal. She said her next comment was not specific just to this proposal, but memorandums of agreement or cooperative agreements seemed to be boiler plate across many of the programs and not something that was negotiated out. Ms. Thompson explained that AVV has longer agreement documents with the Copper River Health Network, Providence Valdez Hospital, and Providence Behavioral Health. But they mostly used the agreements with the template in the grant proposal.

Chair House asked what type of system AVV used in training advocates and employees. Ms. Thompson said they typically have Patti Bland of the Network come in to do the 40-hour crisis intervention training. They also have a shadowing process for new advocates with the current advocates.

Ms. Ashenbrenner announced that the teleconference connection had been lost around 11:30 a.m., and the meeting would continue with the intent to fix the connection during the lunch period.

Chair House stated that the executive director's responsibilities were not spelled out as clearly as she would like to see. She asked Ms. Thompson to explain the executive director's responsibilities. Ms. Thompson said that AVV just had its on-site visit with CDVSA's associate coordinator Ann Rausch last week. All the personnel files were fine, and then they went through hers with the board president. The notation for her duties was to make sure that everything gets done and do everything else. That is basically what she does, everything from personnel to direct services. Her background is a master's degree in marriage and family therapy, so she also meets one-on-one with clients. She takes out the trash and does anything and everything that needs to

get done in the office.

For a closing summary, Ms. Thompson stated that AVV's outreach area is one of her main concerns because many times the folks are in that area because they want to get away from someplace. There is no city government over that area, so the Alaska State Troopers (AST) actually cover it. AVV has had a great relationship with AST. One of the goals in the future is to have a shelter in the outreach area that can focus there one hundred percent. The numbers have increased so greatly in reaching out at the schools that they have about 19-20 kids per session. Recently, there was an incident in a home where a little girl was playing with her friend and the parents got into an argument, which escalated into violence. The little girl immediately went home, told her parents what had happened, and they then called the Valdez Police Department, which responded, and AVV was able to provide services. When asked how the girl knew what to do, she said it was because Sarah in the after-school program had told her what to do. It is a testament that AVV is getting the information out and that a third- and fourth-grader can learn what to do.

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

Presenters: Judy Cordell (executive director), Suzi Pearson (deputy director), and Tim Dee (finance director)

FY09 Award.....	\$1,090,979
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$1,376,786

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Satterfield recalled that Alaska Women's Resource Center (AWRC) was discontinued at the time of the June 2007 funding meeting, and the Council divided approximately \$200,000 of CDVSA support for that program between AWAIC and STAR. She thought that the extra funding to AWAIC that they had not planned for was going to be used for legal advocacy. Ms. Cordell said the funding for their one legal advocate is coming from CDVSA. AWAIC used to have a second legal advocate at the court house through Grants to Encourage Arrests funds. That grant is gone, and they hope it comes back in the fall. They need five legal advocates for the size of Anchorage and the 4,000 domestic violence arrests per year, and they have one.

Ms. Satterfield noted that AWAIC requested an increase of \$285,807. The proposal asked for two advocates, a food facility coordinator, and a data technician, totaling about \$138,000 plus benefits. She asked where AWAIC intended to use the remaining \$147,000 of the requested increase. Ms. Cordell said that three of the requests are restoring positions that were eroded: they have one 20-hour position doing all the food and facility work, and it is a mad house. Their request is providing for 3% cost-of-living increases to all the other employees, which does not even cover the cost of living in Anchorage that rose 4.6% last year. AWAIC provided 4% salary increases last year, and CDVSA gave 2% across the board. They are still trying to recover that lost ground. The requested increase is not very big for an agency the size of AWAIC. The left-over is a half-time staff person, making the food and facility person full-time, and a quarter-time employee in the shelter.

Chair House inquired about the food and facility coordinator's job description. Ms. Cordell said he is responsible for purchasing food, doing office commodity supplies, monitoring the entitlement Child and Adult Care Food Program, making sure menus are nutritionally balanced and culturally sensitive, doing safety and sanitation checks, making sure refrigerator temperatures are accurate to preserve food, and more. With so many people going through the shelter, safety and sanitation is a huge responsibility. Because people are only staying an average of 13 days, and the shelter has no cook, the women are assigned to make dinner and have to be taught the kitchen protocols for food handling and cleaning. It is an empowerment model and it works just fine. That is what the food and facility position does in 20 hours a week.

Chair House asked for a description of the data technician position. Ms. Cordell replied that AWAIC reports to more than two dozen grantors that want outcome measures, and they are all different. AWAIC is aggregating data without a very sophisticated database to be able to do that. They are pulling one of two people off the night shift staffing pattern to sit at the computer and compile the statistics. That leaves one person on the floor. The program has taken 5,000 crisis calls this year. That one person has to answer the phone and deal with all the people in the shelter. AWAIC really needs the data technician position. Further responding to Chair House, Ms. Cordell confirmed that everybody who works at AWAIC now is required to do a time audit in 15-minute increments, which costs a lot of money to do. The board required the time audit as an internal accounting control, as advised by the external auditor.

Chair House asked about salaries for AWAIC personnel. Ms. Cordell said she makes \$96,515 a year. When she considers pay for anybody doing anything, she only looks at three things: what the market pays for that position currently (looking at salary analysis reports done by reputable firms); the qualifications, credentials, and experience of the person; and how the person is performing in the position, if they are already hired. She receives market pay based on the 2008 Foraker salary survey done and updated every two years for not-for-profits by company size and position in Alaska. The 75th percentile for an executive director of a company AWAIC's size is \$95,000 a year. She is actually underpaid, according to the research. An adjustment for the 3% cost-of-living increase in 2009 would put her market salary at \$97,850. Regarding qualifications, she is a licensed psychologist associate with 20 years' experience in the field. She is federally recognized as an expert witness in domestic violence. She has provided testimony twice so far this year in federal court. She is an adjunct professor in both psychology and sociology. She is a certified child custody investigator. She saves AWAIC \$6,000 a year in clinical services alone, services that were outsourced prior to her hire. Her rate of pay away from AWAIC is \$120 an hour; her rate of pay at AWAIC is \$46 an hour — if she worked a 40-hour week, which she does not. Her actual rate is \$26 an hour. In her nearly five years at AWAIC, the program has had clean audits, their service delivery has increased 40%, and the company has increased in size by 58%. As an aside, women are still paid 70 cents on the dollar. The AWAIC mission had its roots in the women's movement and, therefore, market competitive pay for women is not an incongruent objective to their mission. The most valuable asset to AWAIC is the caliber of people working there. She is middle-aged, and there is no retirement pension for her. As a

woman, statistically she will live at least 30 years in retirement, most likely on Social Security. She asked the Council to think about that. She works because she is mission-driven and to provide for herself and her family. These should not be mutually exclusive. In summary, her pay is not out of market (she would provide the documentation after lunch); her credentials and experience justify the level of pay; and her performance has been exceptional. She wants to continue the work she is engaged in at AWAIC, but she wants to continue to be paid a fair market price for her labor. AWAIC is well respected, and she hoped her responses would encourage other people to consider the three factors she mentioned at the beginning and ask for a raise. People with advanced degrees and 20 years in the field are afraid to ask because they don't want to appear greedy. It is not about greed, and it is not about whether there is a spouse supporting them. She said the personal is political.

Ms. McFadden said the Council was not questioning how much program directors or anyone working at the facilities make because it is money well earned, and in fact they are underpaid. She has always supported finding a way to give the employees more. She thanked Ms. Cordell, saying she has been to the AWAIC facility and been warmly received and shown around. She noted that AWAIC provides services for a lot of people who come into Anchorage from the villages and, in essence, is supporting the whole state. Ms. Cordell stated that there is great value in the partner agencies that provide rural services. AWAIC has seen some in-migration, as well as some up-migration from the Lower 48 states. The school data will support that observation. But it is not the in-migration that is causing the AWAIC shelter's over capacity. They do not have hard research on this, but they are seeing domestic violence spike nationally. Although Anchorage is not as impacted by the economy, those people who are right at the bottom are impacted, and she attributed the bulk of AWAIC's spike to the down turn in the economy.

Noting that AWAIC is a huge organization with multiple funding sources, Ms. Andreen asked what percentage of the domestic violence and sexual assault services are funded with CDVSA funds. Ms. Cordell said 33.4%.

Chair House noted that Ms. Cordell's salary is total cost, including the cost of benefits.

In closing, Ms. Cordell stated that 20,000 bed nights in the main shelter is not something she expected to see at AWAIC - but it is here, and they need the Council's help to fully fund their FY2010 request. Anchorage represents 40% of the state's population. She asked that the Council please consider the size of the agency and the volume of the victims that AWAIC is now serving when determining the size of the award.

### **LUNCH RECESS**

Chair House called a lunch break a bit early so that the teleconference connection could be replaced. The meeting reconvened at 1:20 p.m., and all six Council members were present. They continued to hear presentations from grant applicants.

**Aiding Women in Abuse and Rape Emergencies (AWARE) - Juneau**

Presenter: Saralyn Tabachnick (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$583,078
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$705,780

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Andreen thanked Ms. Tabachnick for the information about the Juneau Police Department's Byrne grant for an advocate to provide immediate follow-up after domestic violence calls. She commended AWARE for a well-written application that was a pleasure to read. She said she did not have a clear sense of what was happening for teens. Ms. Tabachnick replied that there are intervention as well as prevention services. AWARE receives funding from the Delta Project for primary prevention with teens. That is not necessarily to work directly with teens but with the community to get other agencies and individuals on board to come up with strategies that will work in teen prevention. One program is Girls on the Run, a 12-week curriculum that incorporates a two-day-a-week after-school running program where girls learn self-esteem and confidence building. At the end, the girls do a five-kilometer run. In December, AWARE was pleased to see dads supporting their daughters in the final running event. AWARE also started a program called Teens Resisting Abuse and Initiating Non-Violence (TRAIN), which is peer education in the schools. That has led to a program called Lead On, a statewide Delta Project working in AWARE's rural communities with teens who come up with projects. For example, a young woman in Gustavus who came to the Lead On conference did a wearable art show as a fundraiser for AWARE. This summer AWARE is working with Juneau Youth Services, which does month-long wilderness trips. An AWARE employee, a wilderness first responder, will be going with them to put some of AWARE's curriculum into JYS's programming.

Ms. Andreen noted that AWARE had strong memorandums of agreement that were tailored to the agency specifics, which she found positive. She asked what AWARE would like to do with the requested increase, now that it does not have to fund the police liaison position. Ms. Tabachnick said AWARE has a volunteer coordinator position that is at 30 hours, and she is spread thin working on other projects as well. One of those projects is Girls on the Run. Part of the requested increase would support continuing to do that project. The program has also expanded to four elementary schools in Juneau and two rural communities, as well as Sitka, Ketchikan and Wrangell. They hope to continue expanding into the middle schools. Part of the requested increase would go to staff salary increases of about 4% because that was not included in the budget. It depends on what the health insurance increase is this year.

Ms. Curran said she was impressed by AWARE's proposal because it told her everything she needed to know.

Ms. McFadden asked if there was anything that Ms. Tabachnick, when she held other positions at AWARE, thought she would like to change or fund if she ever became director because it was important to making the shelter run. Ms. Tabachnick said she thinks about prevention, and AWARE has been fortunate to be able to move in that direction in very meaningful ways — and

she is proud of that. From the day she arrived at AWARE people have talked about the need for transitional housing. They have really taken that on in the last couple years. They were able to purchase vacant treed land next to the AWARE shelter, in partnership with the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority. AWARE is also part of the Foraker pre-development program and has moved pretty far along in that process. The plan is to build some community space to hold group meetings and trainings there, as well as some office space. But the biggest focus will be five units of transitional housing that could house about 14 people.

Chair House mentioned that the proposal appeared to cross over and request funding for the batterers intervention program. Ms. Tabachnick said that any references to the batterers intervention program were not implied requests for funding. She added that AWARE recognizes the need for a male staff person to do some prevention work with men, as well as to insure co-facilitation for the batterers group. They are using a Jesuit volunteer for that and seeking support from batterers funding, but not through this proposal.

Chair House noted that AWARE had minor requests that were not met in the previous funding, namely a staff position for child therapy. She asked how that affected AWARE's ability. Ms. Tabachnick said it was problematic that they could not provide ongoing counseling for kids. People knew this was happening, and the community picked it up pretty well with other sources. As soon as the position was filled (and there are 1.5 full-time employees there), they had a full work load and a waiting list. She is pleased that AWARE is able to do that.

Saying she had seen the young runners, Chair House lauded AWARE for creating so much energy with its program in Juneau. She also found AWARE a silent operation, because she had no clue that the shelter served 196 women in 2007, 205 in 2008, and 117 so far in 2009. She thanked Ms. Tabachnick for her work.

Ms. McFadden mentioned that AWARE has an outstanding volunteer organization, where people go through 40 hours of training. Ms. Tabachnick said the training is two evenings a week, 5:30-8:30, plus weekends, in a three-week block. The first part of 25 hours is for anyone in the community to understand violence against women and the work that AWARE does. For people who want to volunteer or provide direct services, there is an additional 15 hours of training to cover the policies and procedures. That is followed by on-the-job training.

Chair House inquired about the purpose for a CPA consultant in the proposal. Ms. Tabachnick said AWARE had an audit in 2007, and the practice was for the auditor to do the year-end adjustments for AWARE. In 2007, they said the law had changed and they had to disclose that AWARE was not able to do their own adjustments. The choices were to keep reporting that finding in future audits, or to hire a CPA to close out the books. AWARE chose to do the latter, but they asked the CPA to teach the business manager, Rachael Helf, how to do the closing. Ms. Helf also just completed an accounting course, and they are pleased with how this change is progressing.

For her two-minute closing, Ms. Tabachnick reported that they started volunteer training two weeks ago for about 20 people. She recognized one woman from AWARE's 10-week healthy relationship class that they offer to the community. This woman told her she was attending the volunteer training because she had felt so welcomed by AWARE during the previous class. The woman had found the class so helpful that she wanted to give back. That is what AWARE wants everyone to do, to come to a place where they feel empowered enough that not only can they take care of what they need personally, but they can pass that on to other people. She hoped AWARE would be able to continue their work in this way with the Council's support for all the programs.

**Arctic Women In Crisis (AWIC) - Barrow**

Presenters: Virginia Walsh (program coordinator) and Cheryl Humme (outreach coordinator and counselor III)

FY09 Award.....	\$357,118
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$367,620

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Mentioning AWIC's report on the high rate of suicide, Ms. McFadden asked if AWIC works to get people services outside of the shelter or if they provided in-shelter group counseling. Ms. Walsh said survivors come to the shelter for group counseling. AWIC is part of the North Slope Borough Health Department, so they often refer family members for more intense counseling at the Health Department's grief and loss group. There were recently four suicides, and the whole community is impacted by these deaths.

Responding to Ms. McFadden's question about the organizational structure, Ms. Walsh explained that AWIC is an entity under the North Slope Borough and specifically the Health Department, which has a director and two deputy directors. Gail Reed, the deputy director of the Health Department, is Ms. Walsh's immediate supervisor. Annie Witty is the deputy director of Accounting, and AWIC works closely with her. AWIC receives funding from the North Slope Borough.

Referring to the second paragraph of the abstract in AWIC's proposal, Col. Holloway asked her to explain the message in the sentence, "Unfortunately, Alaska Natives are disproportionately represented in sexual violence cases." Ms. Walsh said she meant to say that there are so many reported sexual assaults, and on the North Slope the Inupiat population is the highest part of the population. They are represented in the sexual violence cases.

Ms. Satterfield noted that AWIC was asking for an increase in the travel budget and indicated that over the last couple of years they had transported sixty women and children. AWIC was projecting a bit less than that in the coming fiscal year, and she asked if that was realistic. Ms. Walsh said her projection was conservative. AWIC participated in all the health fairs held this year on the Slope, and they had so many more contacts with village clients than they ever did before. People indicated they felt more trust in what the program does, so she thinks AWIC will

be seeing more people flying in from the villages who have developed a relationship with the program. Ms. Satterfield said her concern was that the amount requested for travel might not be sufficient if AWIC saw that sort of trend continue. Ms. Walsh said that is why she felt that a 3% funding increase would not be enough to meet the needs, if they have the higher number of people coming in that she believes they will.

Responding to Ms. McFadden, Ms. Walsh said that the whole team at AWIC is so invested in providing services for everybody on the Slope that she thought she would be conservative in their funding request rather than jeopardize the program by asking for too much of an increase.

Ms. McFadden inquired about the status of transitional housing that AWIC is working with the North Slope Borough on. Ms. Walsh said the housing talks have been going on for quite a few years, but there was a meeting last week about three multi-plexes available on the Slope. The buildings need asbestos cleanup, but the Borough is hoping that in the next year or so AWIC would be able to transfer to one of the multi-plexes. Those two to four apartments would be a dream come true for their clients. There is no housing available on Slope: the shelter has a six-week cutoff, but they have people who stay up to a year because there is nowhere else to go.

Chair House asked for the rate of increase in clients. Ms. Walsh said that in 2007 they had 351 clients, and in 2008 they had 643 unduplicated clients. Chair House inquired about being unable to get sexual assault examinations at the hospital due to high turnover there. Ms. Walsh explained that historically the hospital has had itinerant staff. AWIC would hear about a sexual assault after the fact when a client inquired about why no advocate was at the hospital. After trying to convince the hospital to call AWIC, they have been inviting themselves to meet with new itinerant staff to get acquainted, and so they have been getting many more calls. There is a forensic nurse on the Slope, and they had a conference call with other sexual assault nurse examiners recently. They are hopefully starting a sexual assault response team (SART), and she is extremely happy about that. AWIC also just began a multi-disciplinary team on the Slope. They invited the child advocacy center in Fairbanks to come talk about a multi-disciplinary team. A day later the police and various community agencies came together to form a multi-disciplinary team, and they have held two meetings so far.

In light of recognizing the high rate of sexual assault in that area of the state, Chair House asked if AWIC had a prevention program. Ms. Walsh said they talk at the schools about sexual assault, healthy dating, and safety. They also do a lot of prevention work in the community. For example, they had various community events in April, and ITTC (Inupiat Teens Taking Control) created banners about sexual assault and safety. There are also public service announcements on radio.

Chair House noted that AWIC has very high fringe benefits and asked Ms. Walsh to elaborate. Ms. Humme said she has been with AWIC for eight months, having moved from Fairbanks to Barrow to take the outreach coordinator position. The fringe benefits that may seem high are offset by much higher expenses for living in Barrow. For her to go out to any of the villages takes well over \$1,000, and AWIC is hearing more and more requests for them to go out. The

benefits are required to attract and keep staff in Barrow. She was surprised at how many times people change jobs in Barrow to make more money. Even AWIC employees, for whom fringe benefits are so high, work three jobs to make ends meet in Barrow. She said she could not stress enough how much it costs to live there.

Ms. Andreen said that AWIC employees' compensation includes 22% for retirement, which the vast majority of the victim services programs do not have. That is because AWIC is part of a local government.

Ms. McFadden inquired if there was any cycle to rises and falls in the number of AWIC clients related to cultural activities, such as whaling. Ms. Walsh said they often see higher rates of violence when the dividend checks come out because some people will drink. They put more advocates on the crisis line because there will be increased calls during that time. Ms. Humme explained that Barrow is "damp," that alcohol can be brought in with a license, but alcohol cannot be purchased in Barrow.

Ms. Andreen said she loved the AWIC grant application, that it read well. She noticed there was no prioritization for the budget increase requested and asked if Ms. Walsh could list the priorities for a 22% increment. Ms. Walsh said it would be to maintain the existing services, to insure being able to continue the outreach to the villages, and to continue bringing the emergency clients that have been sexually assaulted into Barrow to receive services.

For the two-minute closing, Ms. Walsh asked the Council to consider the 22% increase so that they can continue to provide services and keep community members safe. Ms. Humme stated that although high oil prices last year have led to comments about windfall money, that did not translate into North Slope monies. Those people work on the infrastructure, and that has not profited in the way that the oil taxes have for the rest of the state. AWIC has actually seen a reduction in the funding it receives from the North Slope Borough. Regarding outreach, just having been in Kaktovik and Anaktuvuk Pass in the last two weeks, she hears from every village she visits that it is such a good message but they need to hear more. Every bit of research says a one-time class does not change behavior. So for travel for outreach to the villages and for bringing people into Barrow, travel is more expensive than ever and yet so much more needed to go out as much as possible. The school principal at Anaktuvuk Pass said that when they were teaching in Barrow AWIC was such a big presence in the community, and they need AWIC more and more in Anaktuvuk Pass. She said she could not stress enough how much the travel budget is part of that program.

Chair House asked the dollar amount of the 22% increase requested. Ms. Walsh said \$78,566.

**Bering Sea Women's Group (BSWG) - Nome**

Presenter: Samaria Ross (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$474,871
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$479,745

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Col. Holloway said that Ms. Ross's explanation for the grant not being complete and not including all the increases BSWG needs went to some of the questions he had. He said he was concerned that management was not as strong as it should be. One issue was that evaluation forms were not picked up, and that could have been helpful for understanding how well the programs are going. Another issue was a staff member who was ill, therefore, her duties were not completed. He asked if Ms. Ross could have gotten someone else to do the job. Ms. Ross replied that travel to villages was all canceled due to stormy weather, as well, and they were not even getting food into Nome. So it was not just illness.

Regarding how BSWG does evaluations, Col. Holloway said it seemed a bit weak. BSWG could come in and ask for money with more authority if there were evaluations, rather than just saying there were problems — because every program has problems. Ms. Ross stated that part of the problem was that they did not have staff who were able to come in and work on the grant for many days. She apologized and said the grant application was terrible. Col. Holloway said he did not think it was terrible, but there were some weaknesses to it. Ms. Ross said they just did not have time to review and polish it. She added that she had a letter from the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C. telling BSWG what a good job they did on the paperwork for that grant — if that would offset it any.

Ms. Satterfield asked what kinds of things BSWG could put into place to take care of the issues and problems that have surfaced. Ms. Ross replied that pay raises would help make them competitive. She did not foresee Nome having weather like they experienced this past winter again. Nova Gold went broke in December, so BSWG has seen a big increase in clients since January. One woman even found an apartment in two days. Last year they had to keep a woman in shelter almost a year because there was no place for her to go. BSWG will hire staff for the other positions: high turnover of people in social service agencies is just part of living in that community. It is a rough area to live in with the severe alcohol problem, and people have to take on a lot more than they normally would because there are no resources available.

Ms. Andreen expressed relief that there were explainable reasons for why so much was left out of the BSWG grant application. She said pieces were done that were really good, such as the detailed budget narrative. She asked for some of the key things that Ms. Ross saw happening in terms of service delivery that make BSWG so unique: the service part of the proposal really lacked information.

Ms. Ross stated that BSWG has a 24-hour crisis line. The legal advocacy program looks very weak because there were only two protective orders issued a quarter. The reason is that people in the villages do not want to file protective orders. Number one, it goes in the paper, and number two, it can anger the entire village if it is a small place. There has been quite a bit of turnover in the police department. A bad incident occurred three years ago, and it will take a while, with the new police chief, for people to trust law enforcement intervention. People do not want protective

orders or police intervention. The legal advocate spends hours and hours working on alternative plans of safety for people. So while the numbers appear very weak, the advocate is very busy and does other things to take care of victims. BSWG would like the children's advocate to be out in the villages more and have the safe home reps trained. There are currently two who take children who are fearful because their parents are intoxicated or using drugs in the villages that have no law enforcement. BSWG would like to encourage village police officers to come in for training, along with the safe home reps. And a protective order is not going to do someone any good in an area that does not have any law enforcement. By the time they get there, it is way too late for anything.

Ms. Andreen said it would be important to get on the record who in the organization is responsible for making sure regulations and grant award conditions are met. Ms. Ross replied that would be her, and they got all caught up on compliance last year. Ms. Andreen asked if BSWG has a safe home rep in each outlying community. Ms. Ross said they have 11 safe home reps in eight of the villages, and they are trying to get them in the remaining villages. But it is very dangerous for people to do, especially in areas with no law enforcement.

Ms. Andreen asked if the safe home reps have a role besides just providing housing, such as crisis intervention. Ms. Ross said yes, and they try to help with protective orders or with filling out crime compensation forms. The safe home reps complete basically the same training that the crisis line people do in Nome. BSWG tries to bring them in for training once a year and to send them outside for training when they can afford to do that.

Chair House mentioned that she has had concerns about Nome for a long time. She said the written grant proposal was not nearly as strong as Ms. Ross's verbal presentation, and she hoped to see her back. She asked why the reports of violence declined during the period of Nova Gold. Ms. Ross stressed that domestic violence did not likely go down, but people were not contacting BSWG because they knew there was no hope of moving on any place. She added that not that many jobs were available; it was hard work and the company brought in mostly men from the outside. Once they left, people were able to get housing.

Chair House inquired if the safe home reps are paid. Ms. Ross said they get a \$40 a night stipend, which is like nothing because milk costs \$13.50 a gallon in the villages and food is horrendously expensive. The houses are very small, and it is tough to take in someone. Chair House observed that an audit for \$20,000 sounded high. Ms. Ross explained that the \$20,000 was for the CPA and the computer technician. The audit was \$10,000 and not included in that part but added today.

Ms. McFadden asked who made up the hiring committee. Ms. Ross said it is usually staff, and they ask the same questions of every candidate. The process seems to work as some people stay a long time. They do not have a staff turnover problem within the agency.

Chair House asked when the last audit was and if there were any deficiencies. Ms. Ross said it

was last year, and there were no deficiencies. Another audit is currently underway.

Col. Holloway requested more information about the crab fishing venture. Ms. Ross stated that Norton Sound Economic Development Corporation has offered to give BSWG 25% ownership in a boat called the Aleutian One, and the paperwork should be completed by the time she returns to Nome. BSWG will get 25% of the profits from it. The corporation is doing this because it is a great tax benefit to them. Many grants talk about sustainability, and that is one way that BSWG is working toward that goal. There are a couple of other boats interested in doing the same, if it looks like this venture will be successful. She thought it was precedent setting, and they were excited about it.

Chair House asked how many employees were at the shelter. Ms. Ross said nine full-time and nine part-time people. Responding further, she said it costs \$1,700 a month for insurance for the Caucasian people, and she was thankful that most of the employees had Indian Health. They all have dental coverage but no retirement benefits.

In closing, Ms. Ross said she hoped that BSWG could get the remainder of funding to try to expand next year and focus more on doing outreach to the villages, particularly to the children. If they get the other half of the children's coordinator position, hopefully she will be able to go to the schools and do presentations in the villages. The rural villages badly need that now, with the high sexual assault rate.

**Cordova Family Resource Center (CFRC) - Cordova**

Presenters: Nicole Songer (executive director) and Melanie Mattson (client advocate)

FY09 Award.....	\$ 94,240
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$120,964

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Chair House said the grant proposal was well done, given that it was from a small community. She thought CFRC ran one of the most frugal programs in history. She asked how they cover the 24-hour crisis line. Ms. Songer said staff takes it during office hours, and they use volunteers with cell phones for evenings and weekends. CFRC would not be able to do all the things they do without a great volunteer base.

Chair House asked how many safe homes CFRC has. Ms. Songer said there are two currently. Chair House inquired if they plan to increase that number or add safe homes in outlying areas. Ms. Songer replied that they have tried over the last few years to have safe homes in the villages, but it is really difficult. CFRC services Tatitlek and Chenega Bay as well, and it is dangerous sometimes for people to become a safe home because the communities do not have a village public safety officer. Cordova Troopers service Tatitlek, but she was unsure which Troopers service Chenega Bay. It is a flight or boat ride away, so not immediate response. In the past, CFRC was going out to the villages a couple of times a year. Through other funding sources they have been going to the villages every single month. They are hoping their ability to be out there

will encourage somebody to provide a safe home there.

Chair House inquired about the total population that CFRC serves. Ms. Songer said Cordova has about 2,500 people in the winter and about 5,000 in the summer because of the fishing industry. Chenega Bay and Tatitlek have 87 and 52. Chair House asked about the staff turnover rate. Ms. Songer related that they lost two staff members last year, which equates to 50%. Those people went to work for the Alaska Marine Highway System for a higher salary plus benefits. CFRC does not offer any benefits, except for some vacation pay.

Chair House commended Ms. Songer for a positive comment in her proposal summary about working for the community. She asked when the most recent audit took place. Ms. Songer replied that it was six years ago when she came on as director, because CFRC does not meet the federal guidelines for requiring more frequent audits. However, they have requested increased funding under contractual to provide an audit.

Ms. McFadden asked if Cordova had a large Spanish population or if it was just in the fishing fleet. Ms. Songer said it is especially high in the fishing season. CFRC hired a Spanish-speaking person, which has increased some of the client numbers. In the last six months they have gone from zero Spanish-speaking participants to 12 because that staff member is available and broken down the language barrier. They expect that use to get larger. There are five canneries in Cordova, which are bringing 800 people into the community, a large portion of which will be Spanish-speaking people. The CFRC person is going to the canneries once a week doing education and prevention. They have a women's group that is Spanish speaking, and they have art with Spanish emersion to work with the kids.

Ms. McFadden inquired how often people go to safe homes but don't feel safe and have to be moved to a shelter somewhere outside the region. Ms. Songer estimated that CFRC sent one person last year to Advocates for Victims of Violence in Valdez via the ferry system. CFRC has worked well with Anchorage, and Anchorage will take someone from the Cordova area if they have room.

Ms. Andreen said she appreciated reading the CFRC grant application. She noted that CFRC wrote in its abstract that there has been a significant increase in utilization, but she did not see any supporting numbers. Ms. Songer explained that at the end of FY08 they had 32 program participants, and for the first 10 months of FY09 they had 46 brand new participants and at least eight or nine carryover clients.

Ms. Andreen commended CFRC on being involved in a multi-disciplinary effort to identify and track community indicators. She encouraged Ms. Songer to talk about what those indicators are and her involvement with the group. Ms. Songer stated that there is a monthly meeting where all the providers in the community discuss a particular topic for that month and come up with goals. She was on leave the past three months, but the last meeting she attended the discussion was about there being nothing for teens to do in the community and how to address that problem. The

new person running the Salvation Army wanted to get some activities going. The November meeting is usually focused on the food drive and the holiday time when people may be unable to provide a good meal and gifts for their kids. The CFRC peer program has gotten the kids involved in the community in many ways.

Regarding the budget, Ms. Andreen observed that the travel line appeared to have very high per diem (\$220) and hotel rate (\$400) numbers. Ms. Songer said that was not per day but for the total travel time. There are no hotels in the villages, but they get charged an enormous rate to stay on a cot in the hospital for overnight stays.

In the two-minute wrap-up, Ms. Songer stated that she loved the youth programs and the Windows Between Worlds art programs, and those have really expanded. CFRC worked with the school district last year, which provided healthy lunches for kids for the entire summer without any income guidelines. CFRC thought it was a great opportunity and provided art during a two-hour lunch. The first day saw five kids, and by Friday of that week they had 20 in a space that only fit 10. They broke it into one-hour lunches, meaning 10 art groups a week for the entire summer. The summer camps were extended from two to three because of a waiting list. CFRC was able to reach kids at risk, because she estimated that 95% of them have been a victim of bullying or sexual assault or have lived in domestic violence homes. CFRC does art every day at their facility with 10-15 kids, so she is happy with that work. She thanked everyone at CDVSA for the support provided to their agency.

**Emmonak Women's Shelter (EWS) - Emmonak**

Presenter: None

FY09 Award.....	\$ 0
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$444,791

Emmonak's grant application was missing documents. No one from the program attended the meeting in person or by teleconference.

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

Presenter: Brenda Stanfill (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$ 821,133
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$1,000,891

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Referring to IAC's three bilingual translators, Ms. Curran asked what languages they need in the area. Ms. Stanfill said the primary language they are encountering is Spanish. Ms. Curran inquired what IAC has done as a result of the input received from the client exit evaluations. Ms. Stanfill said some changes are simple things like staff being kind when people come in - even at the end of a busy day, making eye contact, and saying hello when walking through the waiting room. Comments have been that it did not feel inviting when people first walked in, which resulted in these customer service changes. Some things also made people feel unsafe. For

example, there were some beautiful glass doors in IAC's new building. In focus groups when IAC first moved in, they learned that those glass doors were a big worry about someone being able to get in. IAC did some creative things with art so the bars look like birch trees. Ms. Stanfill said they have suggestion boxes throughout the building that the women love to use. A couple of clients use dogs, and IAC discovered that ice melt is harmful for animals. One suggestion resulted in using a different product. Some comments were about how to help people with their safety planning to make sure that it was their process and not IAC's process. People seem to feel comfortable saying in the evaluations what they needed and what they did not feel like they got from IAC.

Ms. Curran requested more details about how IAC goes about getting its volunteers. Ms. Stanfill replied that the volunteer program comes and goes, and sometimes it is stronger than other times. Right now, because of the staffing, is probably one of the more challenging times in volunteer recruitment. IAC is very dependent upon volunteers coming in versus the program doing a lot of recruiting, which would be the ideal way. While volunteers are a wonderful addition, it takes an extreme amount of staff time to keep them invested. They are volunteering for a reason, and part of that is to feel good about why they are volunteering. IAC is currently using volunteers in the SART team, on the crisis line, and for special projects. But it is more about people calling and saying they want to volunteer than IAC doing any recruiting right now.

Ms. Curran inquired about IAC's staffing issues mentioned. Ms. Stanfill explained that the program has pretty well lost a full-time position each year for the past five years due to the cost increases that the program experienced. The old building had enough shelter space, and they were not having to turn anyone away — but they were just housing them uncomfortably. So when they moved into the new location, they thought there would be adequate space to house people. What happened is they reached a whole segment of the population that they did not know the program was not reaching. The working poor, for lack of a better term, women who were reluctant to come to a place with narrow hallways and that sometimes did not feel so clean, so staying at home seemed better than the alternative. The bright, inviting and comfortable building has changed that, and women are choosing not to live through very tough things at their homes. IAC knew they would see an increase from the 10,000-12,000 shelter night a year range, but they will reach 20,000 shelter nights this year. They had not anticipated that. At the same time, the program was working on all these community partnerships, and the Office of Children's Services team decision-making meetings required a staff member to be there as a community representative. So the staffing time that was required was way over what they had anticipated. They had to set priorities. They cut the children's program. They have had to choose the emergency shelter needs, the emergency response to SART, and the emergency response to the hospital for medical forensic examinations as being their priorities. Unfortunately, they have not gotten to the point where the volunteer program can help in those efforts. They are reacting versus the other way around.

Ms. Curran commented that IAC's grant proposal was very well written, and she got a clear picture.

Chair House asked what IAC thought was causing 20,000 shelter nights a year. Ms. Stanfill said she attributed it to a few things: being more visible in the new building; people do not have the resources to get a hotel room if they need to leave home for the night; and a housing crunch in Fairbanks, which has had big rent increases and not enough section 8 housing vouchers or public housing. Chair House asked how many beds IAC can accommodate. Ms. Stanfill said they have a total of 58 shelter beds, and they could fit another 20-25 people on pull-out couches, if they had to. They are trying not to do that because the program does not have enough operations staff for that many. Often there is only one staff member on, and that is pretty intense with 50-60 people staying in the shelter. IAC does a very good job with screening: if a person does not have a partner they are in danger from, and they have past domestic violence or assault history, they refer them to the rescue mission to help keep the shelter numbers at a safe level.

Chair House praised the Wise Family donation that was a very good approach. She questioned how the shelter serves breakfast, lunch and dinner. Ms. Stanfill said IAC was able to do that through the education food program, which reimburses for breakfast, lunch and dinner for every child 18 and under served at a homeless shelter. IAC is a member of that group. With the money reimbursed from that program they are able to pay a person to cook and to buy a significant portion of the food. They get food from the food bank, and there are people who do canned food drives. Sometimes people donate moose and fish. They also get food from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's commodities program.

Ms. Satterfield mentioned that for a number of years IAC was unable to do the rural outreach, but the program has been doing some of that for the last couple of years. Ms. Stanfill said IAC was able to get some funding through a two-year VAWA victim services or discretionary grant to do rural outreach in the villages. The first year the grant was \$65,000, and the second year they got \$70,000. In this CDVSA grant request they are asking for some help with that because it is not enough to pay for the staff person. Without additional funding support, IAC will run out of money to keep the rural outreach going far short of the end of the two-year VAWA grant time frame.

Ms. Satterfield asked what the rural outreach advocate is doing. Ms. Stanfill said the advocate is going out to the villages to help them set up safety planning and learn how to respond to a crisis. IAC is working in partnership with the Alaska Native Women's Coalition and the Tanana Chiefs Conference on that. The IAC advocate also visits the village schools on each visit, covering the curriculum they use in the Fairbanks schools. Each age group is getting a bit different information as the advocate goes from classroom to classroom. The Alaska Native Women's Coalition has been very helpful because they are able to open some doors that were challenging for IAC to access. That partnership has grown and solidified as the year has gone on. Last year IAC contacted all 42 villages that it serves by going to 12 specific villages and bringing representatives in from every village for a big rural conference.

Ms. McFadden inquired what services the children were getting at the shelter if IAC no longer

has a children's advocate. Ms. Stanfill said not a whole lot right now, other than child care. It had to do with setting priorities to deal with emergency needs. The children's program was the only one they could take away that did not leave an immediate hole in emergency. But it leaves a long-term hole. The problem is that IAC set its salary scale in the late 1980s or early 1990s, before her time there. That is the salary scale they still had up until last year, which started advocates at \$11.70 an hour. They had to make a decision about what to do, and the board decided they had to be able to cover the emergency shelter advocates. That is when the children's program went away. IAC is able to do a teen night once a week because they have an energetic volunteer who wants to do it.

Ms. McFadden asked if IAC could get a memorandum of understanding with an organization or agency to do some child counseling. Ms. Stanfill replied that it is very difficult to do, but a lot of children do receive counseling outside of IAC — maybe Denali Kid Care, or they can go to Fairbanks Counseling & Adoption with some kind of Medicaid assistance. They still do referrals but just do not have staff providing counseling in the shelter.

Col. Holloway asked why the audit cost increased so much. Ms. Stanfill said she didn't know, other than the auditor indicated they had to raise salaries. IAC goes out to competitive bid for external audit services every three years, and it has been \$8,000-\$9,000 in the past. This year when the bid responses came back the lowest cost was \$16,000. Part of it is that IAC is both in federal and single audit territory now. Some of the money that comes in is federal pass-throughs, and added to some of the OVW money IAC gets for transitional housing and HUD (Housing and Urban Development), it puts IAC in a federal capacity. Then the Denali Commission funding for the building work put IAC into a federal capacity.

Ms. Andreen asked if the IAC budget reflected the new salary ranges. Ms. Stanfill said yes, that \$23,000 would go to increase the starting wage from \$12.65 an hour to \$14.00 an hour. That would put IAC in the same range as the other social services in Fairbanks. Right now IAC is the lowest paid social service in Fairbanks. Ms. Andreen commented that the salaries still looked very low. Ms. Stanfill agreed but explained that she told the staff she was asking for a competitive wage for them not a living wage, and by competitive she meant compared in Fairbanks.

In her two-minute closing comments, Ms. Stanfill described a couple of things that will be happening in the community that IAC anticipates will increase service numbers even more. A military deployment will be coming back in August. Last time that happened there was about a 15% increase in military clients, whether service members or their spouses. IAC is focusing even more on its community partnerships. Office of Children's Services is one they are working heavily with. The Family to Family (of OCS) has incorporated IAC into every meeting, and that give IAC a place to make first contact with people. There are people that OCS is involved with that IAC has not met yet. The medical forensic unit in Fairbanks is a new field. Up until this point they had SART examiners, and now the medical forensic unit is starting to take all the domestic violence cases there to have a forensic examination. IAC has put together a team

similar to SART that responds to the hospital every time there is a domestic violence and makes a connection with that person. Those community partnerships are really opening up a tremendous amount of doors for IAC in Fairbanks. But it will continue to take resources to keep up with that. There is nothing worse than saying, "Hey, we'll be there," but then finding out on Saturday night when two sexual assaults are happening at the same time, and a domestic violence, and a crisis at the shelter, that the program is struggling to find somebody to be available. Ms. Stanfill asked that the Council consider IAC's funding request, noting that she believes in asking for what the program truly needs. It might look like a high number, but it is what they need to operate efficiently and effectively. IAC cannot offer the services they offer without a comprehensive unit in treating the whole family. Without children's services, there is a huge gap.

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

Presenter: Rebecca Shields (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$303,723
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$344,971

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Satterfield said she realized the RFP had changed somewhat from the prior time, and she found KWRCC's grant proposal one of the easiest to read, that Ms. Shields followed each category in order and answered the questions. It took her by surprise that KWRCC revised its requested increase today to 22% for a total of \$370,542. At a previous funding meeting, KWRCC's prior executive director talked about one way to meet the needs was to cut the number of staff hours. She asked if that was still the case and if the requested grant increase would allow the program to increase staff hours or just add more people at the 30-hour-a-week level. Ms. Shields said they have been able to bring the direct service staff back up to 32 hours a week. With the requested increase, she would like to bring them to 40 hours plus allow overlapping in the staffing pattern.

Ms. Satterfield asked for more information on the immigrant outreach advocate's work. Ms. Shields said she is very proud of the immigrant outreach program that started in late 2007. It is a dual program doing outreach and prevention services, as well as direct services. Kodiak has a high population of immigrants... *[tape change - missing a few seconds]* The advocate also helps in training other liaison people in the Filipino and Korean communities to work specifically with KWRCC. That also coordinates into KWRCC's inter-cultural work, which includes the Native population. There are so many more barriers in immigrant communities, and the outreach has increased the services numbers.

Ms. McFadden inquired about KWRCC not having an 800 number but accepting collect calls. Ms. Shields said they are hearing in evaluations that clients would like the program to have an 800 number, so that is what they will be doing. Ms. McFadden asked her if that was a budget problem. Ms. Shields said being able to afford the 800 service has been one reason, and partly they thought the collect call system was meeting the need. The new evaluation systems are

providing feedback to the program saying specifically why they want an 800 number.

Ms. Andreen said it was a very well-written grant. She noted that the grant proposed providing services to 100 victims and 25 children and 500 non-offending family members. She said that last number is very high compared to other programs. She asked how KWRCC defined non-offending family members it was providing services to, and if it was for domestic violence or other crimes. Ms. Shields responded that the broader community was included in that 500 number. Some KWRCC programs are prevention work, which would fall under non-offending family members. There is the parenting program, and the crisis line and outreach — helping folks that are indirectly impacted by domestic violence in the community. It is prevention and broadening out the scope.

Ms. Andreen commented that the evaluations did not look like KWRCC was looking at outcomes, but she liked the way the evaluations were used in the planning and all the specifics described in the planning process. She asked if the inter-cultural task force was strictly internal or if KWRCC was working with outside agencies. Ms. Shields said they work with outside folks in the community. The inter-cultural task force is hosted and centered through the KWRCC agency, but it identifies leaders within different cultural communities and brings them together where they can give KWRCC feedback on the services and how to make the services more accessible to members of their communities. It also helps KWRCC educate the community leaders on domestic violence and sexual assault responses so that they can do their own culturally appropriate outreach. It allows KWRCC a format for bringing in other community service heads, such as law enforcement and the school superintendent and public assistance, to talk about the barriers and what is working or not working. The service providers can explain why they do things the way they do and what they would like to do for the communities.

Ms. Andreen mentioned that KWRCC's salaries appeared very low. Ms. Shields agreed, saying she is lucky to have a staff that is very dedicated and passionate about the work that they do. But they are incredibly underpaid, and most of them have to have second jobs to make ends meet. KWRCC has started to lose some good people because they simply cannot afford to work there any more, and she needs to fix that problem.

Chair House observed that KWRCC having 98 volunteers is amazing. She also noted that the program has a place for pets when people come into the shelter. Ms. Shields said the program has a memorandum of understanding with the humane society to take in pets free of charge, as well as a safe home for pets.

Chair House referred to the budget reflection that had increased costs for contractors and bookkeeping services. She asked if KWRCC had shopped for those services already. Ms. Shields said yes, that the bookkeeper they had for the last 20-some years is retiring, and along with her goes the marvelous price that she offered KWRCC. They now have to enter into the competitive wage world and have seen a major increase for bookkeeping services.

Chair House quoted from KWRCC's proposal, "Through both our direct services and education and prevention, we believe our services reduce overall crime and homelessness due to domestic violence in Kodiak." She wished KWRCC a huge success in that.

In summary, Ms. Shields asked the Council to consider that Kodiak being an island means it is very isolated there, and the victims are a plane ride away from getting services of this type anywhere else. That is very spendy and makes what KWRCC does incredibly important in the community. She is very proud of KWRCC's partnerships. On top of the inter-cultural task force they are now hosting a community multi-disciplinary team, which has all the first responders involved. It has been very successful in building those relationships in Kodiak, keeping communication lines open, and working to prevent problems before they come up. KWRCC's outreach has been really exciting. She is proud of the parenting classes because it is preventative and community wide. It has allowed the program to build a relationship with the entire community and for people to see the services and learn it is not a scary place to come to. With that, people have been calling and asking KWRCC to give more presentations and get into the schools, so they have been building a lot of relationships, which has been wonderful. She thanked everyone for the opportunity to represent the program.

Chair House called a scheduled break from 3:20 p.m. to 3:40 p.m.

**The LeeShore Center (LSC) - Kenai**

Presenters: Cheri Smith (executive director) and Sue Best (bookkeeper)

FY09 Award.....	\$559,367
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$840,896

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Andreen asked for continued comment on LSC losing its legal advocate (funded by Grants to Encourage Arrests) and its youth outreach advocate (funded by Rural Domestic Violence & Child Victimization Grant). Ms. Smith said LSC was one of the original programs that received Grants to Encourage Arrests funding for a legal advocate because Kenai had a high level of protection orders. They have had a court-based legal advocate for a few years. She hoped the Council would be successful in getting that grant funding again because then LSC would not have to get the roughly \$34,000 listed in this grant proposal budget for an advocate. In order to continue the legal advocacy services until they get that position up and running, which would be late summer to early fall, if they reinstate the advocate position they lost in FY05, she could use that person as a court-based legal advocate until they got that. The youth outreach coordinator position is vital. LSC does not have the staff to go out into the schools. They did 138 presentations to over 2,700 children last school year, and it takes a full-time position.

Ms. Andreen said it was a well-written grant. She found the staff salaries to be low. As a general comment, she said it took her a couple of grant applications before she realized that the goals and objectives were provided to the applicants and they filled in the numbers. It makes it a lot easier for the applicants, as well as the Council to track these types of things. She found details lacking

in LSC's activities that could have been helpful, although they did a nice job of describing in the narrative how services happen, so she felt comfortable understanding how things operate.

Ms. Andreen noted that LSC indicated an expected increase in insurance premiums, and asked for a dollar figure. Ms. Smith said they were projecting from 30%-50% — they have already been told it will be a minimum 30% increase. Ms. Best added that they should know by the middle of May.

Ms. Satterfield questioned a statement in the proposal that LSC did not meet its goals due to a CDVSA data requirement. Ms. Smith explained that when the CDVSA instituted a new data system it meant, for example, that if three advocates met one-on-one with a client in the shelter the count would previously have been three contacts, but now it is just counted once. So if the numbers appear to be low, it is because of that data change.

Chair House asked if a wage of \$12.08 an hour included any benefits. Ms. Best said that was the person's hourly rate and did not include insurance or taxes of any kind. Chair House inquired about the reason for the high staff turnover at LSC. Ms. Smith replied that the program had 45% turnover last year. LSC is an umbrella agency of about 26 staff. They had to re-advertise a couple of times for the child advocate position because they require that the person have some knowledge of child development, and a degree is preferred but not required. Trying to pay someone with a degree \$12 an hour is very difficult. Some staff have been with the agency a number of years, but it is difficult to attract new people when they are competing with other entities in the community. LSC has lost some staff to Office of Children's Services, and a person can get a retail job that pays a bit less but offers more freedom than providing services for domestic violence and sexual assault victims. The main issue is the low pay.

Chair House asked if Ms. Smith had done an exit interview with staff to find out if there were other issues besides the pay. Ms. Smith said every advocate who leaves the agency does an exit interview, and the comments are always very positive. The reasons are that they are leaving the state, taking another position, or going back to school. It is nothing to do with the agency per se, but they are looking out for their best interests.

Chair House asked if all the employees are cross-trained. Ms. Smith said yes, that one of her priorities as director is to provide a lot of training. There is monthly training for all the staff, and advocate staff get training on a weekly basis. They all have to go through the 45-hour training to begin with. As funding allows, LSC sends them to in-state and out-of-state trainings and to any free trainings. LSC has an education and training coordinator who is responsible for finding what training is available.

Ms. Curran inquired about the statement on page 29 of the proposal about four memorandums of agreement (MOAs) for batterers intervention programs. Ms. Smith said LSC has a strong batterers intervention program. This CDVSA grant application process was a bit earlier this year, and Kenai is a busy community, so trying to find people that were there to get MOAs when there

was some turnover in different organizations was harder. But the MOAs were to show the Council that the people who signed the MOAs, even for the batterers intervention programs, are very supportive. LSC works closely with law enforcement, the Office of Children's Services, and the drug treatment facilities.

In her two-minute closing statement, Ms. Smith encouraged the Council to grant LSC the large increase requested because it is vital to continue what they are doing. It is not for anything in addition. Even the one advocate position is a reinstatement and very important. LSC has a total of eight advocate staff, including the shelter manager, the child advocate, the youth outreach advocate who is out in the schools, the legal advocate who is at the court, and two night advocates. That leaves three full-time direct service advocates that are meeting the needs of all the shelter residents, all the walk-ins, and all the crisis calls. It is very important to be able to reinstate that one position. And she has to be able to pay the staff a liveable wage, not only for retention, but they are certainly worth it. Even if she were able to bring the pay up to \$14 an hour, it would still be way below the competition, but it is the best the program can do at this point. The grant request would be a lot higher if she asked for what the people should be paid.

**Maniilaq Family Crisis Center (MFCC) - Kotzebue**

Presenter: Michelle Dakai (by teleconference)

FY09 Award.....	\$306,101
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$454,164

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Satterfield told Ms. Dakai that CDVSA staff reports to the Council on the timeliness and completeness of program quarterly performance reports and financials. MFCC's quarterly performance reports have been consistently late, however, they are complete when received. The quarterly financial documents have been consistently late as much as three weeks, and they have been incomplete. She asked what has happened and what steps MFCC was taking to correct that. Ms. Dakai said that MFCC looked at the accounting software system that they had been using and came up with a new accounting system that would allow programs to see exactly where they were with the budgets and to have access to their spending reports. The directors and administrators thought this was a good idea. When the system was installed there was difficulty getting the access codes correct and the spam filters installed. The MFCC information technology department is continuing to work with this challenge. She has been assured that once the accounting spam filters have been installed they should have a better financial system in place, and that is what they are looking forward to.

Ms. Satterfield asked who is handling the financial part of things. Ms. Dakai said MFCC has a financial department that has access to this accounting system. However, with the changes, as a director, as an administrator, as a program person, MFCC was not privy to that information. But they need to have access to that information, so they were instructed to call the finance department and ask a staff person who could access the information to provide it. That worked fine, but it held up the financial department staff person from what she was working on because

she had to stop and answer the program's questions. Ms. Dakai said she is projecting that this will be a better program all the way around in FY10. Ms. Satterfield asked how soon the improvement would begin. Ms. Dakai stated that last week the directors were given permission to get into their accounts. They have decided to roll it out slowly: the administrators have had access, and now the directors are getting it. After checking to make sure there are no failures or difficulties, they will roll out the accounts to the supervisors. She is looking at having this rolled out in the next two months, at the very latest.

Ms. Satterfield mentioned that the grant proposal reported having audits done in 2006 and 2007, with the 2008 audit currently underway. The proposal reported that the findings and exceptions are all usually addressed by the finance personnel. She asked for clarification of the word "usually." Ms. Dakai replied that the association's structure is that all the programs report their findings to the financial department, which then fills out the paperwork. MFRC gets that paperwork back from the financial department and signs off on it. The finance department has the audit records and the information. "Usual" means that when there are questions regarding specific programs or specific funding the program manager, director or administrator is called in to meet with the auditors.

Ms. Satterfield stated that the budget submitted in the grant proposal contained several errors. She asked Ms. Dakai to explain the new positions that MFRC was proposing to pay for with the requested increase. Ms. Dakai said they would like to fund the supervisor, a full-time women and child advocate, the SART advocate, the outreach advocate, and two shelter staff with the CDVSA funding. She said they are not asking for the legal advocate because they are getting that through federal funding. MFRC also received some federal money for an administrative assistant. Because of the outreach concerns that were recognized in FY09, MFRC has looked to the Office of Violence Against Women for a Rural Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault & Stalking grant to provide for an advocate in eight of the 11 villages.

Col. Holloway expressed his concern about the lack of specificity in the grant application and in the narrative. There was much about cultural things, which are important, but the application did not really address what was actually going on as much as he would like to have seen. He said by MFRC's request for so many positions he was hearing that part of the problem with providing the services is that the program lacks the positions. He asked if it was that or if management was not as good as it should be. Ms. Dakai responded that MFRC was asking the CDVSA to fund six positions, and they have obtained the funding for the other positions through other grant programs. At this time, all the positions are filled, except for the women and child advocate. Cultural issues are an interesting factor in their shelter care. They offer the beading class or the basket-making class at specific times during the year, but it depends on who is at the shelter and if the community wants to participate. MFRC invites all women to gather to sew and address issues, not just victims.

Col. Holloway said he was not sure, based on what the Council is seeing in the reports, that adding personnel would make a difference in the quality of services the shelter is providing. Ms.

Dakai conceded that MFRC has had some challenges with its supervisor in FY09. Supervision is new to Louise Conwell, and she is continuing to work on her skills and her service delivery. Ms. Conwell has a very strong desire to assist victims and work with families to overcome what they are facing and live a violence-free life. It is also difficult for a supervisor to come into a 24/7 program, but without that position it makes it even worse. Ms. Dakai noted that MFRC did not ask for relief staff costs, and she will have to look around for funding for that because MFRC has to have people to cover the program 24/7. Currently, when staff call in sick, Ms. Conwell is covering.

Col. Holloway noted that he did not see a summary in the proposal of how the program had met the previous year's goals and objectives. However, that missing piece fits in with some of the other comments he already made.

Referring to the indirect costs in the proposal, Ms. Andreen said the authorization indicates a 28% indirect for non-hospital and 45.5% for hospital. Ms. Dakai clarified that she used the 28%: it is a very significant program for MFRC and not something she would overlook or get incorrect. Ms. Andreen informed her that Ms. Ashenbrenner had just directed her to where it was documented on the budget summary.

Ms. McFadden referred to the personnel management section and asked if many employees are non-Native, given that staff orientation includes an overview of Native culture for Northwest Alaska, or if the program employees had a diverse background. Ms. Dakai explained that Maniilaq Association has Native preference hire. However, it is very difficult to fill many of the positions with all Native hires, especially in the clinics or the hospital. So there are quite a few transplants to the Arctic, and MFRC makes sure that they have the cultural competency class to bring them all up to speed on the appropriateness of the community.

Chair House stated that MFRC has a rather unique volunteer program, and she approved of them using the seniors in the community. She added that when reading the proposal she had to assume that the services were on par with the other programs, but it was very hard to discern that from the proposal. She recommended clear job descriptions for everybody on staff, including volunteers and management, so that everyone can follow them and know what they are doing. Ms. Dakai thanked the chair for the recommendation and stated that the program just finished working for several months with human resources to finalize safe home provider volunteer job descriptions. She will definitely begin working with the supervisor on the other volunteer job descriptions.

In closing, Ms. Dakai stated that Maniilaq Association desires to see changes that are necessary for improving the lives of those that they serve. They have a real investment in the region, and they believe in the health, well-being and success of the people in the Northwest Arctic. There is a significant concern that services need to continue and that MFRC as an agency needs to be accountable. She has made that commitment to CDVSA associate coordinator Linda Hoven and makes it right now to the Council. She recognized that their reports were late and that they had

some real challenges in FY09. But she asked respectfully that the Council still consider MFRC's grant proposal and the needs of people in the community when reviewing the funding requests.

### **RECESS FOR THE DAY**

Chair House recessed the meeting for the day at 4:20 p.m.

---

Tuesday, May 5, 2009

### **CALL BACK TO ORDER**

Chair House called the funding meeting back to order at 9:00 a.m. All six Council members were present at roll call to form a quorum.

Chair House informed those present that the Council was amending the agenda to take up a short discussion on the process to select a new CDVSA executive director.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SELECTION PROCESS**

Col. Holloway requested guidance from Ms. Ashenbrenner and staff about the rules for selecting a new executive director, and that the Council discuss the best way to proceed, whether it be to form a committee, etc.

Ms. Ashenbrenner explained that the Council has the statutory responsibility to hire or fire the executive director. The statute does not specify whether the whole Council has to be the interview committee. In the past, a subgroup of two or three Council members has participated in interviewing and made a recommendation to the full Council. The appointment must go to the Governor's Office for approval. She said she had forwarded to some Council members the recruitment notice that will be posted later this week. As applications come in, they will be provided to a subcommittee of the Council.

Col. Holloway suggested appointing a subcommittee and holding any necessary discussion before the meeting was done.

Chair House appointed Colonel Holloway, Ms. McFadden, herself — and Ms. Wooley, if available — to the executive director selection committee.

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

**Safe and Fear-Free Environment (SAFE) - Dillingham**

Presenter: Ginger Baim (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$468,580
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$562,373

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Chair House asked how many people SAFE served per month. Ms. Baim said she reported in her quarterly report that in October 2008 they provided direct serves to 234 individuals (not including outreach and education). That is 10% of Dillingham's population and represents 3% of the Bristol Bay area's population. That is twice as many people as the hospital served that month. SAFE had been averaging about 150 people a month, and now the average is 150-200 a month. Chair House asked for the number of employees. Ms. Baim said the full-time equivalent is about 26, but the total number of employees is 40, including six part-time village-based advocates. She explained that the 3,000 bed nights last year were a combination of the shelter and the children's emergency receiving home. SAFE saw a substantial drop in shelter nights in FY08, and they still do not understand why that happened. It appears to have been a fluke because FY09 will wind up about the same as for the last five years. That is surprising because most of the programs in the state, and certainly the rural programs, have been busting at the seams. SAFE expected to have lots more people in shelter than they had in the past, but they have not.

Chair House inquired if SAFE had done any research on the economic situation in Dillingham and area to see what caused the fluctuation in the number of shelter nights. Ms. Baim said they called everyone and were referred back to SAFE. She added that there is no way of determining if Dillingham's population has been stable or not. The last census was about 2,300 people. SAFE knows that people have moved out of the community, but the school system lost a total of one child. The feeling is that the total population has been pretty much stable for the last two years. However, there has been a terrific change in the demographics of the people in the community, lots of people with young children. Almost everybody with a degree or a work history has moved to the urban areas for more job opportunities and things to do. In the meantime, people from the smaller villages have moved into the Dillingham, the hub village of Bristol Bay. What that means to SAFE is that the skill sets of the people coming in from the smaller villages are very different. They are competent, smart, hard-working people who are not particularly skilled in the areas that SAFE needs and not particularly imbued of the 9-5, five-days-a-week work culture.

Chair House observed that SAFE spends a lot of time training staff, about 80 hours with advocates. Ms. Baim said that SAFE operates a residential childcare facility. The CDVSA requires that advocates get a minimum of 40 hours of documented training in order to meet the confidentiality provisions. The residential advocates are the lowest paid and the ones with the most responsibility. They get the 40 hours of training, then work alongside someone for a couple of days, and then they are on their own in a building with 20 people — many of whom have addiction issues and mental health issues, etc. — and a crisis line to look after. The residential advocates have an incredible amount of responsibility with minimum preparation. The least SAFE can do is provide that level of training.

Chair House asked if paying tuition for staff to go to school was part of the fringe benefits package that SAFE was proposing. Ms. Baim explained that fringe benefits are either 32% or 14%, depending on whether the person takes health coverage, which is almost 20%. SAFE's health coverage is not good, costs \$1,000 a month, it is for the employee only, and the employee is required to pay 25% of it (\$250 a month). Dental and vision costs another \$50. So most of the employees do not opt for health coverage. None of the Alaska Native staff have opted for it because they have coverage from Indian Health Service. She thought that was morally and ethically wrong because SAFE was living off the health corporation, basically. If SAFE had to provide health coverage for all the employees that are eligible for it, the program could probably not keep the doors open. The training benefit is not counted in that percentage; that is FICA, Worker's Compensation, etc. Last year SAFE instituted a retirement program and has a modest 401K plan. SAFE has a terrific staff turnover rate that is crippling the program. They did not get a single application for a couple of key positions for two or three months, and they could see that people accessed the application on the web site. People cited lack of a retirement program as one reason.

Chair House said it appeared that SAFE's prevention program was working very well. Ms. Baim stated that the CDVSA is SAFE's core grant, and they cannot do anything without that grant. Even though it accounts for less than 30% of the overall program, it is the only funding that SAFE can use to put bread on the table and keep the heat on. Because of that base from CDVSA, SAFE was able to apply for and receive an early intervention and prevention grant from the Department of Health & Social Services. Shortly thereafter, SAFE worked with the Network to sign up for the Delta Project, so they could focus a lot of attention on prevention.

Ms. Andreen related that she was in Dillingham working with public health nurses in one of their community organizations this past year, and the energy and excitement she encountered in the shelter made it obvious that SAFE is one of the core places in the community that people turn out for. Also, SAFE has been on the cutting edge for a number of years, and she applauded Ms. Baim's efforts for being the driving force behind making that happen. She noted that SAFE's grant proposal abstract stated that in any given year 15-20% of the adult women in the Bristol Bay area will seek and receive direct services from SAFE for abuse-related issues. But under the services to be provided section, it looks like 50 adult victims will get shelter and 200 will get advocacy. Also, 40-45% out of the numbers in any given month are new clients. She felt the numbers did not come together clearly.

Ms. Baim indicated she could not recall the 40-45% being new clients. But she did recall that about 45% of the people are not from Dillingham and that the distribution of sexual/physical violence and incidents is about even with the people outside of Dillingham as in the town. Her point was that the statistics in Dillingham seem to be pretty much applicable across the board. One of the problems is last year was the first full year collecting data under the new CDVSA data system. SAFE had always had trouble trying to determine unduplicated clients: at the end of the year they had to add up all the client numbers and then try to mark off the ones that appeared

more than once — because it was a really bad system. So a lot of SAFE's reporting under goals and objectives was based on a mishmash: some of the numbers were duplicated and some were unduplicated. This year for the first time the stats person compiled the statistics she had as near as she could read them (by the way they were instructed to in the goals and objectives) and then Ms. Baim reduced them to be as realistic as possible. SAFE will probably serve between 550 and 600 unduplicated people in a year. A significant number of them are going to be teens and children, so they are not counted in the adult women count. About 10-15% to 20% are going to be men or boys.

Ms. Andreen said that explanation helped her understand that SAFE is still in the process of getting a real handle on the unduplicated numbers. She praised SAFE for the proposal to pay for college credits for three classes, which is a wonderful support for the staff. She also congratulated Ms. Baim for her graduation from the University of Alaska today. She commended SAFE for the village advocates in five villages because it provides a presence right in the communities. The goals and objectives in the grant application were very clear and understandable.

Ms. McFadden asked why Ms. Baim disagreed with the Council on the required training hours for advocates. Ms. Baim said that the statute says that an advocate is defined as a person who has 40 hours of training or whose job requires them to answer the phone or provide counseling services. To her, if a person's job requires them to pick up the crisis line, for example, they are covered, regardless of the amount of training they have. However, it is not unreasonable to require the training, and the least that SAFE can do is to make sure their people get the minimum 40 hours of training before they are in a position where they are making life and death decisions for themselves and others. It is just that the 40 hours of training is not required by the law, in order to be covered by the confidentiality provisions.

Chair House observed that a 30-year relationship with SAFE's bookkeeper is a long time. She was once told by an old sage that you should start looking for a new accountant after five years to get someone different looking at the books. Her recommendation to SAFE was to go shopping for alternatives. Ms. Baim stated that SAFE has looked for alternatives a couple of times. The accountant lives in Nevada: the online world is amazing. SAFE has had 25 years of clear, perfectly clean audits, and the program has some very strong safeguards. Those get stronger every year because there have been problems in other nonprofits in the state. The business manager at SAFE handles all the billing, but the accountant handles all the monthly reconciliations — so that one hand does not control the whole process. SAFE scans and sends the invoices to the accountant daily to verify correctness, and the accountant sends a message by email so that SAFE can put the checks in the register at the program site and print out the checks. The accountant can check on the status of SAFE's account but cannot move anything around.

For her two-minute summary, Ms. Baim stated that when she put the grant application together she was embarrassed to ask for as much of an increase as she did. No matter how professional the approach, she did not think in a million years that CDVSA would be successful in getting the

22% increment through the Legislature. SAFE's request is not truly extra money, it is what the program actually needs to hold even and keep the doors open. She has to approach her board of directors this year and tell them the program is \$50,000 in the hole, which is one-quarter of their reserve fund. SAFE is looking at the real possibility of not being renewed on the \$200,000 a year grant that is core operating funds as well. So this is a very scary time for the program. Because the CDVSA was successful in getting the increment, she would like to amend SAFE's request so they at least get a 22% increase, amounting to another \$9,200, which can make a big difference. If the Council could give more, the programs are very good stewards of the funding support from CDVSA, and SAFE would be the very best steward possible.

For clarification on the 22%, Ms. Ashenbrenner said those were the figures that the Network provided to her about the need. She did not make a huge point of testifying to those specific numbers at the legislative hearings, but talked more generally. However, she used that to base the increment request on because the CDVSA had to have some data and hard numbers. She wanted everyone to be aware that the increment request based on those numbers was cut by 27.5%. So the budget the CDVSA wound up getting does not give that 22%/13% increases that the numbers were built upon. She did not want people's expectations to be higher than the Council was capable of giving.

**Sitkans Against Family Violence (SAFV) - Sitka**

Presenter: Chris Bauman (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$343,346
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$406,206

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Referring to the evaluation section of the SAFV proposal, Ms. McFadden asked for one or two examples of how SAFV has changed the way it does business to meet its goals. Ms. Bauman said they used to have four pages of rules for people coming into the shelter. In listening to shelter residents, they have changed that to one page of guidelines that just involve safety. When they had an active outreach worker SAFV had a lot more calls from the villages and people coming to the shelter from outlying areas. Then they went through a couple of years without an outreach worker, and all those numbers fell off. This caused SAFV to look at how to reach out to the villages to keep them informed of the services available that they may not know about when SAFV does not have anyone to go out there on a regular basis. With more teens coming to the shelter for a lot of services, SAFV is really looking at the way they do business because their advocacy is based on adult women and small children. The program has never before had two or three teens a month coming in to report being in an abusive relationship or having been sexually assaulted. SAFV is looking at how to provide services for teens with people who are not used to working with teens.

Ms. McFadden asked if SAFV's outreach person was not funded or if they were unable to hire one. Ms. Bauman replied that the position was funded, but they could not find anyone to hire. They advertized and nobody applied for months. Ms. McFadden asked how the court-appointed

volunteers are working. Ms. Bauman said they get a lot of teenagers who have minor consuming charges and have to do 50 hours of community service work. SAFV puts them to work cleaning, doing yard work, doing copying, helping with the newsletter, etc. SAFV also finds that the teens talk about their issues, so while the teens are doing their volunteer work, the program does advocacy with them.

Chair House asked for Sitka's population. Ms. Bauman said about 8,600, and more in the summer months. Chair House inquired about the shelter nights and people served. Ms. Bauman said they did 3,187 bed nights last year: that was 90 unduplicated clients and 132 duplicated, for a total of 222. Chair House asked what SAFV attributed the increased shelter numbers to. Ms. Bauman replied that part of it is how the community is responding to domestic violence. For example, Sitka has had a different prosecutor every couple of years, and some prosecutors want to prosecute domestic violence and a lot of prosecutors will just plead down. If a lot of domestic violence cases are getting prosecuted, it seems like the numbers go down. If no one is being prosecuted, the numbers do not go down. If the community is working well together, SAFV sees less people needing shelter versus if the community is not offering services as well. It varies. Plus Sitka's population is pretty transient.

Chair House inquired how the new judge is working out in Sitka. Ms. Bauman said SAFV is trying to break him in. Chair House asked what the part-time employee benefit package consisted of. Ms. Bauman explained that if someone works 20 hours or more a week they are eligible for all the benefits, which include 2% retirement, health benefits, vacation, sick leave, etc. If someone works less than 20 hours a week they are not eligible for any benefits.

Ms. Satterfield complimented Ms. Bauman on SAFV's grant application, saying she was one of the few who followed the outline, which made it so much easier to read.

Ms. McFadden mentioned that she liked SAFV's staff diversity because it looked like it mirrored the community the program supports. The broad age group of employees from 21 to 72 was also interesting. Ms. Bauman said the 72-year-old was formerly an alcohol and drug counselor, and she works in the middle of the night, so she often talks to people about sobriety.

Ms. Andreen echoed other's comments about SAFV's being an excellent grant application and the program's reputation being good. She asked if the Sitka Healing House Legal Services and the Family Justice Center were the same entity or if they were linked. Ms. Bauman explained how the organizations started out separately but eventually merged.

Chair House noted that the last audit in 2007 had minor findings. She asked what those were. Ms. Bauman said one finding was that SAFV did not have copies of the bank signature cards on file, and she got those from the bank. Another finding was lack of correct documentation for the journal entries made. Things like that, that she could dig up and find, but the things were not where the auditor wanted them to be.

Ms. Andreen made the observation that SAFV's salaries are very low. Ms. Bauman said she would like Ms. Andreen to tell SAFV's board that.

In closing, Ms. Bauman thanked the Council for considering the SAFV grant proposal. She has been at SAFV for almost five years, and she is still amazed at the strength of the program and the cutting-edge prevention work that staff is doing. She can take only a small amount of credit for that and feels lucky to be there.

**Seaview Community Services (SCS) - Seward**

Presenters: Bernie Jarriel (executive director) and Tammy Jarriel (dv/sa coordinator)

FY09 Award.....\$ 89,947

FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....\$135,670

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Curran inquired how the job searches are going. Mr. Jarriel stated that Seaview as an umbrella organization has had a lot of job openings this year. It was down three directors, as well as all of dv/sa. All the positions are essentially filled, and he made an offer to the last remaining director position prior to coming to this meeting. If the person accepts, Seaview will be essentially fully staffed on its open positions.

Ms. Curran asked what changes or improvements SCS has made as a result of the information the program has gathered from the evaluations. Ms. Jarriel said she does written client surveys with each client, and they are always very good. The difficulties have come more through verbal responses. An example is that, being the only person in domestic violence, Monday a week ago she spent four hours with a new crisis intervention client trying to resolve a crisis, fill out an ex parte long-term protection order, and having the hearing. She had four other clients trying unsuccessfully to reach her, and their comments when she returned their calls were that they really needed her. That has been the most difficult, because she knows the people calling need her and the person sitting in front of her needs her, and she is only one person. That is what SCS is trying to rectify by asking for a half-time advocate for more coverage in the domestic violence program.

Ms. Curran asked what education the volunteers get so that they can go out and educate various constituencies. Ms. Jarriel replied that sadly almost none of the volunteers are involved in client care. The volunteers do fundraising, and all the advisory board is volunteers. However, Marianna Keil, who held the dv/sa position for almost a decade, and Melanie Stevens, who is the youth coordinator at the Qutekcak Native Tribe and also SART trained, are the back-up SART responders. Other than those two, she has no one to assist her with a client, volunteer-wise. Ms. Curran referred to page 19 of the grant proposal where SCS states "have volunteers provide education in abuse prevention, detection and intervention to schools." She wanted to know what SCS does so that volunteers are capable of doing that. Ms. Jarriel responded that SCS has monthly crisis training for the crisis line team, and volunteers are welcome to join that training. She also goes over basic education with them on how to handle different types of situations

when they have someone who is available to go into the schools. Mr. Jarriel added that SCS also wants to build up the volunteer group this coming year to go to the schools, because with one employee the program does not have the ability to go out into the schools and community the way they would like. Ms. Jarriel said she met with the counselor at the high school, who was interested in starting a teen support group. She would like the requested advocate position to assist with that.

Ms. Satterfield said that at the last funding meeting SCS reported having a part-time staff person for six months and one and a half full-time positions for the other six months. To her, that did not seem like adequate coverage, but the Council was assured there was plenty of coverage. She asked what has changed now that SCS is asking for 1.5 FTE coverage for 12 months. Further, she did not see in the grant application where SCS talked about whether the program met its goals last year. Mr. Jarriel said they had a half-time FTE year round. Marianna Keil, who works for the legislative office, when it was closed for the other six months of the year, she worked full-time with SCS. The advantage is that Ms. Keil's office is downstairs in the same building as SCS. So even if it was a slow time when she was not working for SCS, she would come up and volunteer. Ms. Keil is still downstairs, but some other issues have priority in her life, so it difficult for her to volunteer as much as she did before. That is how SCS got by with a half-time person and then 1.5 persons in the busy summertime. With the changes in staffing, SCS has had to modify the goals from last year because they are not going to be able to meet everything. SCS has worked with CDVSA's Lauree Morton on modifying the goals for the current grant year. The first quarter they had almost no services outside of the emergency response. The second quarter was a major learning piece for her (who?).

Ms. Satterfield asked if SCS is seeing an increase in services. Ms. Jarriel said definitely. Last year SCS, which is a shelterless model, provided ten nights of safe shelter to six victims. So far this year they have had 13 victims for whom they have provided 25 nights of shelter. The program has 63 active clients. In the last eight weeks, they have had 24 new clients. Twelve have been new crisis presenters, and the other 12 have been old clients as far back as the 1990s representing. With the economic situation, the perpetrators are trying to come back, and the clients are afraid and coming back to SCS.

Ms. Satterfield inquired how many volunteer advocates there were. Ms. Jarriel said she was on call 24/7. Mr. Jarriel added that they have a 24-hour crisis line mostly run through behavioral health for the mental health clients. But it is the crisis line for Seward and that side of the Kenai Peninsula. SCS has three masters-prepared clinicians for the level two crisis line, and six of the other staff plus Tammy for the level one.

Ms. McFadden asked about the benefits of being a shelterless organization in Seward and if the management ever considered acquiring a shelter with some of the funding available out there. Mr. Jarriel said the shelterless model works well for Seward, but Seward is an isolated community. It is relatively small, and if the perpetrator is going to hide, there are not a lot of places to hide in Seward. The police and Troopers do an excellent job of getting the perpetrators

in. The shelter night statistics show that there is not a vast volume of survivors who cannot go back to their homes. Most of the shelter nights are actually visitors to Seward who need to spend the night in a safe place so they can either get back on a cruise bus to Anchorage or get to another part of Alaska.

Ms. McFadden inquired about the annual cost for sheltering someone at a hotel and if SCS used different hotels. Ms. Jarriel said SCS has one primary hotel and a backup hotel, and they both charge SCS \$99 a night. The maximum stay is three nights. They never have to extend, but if they needed to they could. Seward receives an incredibly high volume of tourists, some of whom end up in a domestic violence situation. So oftentimes they will either have a bus ticket or plans to go to Anchorage in order to leave. SCS has a memorandum of agreement with the LeeShore Center in Soldotna, where they have transported one sexual assault victim. Mr. Jarriel added that SCS works very closely with the Alaska Vocational Technical Center in Seward, and a lot of folks from Western Alaska come to that school. SCS has had several clients who got into domestic violence situations there, and SCS has bought or assisted in purchasing plane tickets back to the villages for them.

Ms. Andreen said she could not tell from the grant application how many training hours are done for the dv/sa staff. Mr. Jarriel said it will be 40 hours. Network people are going to Seward in August to do that training for all the crisis line staff, not just dv/sa staff. Ms. Andreen inquired about the advocate I and II positions that have different levels of response. Mr. Jarriel explained that SCS has an advocate and a dv/sa coordinator. The only area where they have two levels is the crisis line. Level two calls are masters-prepared clinicians. The others are level one. Ms. Andreen asked what level of service is required for a level two crisis line responder. Mr. Jarriel said suicide, or if assessments are needed at the hospital or jail, or an existing client that already has an established relationship with a clinician and is in an extreme crisis (usually more behavioral health related or mental health related).

Ms. Andreen commented that she appreciated SCS doing training for hotel staff, and asked how often and how long that training is. Ms. Jarriel said that if the hotel lets her know they have a new staff person she will train them one on one. Otherwise, she tries to train there quarterly or be available to answer questions. The primary hotel that SCS uses changed ownership, and she and the new owner have a very good working relationship and talk almost weekly.

Ms. Andreen said the need for volunteers to be more actively involved has been brought up, and she was glad to hear that SCS is looking at incorporating that training. She said she knows it takes a lot of energy to build a volunteer program and sustain it, but the rewards can be incredible. Being a huge fan of the logic model for evaluation, she said she appreciated how SCS put so much thought into the different levels of questions they will be looking at for evaluation.

As an area of concern, Ms. Andreen mentioned the \$51,000 in the budget for the dv/sa staff, plus the \$25,000 for salary support of the umbrella organization's executive director, the administrative, and the information technology. That is about a 50% add-on to the direct services

cost, and that seemed very high to her.

Chair House indicated that she had questioned that also. She asked if most of SCS funding came from CDVSA. Mr. Jarriel said that was correct for the dv/sa program. Chair House inquired where SCS got the funding for his executive director salary. Mr. Jarriel said they have about 12 or 13 other grants, the largest grants coming from the Department of Behavioral Health... *[tape change - missing a portion]*

Mr. Jarriel thanked the Council for supporting Seward and SCS with funding to work with clients there. He stressed the importance of getting another half-time employee to provide extra backup for the dv/sa coordinator and for the prevention work needed in Seward.

**South Peninsula Haven House (SPHH) - Homer**

Presenter: Peg Coleman (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$316,840
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$366,016

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Col. Holloway said that SPHH's grant proposal mentioned a down turn in the economy. He asked what that could be attributed to, other than normal recent change. Ms. Coleman replied that with two family households many of the people work on the North Slope. But the majority of businesses in the community are small retail and women-owned, and they are having a hard time in this economy. Those businesses have been SPHH's biggest supporters, so the program is a little concerned about that. It also puts a lot of stress on families. There are a lot of artists in the community, and the down turn in the economy and lower arts grants mean those people are suffering as well. Some of the people were traveling to the oil fields up in Kenai, and some of those are closing down, impacting some people in the Homer area as well.

Col. Holloway pointed out that SPHH had definite numbers that showed change in the services the program is providing, and he thought that was very good in the grant proposal. He asked for more information about the child advocacy center (CAC). Ms. Coleman said CAC is a child-centered response to child victims, particularly of sexual assault or severe abuse. There are several in Alaska, and it is considered best practice. Instead of a child having to go from the school to the police to maybe mental health and to the hospital, it is a model where children are brought to one location, and somebody who is very skilled at interviewing a child talks to the child. The interview is recorded so that the child hopefully will only have to tell their story once. People have been saying that a child advocacy center was needed in the area, but because of the demographics on the Kenai Peninsula (based on a feasibility study), there was not enough money to support another nonprofit. Homer was asked to pursue a national grant to do another feasibility study. SPHH came up with a rural delivery model with three sites so there is not an undue burden on any family or police department to travel. One of the barriers to doing a CAC on the Peninsula was political jurisdiction issues. The rural model is extremely cost effective, and they look at pre-existing resources and how to develop them.

Ms. Coleman said this has been an excruciating process, doing the political thing, and trying to get memorandums of understanding done. But this is how it started. SPHH's advocate responded to a child sexual assault at the hospital; the child was four years old. The police officer did the very best they could in the interview but the child fell off the chair at 4:00 a.m. during the interview because of the length of time. The child had to be re-interviewed several times. It was not a good case. It was not defensible, the interview. Because SPHH's mission is to respond to victims of sexual assault no matter what the age, SPHH made the decision that the best part of a child advocacy center that the program could do was move things around and provide space in the shelter for the forensic interviewing room. Once they did that, and they got local buy-in from the local Rotary organization, the national sanctioned it as a child advocacy center and told them to go forth. They were able to get funding from the state for that. It is a very low-cost model and is meeting a very big need.

Col. Holloway mentioned that another issue he is concerned about in the Peninsula is the Russian Old Believer settlements there. It is very difficult for anybody to get in there and get information about what is really going on. He requested an update on how that group is getting assistance. Ms. Coleman stated that there was a time when if anyone from those villages accessed SPHH's services they would be excommunicated. A couple of dynamics are easing that up. More and more women from those villages are accessing the local community college, and the process of education helps change lives. The other piece of it is that SPHH offers a childcare assistance program and a childcare food program, which is an eligibility based program. There is no prohibition from that community for the women to access these programs, and they are encouraged to do that. By having those services located in SPHH's shelter, and because all the staff is cross-trained, staff has been able to get some education out. Through the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault's special bilingual grant SPHH was able to hire a Russian-speaking advocate, who is translating material and who will be starting support groups. It may look like knitting groups in the beginning because that is how to access those supportive services. The person will also be going into the schools as well. SPHH has seen more and more women access the program's services.

Col. Holloway said there was a news story not long ago about resettlement in Russia. He asked if SPHH had heard anything about people coming over to try to get the people on the Peninsula to move back to Russia. Ms. Coleman said no. Most of the people from the Russian Old Believer communities are coming up through Brazil and Bolivia, and some of them originated in China. There are three very distinct Old Believer communities, some more progressive than others. It is very hard to track the flow. In the five years she has been at SPHH, they have had young women who were brought up (to Alaska) under the guise of being married. One woman from Bolivia was held as a sex slave in the village, and SPHH had to help her get out via a kind of underground railroad. It was very dangerous for staff, and she was very grateful for the support of the police and FBI. Most of the people in the Russian Old Believer communities are faith believing and living good wholesome lives by what they consider their book. But when there is violence it is very covered up and it is very severe. Ms. Coleman said they have had some

progress, interestingly enough, from men in the batterers intervention program. Through the education, the feedback has been insightful to SPHH on how better to serve victims in that community. Progress has come in chipping away at some of the core beliefs and practices.

Col. Holloway noted that the grant application reported an increase in calls from the villages of Nanwalek, Port Graham, and Seldovia. He asked for more information on that. Ms. Coleman stated that SPHH had been in those villages for years through the federal rural grant. They had a rural advocate doing village education. SPHH actually served more women when they did not have an advocate visiting there, and they had to do a lot of debriefing to get to the bottom of that. They were seen as being part of the Troopers and part of the mental health system. SPHH found out from the women that they wanted to go under the wire because there is no confidentiality in the village. SPHH had to redesign its services. They have a new federal two-year rural grant where they have an advocate going in to the villages. Instead of SPHH delivering a service, they are working with each of the distinct needs of the villages to develop protocols internally and to let people know about the services the program has. SPHH is seen as a support for what the people need, based on their community's distinct needs. SPHH has done a better job of serving Native women and has had more people coming in to Homer. The model is very village-based and growing from the inside out.

Ms. Andreen commended Ms. Coleman on being nominated the Chamber of Commerce's Citizen of the Year. Ms. Coleman said she lost out to the local bartender, but she did not take any offense to that.

Ms. Andreen inquired about the amount of training for the volunteer advocates. Ms. Coleman said SPHH does the basic 40-hour training, and training is ongoing. They have weekly staff meetings where they incorporate training. She encourages staff to do a bit of research and to do some of the training. SPHH has the only 24-hour crisis line; even the mental health center that works with the hospital has a call-back crisis line that goes to the police after hours. So SPHH brought up the trauma intervention prevention program trainers from San Diego to work with staff and develop a peer-to-peer critical stress debriefing for people. She thought staff needed to be able to do that emotional first aid piece. That was an additional 40-hour training. There is also a clinician on staff who does ongoing training to support that. SPHH also accesses the trainers at the Network. The program is blessed that Dr. Linda Chamberlain is in the community and will come in and do training.

Ms. Andreen asked about any issues under the status of audits and findings. Ms. Coleman said the issue was an ongoing one having to do with having more than \$100,000 in the bank (above the FDIC federally insured limit) because the grant funding all came in at the same time. SPHH opened up different accounts, and then the FDIC raised the insured limit of bank accounts late last year.

Ms. McFadden inquired if SPHH makes contact with women in advance to help plan how to escape safely or if women show up at the shelter and say they have been planning to do this for

three weeks. Ms. Coleman said it depends. Safety planning is a craft, and sometimes in working with women to explore their best and highest level of safety, it is often not to immediately come to the shelter. Taking time to get their documents in order, to make arrangement for their kids, and to think about the alternatives — if they have the luxury of that time. For some women, it is knocking on the door looking for a bed. It is a mix of people, but SPHH tries to take a thoughtful safety planning approach.

Chair House congratulated Ms. Coleman for hiring the two advocates, including the Russian-speaking person to penetrate the Russian Old Believer community.

For her two-minute wrap-up, Ms. Coleman said she is most proud of SPHH's support group that is blossoming. She had a difficult couple of months on a personal level, and she had the gift of colleagues and friends to see her through. Women who come to Haven House do not always have that gift: they are often isolated and alone. After spending time with a grandchild, she has an appreciation for how the women with children do it. She and her colleagues have each other's backs, and it is an incredible support system. When women leave SPHH they know how to access their own support system.

Chair House asked Ms. Coleman to repeat her comments from yesterday about the Council. Ms. Coleman stated that when she first came to a funding meeting she felt like it was an inquisition. It was really hard, and it felt like someone was trying to find something wrong. It also felt very competitive, even though the programs are not supposed to be. It is not that way now. Instead of trying to see through the programs, they feel like the Council is trying to see the programs through. They get the sense that the Council wants them to be successful, and that it is everybody's success. Ms. Coleman said she cannot talk enough about the collaboration among her sister programs. There was tension between LeeShore in Kenai and SPHH in the beginning. But they collaborate on everything, call each other up. That kind of networking among the programs and knowing that they are in this together, recognizing that this is an Alaska issue and not a turf war. Ms. Coleman said that Ms. Ashenbrenner has done a lot to bring it together, and she thanked her.

Chair House indicated that the agenda would be re-ordered slightly to take up Tundra Women's Coalition at 10:20 a.m. and to move Standing Together Against Rape to 11:00 a.m.

**Tundra Women's Coalition (TWC) - Bethel**

Presenter: Michelle DeWitt (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$799,186
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$966,349

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. McFadden inquired about the staff education beyond high school level. Ms. DeWitt stated that TWC has been able to participate in the Rural Human Services Training Program, a partnership with the Association of Village Council Presidents (AVCP - the regional tribal

nonprofit), a local college, and the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The program is a two-year cohort, and she has been able to enroll two people at a time over the past six years. They go to college one week a month, eight months out of the year. TWC's obligation as the sponsoring employer is to pay their salary. TWC does not pay anything else and the enrolled employees do not pay anything else. When the people finish the two-year program they are certified in rural human services. With one more year of training, they will have their associate's degree. TWC has three people on the associate's track, two people certified, and two people currently enrolled in the program. This education has been a huge retention improvement for TWC, and CDVSA as a funder get a much better product and service delivery. Ms. DeWitt said she could not say enough good things about this program. TWC also has other staff in more traditional college course models in early childhood development, etc.

Ms. McFadden asked about TWC's court-referred volunteers that the grant proposal stated was a challenging pool, and if it was working for TWC. Ms. DeWitt said they make it work. Volunteers in general is an area that is probably not one of TWC's programmatic strengths. People call at the last minute to say they have 20 hours of volunteer work to get in, and that is really tough. These people cannot do direct services because they do not have the training. TWC is creative in trying to think of projects where the people are not coming into contact with program participants. There is no training involved related to the domestic violence and sexual assault work of the program. The volunteers do work outside the building, yard work, shoveling snow, etc., and they have to be supervised. Ms. McFadden asked who would otherwise do that kind of work. Ms. DeWitt said staff does it, including herself. Ms. McFadden inquired if shelter clients do any of the work. Ms. DeWitt said no.

Ms. McFadden asked what more TWC would ask for in the budget if they were able to amend the grant application. Ms. DeWitt said she would ask for more funding in facilities and travel. TWC saw a big increase in the third quarter of FY09 in requests for shelter. They were maxed out, with 30 people in shelter on a number of nights. There were three families in hotels one night, plus a shelter full. She had never experienced that before in the organization. April brought thousands of dollars in emergency airfare bills and associated expenses. The other big expense is utilities: the electricity bill for their 10,000-square-foot building is \$4,000 a month now. Ms. McFadden inquired about the electricity bill last year. Ms. DeWitt said it was about \$3,000. They saw a huge increase in the fall, and TWC is not eligible for power cost equalization (PCE), as an organization. Filling the fuel tank takes over \$5,000. Ms. McFadden asked where the travel takes place. Ms. DeWitt clarified that by travel she meant emergency airfare into Bethel for program participants, and 80% of the program participants come from villages. It is a major expense for TWC.

Chair House observed that TWC has really focused on prevention, in particular in the rural areas. She asked how TWC did that so successfully. Ms. DeWitt replied that in the region she works in the value is elders and kids, and that naturally translates into what TWC is working to achieve. It has been an evolution. Prevention is something that TWC has worked on for years. They are most successful with the Bethel-based teen and children's groups because they need that

consistency. Going to one classroom once a year does not make the impact that having ongoing work does. TWC has many years of resources to build upon, and that is a piece of it. In addition, they are doing some interesting work in Kipnuk related to prevention. That particular community had an issue with a sex offender who abused a very large number of children, and it got media attention. TWC had an advocate who was from Kipnuk originally and who wanted to move back. TWC did a partnership with the community's traditional council where they provided the space and TWC provided the staff person three weeks out of the month. The advocate is doing a lot of work: she started a teen group and children's programs, and does classroom education on a consistent basis, based on what they are doing in Bethel.

Chair House inquired about the transitional housing. Ms. DeWitt said TWC has two transitional houses in Bethel. The houses are not funded with CDVSA dollars but with Continuum of Care dollars, which is HUD and Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC). Obviously, the CDVSA provides in-kind support to that project in so many ways. One of the houses has been converted to a duplex so it can be used as a single family or a duplex. There are typically three families in those two houses. The program guidelines are for a one year length of stay, and by funding it can be up to two years. TWC can make exceptions if families have been unable to find other permanent housing in the community, despite their best efforts. Finding housing can be a real challenge if subsidized housing is not an option for the people.

Col. Holloway asked for a quick update on the capital project. Ms. DeWitt said that construction on the new building will start when the first barge gets to Bethel. She has been working on this project since 2005, and it will be more than \$8 million, not what she expected when she started. There are multiple funders. The building plans are currently at the fire marshall's, and TWC is ready to go.

Ms. McFadden asked if the new building would increase the number of shelter beds. Ms. DeWitt said yes. Right now, the shelter has 22 beds but only six bedrooms. If the families are large, it is hard to combine families in the same tiny space. The new facility will have ten bedrooms. One will be a pre-transitional apartment that was modeled on Fairbanks's new building. Ms. McFadden asked about the targeted completion date. Ms. DeWitt replied that the contractor timeline says one year, and the superintendent said he could have it done in ten months.

For the closing summary, Ms. DeWitt thanked the Council for reviewing TWC's grant application. She said that if Council members get approached with questions about TWC's capital project, they should not hesitate to call and ask her. She mentioned some unique partnerships that TWC has. One is working closely with the new sex offender treatment program in Bethel. They also are working with statewide organizations like the Alaska Immigration Justice Project and the Native Justice Center. When programs talk about what they are doing, some of the work can sound sanitized or canned in increments. She told a story to illustrate how vital CDVSA funding is. This past fall TWC had a referral from an emergency mental health facility in Bethel for a woman whose boyfriend threatened to kill her with a gun. The woman had a mental illness that was never diagnosed, and emergency referred her to the TWC facility. In the

last five months, TWC was able to get the diagnosis onto her paperwork, to enroll her in Social Security Insurance (SSI) with help from the hospital (a very big challenge), and she got permanent housing for mentally ill persons in Bethel. These are things the woman wanted that TWC was able to help her with. The CDVSA dollars provide real services for real people in danger, and the money makes a real impact.

Chair House called a scheduled break from 10:40 a.m. until 11:00 a.m.

**Standing Together Against Rape (STAR) - Anchorage**

Presenter: Nancy Haag (executive director)

FY09 Award.....\$581,346  
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....\$837,117

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Andreen mentioned that STAR's was a well-written grant and that she liked the description of the changes in utilization compared with previous years. She also liked the idea of bed-in-a-baskets available for victims, especially if their bed linens have to be taken in. She noted that the evaluation seemed to be just process-oriented and only focused on service provision. She asked if Ms. Haag would like to expand on the evaluation efforts. Ms. Haag stated that STAR does client surveys and uses the feedback from those to alter services but also to make sure that the program is getting to the point. The point they are trying to get to with clients is to decrease self blame, and to decrease isolation and improve their access to services. She offered to show Council members a summary that she brought with her.

Ms. Andreen asked how STAR was determining success when doing work in the schools. Ms. Haag said they cannot do pre and post testing with the kids, so the teacher evaluates the presentation in terms of the interest to her students. For the coming year STAR would like to implement more of a raising of hands so that the advocate has more interaction with the kids. They would like to ask some fundamental questions about safety rules before and at the end of the presentation. Ms. Andreen said she wondered if the prohibition on testing was an interpretation by the Anchorage School District or the teachers about surveying, which is different than testing. Ms. Haag said she needed to find that out. Ms. Andreen mentioned that some programs are doing a post test that asks about levels of awareness or understanding: it would not give pre test information, but at least it would provide some post information.

Ms. Andreen said she noted that STAR volunteers get 35 hours of training. She asked if STAR was aware that the state statutes say the volunteers need to have 40 hours of training. Ms. Haag said they initially start with 35 hours, and then when the volunteers start taking the crisis line, they take classes after that. An example is the anonymous victim reporting, which is new, where STAR held special classes for the volunteers.

Ms. Andreen commented that she did not see any information related to background checks of staff. Ms. Haag assured her that STAR does them. The hiring supervisor does the reference

checks and the background checks.

Regarding budget detail, Ms. Andreen said that project income/cash was not broken out so she could not tell how much was client fees, third-party payments, memberships, or fundraising. She asked for more information about the funding streams under the cash category. Ms. Haag said that was basically events and fundraising. There are no charges to clients. When STAR provides an educational training, for example they did sexual harassment training to the Pipefitters Union and charged the union \$75 an hour. STAR will soon be making earned income revenue from a building it purchased with two other nonprofits. When the maintenance funds are up to what they need to be to deal with upcoming maintenance, then they will start dispersing the income to the three member owners. That income should start coming in by November. Ms. Andreen said she was thinking more of third-party payments and violent crimes compensation. She asked for STAR's position on not having a fee structure in order to generate third-party payments. Ms. Haag replied that it is not something that STAR has historically done. There is a huge discomfort with the board in doing that, either going through victims compensation or through any sort of third-party billing. The board's fear is that it will remove some of the dollars that would be available to the victim, and they don't want to be involved with that.

Ms. Andreen noted that she did not see a prioritization of items for STAR's requested increase. Ms. Haag said STAR talked about what they would do if they did not get the funding. One area where they have successfully closed out grants is the legal advocacy. Although they are using a model whereby the first person who responds to a victim is also hopefully the one who will accompany them through court, because some cases can take three and four years, some of the advocates may have moved on. It is a good model, but in reality the program director who coordinates all of that, it ends up taking a lot of her time. This person is also the volunteer coordinator and a legal advocate, and STAR realizes that the legal advocate is a big position. Ms. Haag said the other area would be in direct service advocates because there has been such a big increase in the number of reports. On the weekends they are four people deep in terms of responding. Advocates were burning out and they were leaving in short order. STAR is trying to have more relief built in for the direct service advocates. So the priorities for the requested increase would be both legal and direct service advocacy.

Col. Holloway said he had three questions that Ms. Haag could probably answer together. The grant application stated a 45% increase in service requests in the past four years. He wanted more information on anonymous reporting, and an estimate of the numbers that STAR is getting from outside Anchorage, to give an idea of what population STAR is really serving. Ms. Haag stated that in FY08 over FY07 STAR saw a 33% increase in adult reporting, a 30% increase in child reporting, and about a 50% increase in reporting by people who chose to go to the hospital and not report to the police. That was before anonymous reporting was an option. So those were large increases in one year. It continues to be that way through the first three-quarters of the current fiscal year. Ms. Haag stated that anonymous reporting began in February 2009 in Anchorage. STAR did not hear anything for a long time, but in the last four weeks they have had four anonymous victims reporting. Two started out to be victim anonymous reporting and then

midway changed their minds. The other two remained throughout the whole system to be anonymous reporting. There are some issues where one of those victims will come forward probably in the next two or three weeks, but initially the woman felt like she needed to remain anonymous because of the environment in which she was living.

Col. Holloway asked to what STAR attributed the big increase in services requested, and what were the numbers for people coming from outside Anchorage to get services. Ms. Haag said she attributed the increase in services requested to there being more conversations going on about sexual assault. Two things are converging at the same time: people's acceptance of a common language — children are able to talk about it, adults are coming to STAR talking about it — and there is more community awareness that it is okay to report. Ms. Haag guessed that about 5%-10% of STAR's numbers are from outside the Municipality of Anchorage in any year. She thought the crisis line receives calls from the rural areas, the same way that some of the rural programs receive crisis calls from Anchorage. STAR also serves some people who have moved into Anchorage from other areas, but she considers that part of the population of the municipality.

Chair House said she was surprised and alarmed to see the ages of rape victims as two to 80. That should not be happening in this day and age. She noted that the application talked about the long-term safe housing and partnering, but she wanted information about the partnership with AWAIC to cover the phone lines when someone is not available. Ms. Haag said STAR relies on crisis line volunteers after business hours, so oftentimes, with people working, the 10-7 shift is not what people want to volunteer for. STAR has an arrangement with AWAIC to take the crisis line at times when STAR does not have volunteers available.

Chair House stated that she was impressed with STAR's plan in case the funding was not enough to cover their requests, saying it showed a lot of respect and leadership. She said she was also impressed with STAR's Foraker QuickBook work because it saves a lot of money, and with the creative fundraising.

Ms. McFadden said she was super impressed by STAR's grant proposal. She would like the next time the Council meets to invite someone from STAR to give the STAR training presentation that they provide to the community at large. Ms. Haag said they would be happy to do that.

Ms. McFadden asked if clothing was donated or if STAR purchased clothing with grant money. Ms. Haag said they purchase new clothes for victims to change into.

For the closing summation, Ms. Haag informed the Council that STAR is in the middle of a building renovation that is due for completion by the end of June. It was made possible with funding from the Denali Commission and a contribution from Conoco Phillips. STAR is looking forward to their new home that will be designed and decorated to feel safe and offer encouragement and trust. STAR is also looking ahead to the challenges of the coming year. They are encouraged by the numbers of people who are reporting and the growing community

awareness about sexual assault and rape in the community. They understand that knowledge is the beginning seeds of change and perhaps the journey to a safer community.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that STAR is the only agency in Anchorage providing sexual assault services, but every program that CDVSA funds across the state offers both similar sexual assault services, as well as domestic violence services, in their communities. Ms. Haag said that STAR is the only agency that focuses on sexual assault.

**Unalaskans Against Sexual Assault and Family Violence (USAFV)**

Presenter: Lynn Crane (executive director) by telephone

FY09 Award.....	\$138,564
FY10 Core Services Grant Request.....	\$166,277

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Andreen said that both the proposal and today's presentation mentioned the significant increase in clients. But page 4 of the proposal indicated there were 63 victims in fiscal year 2004, 72 in 2005, 58 in 2006, 64 in 2007, and 68 in 2008. Other than a blip upward in 2005, it seemed to her that the numbers had remained fairly consistent. The proposal stated that there have been 42 victims in the first half of FY09. She asked Ms. Crane to expand on her comment that program utilization has increased. Ms. Crane explained that USAFV is seeing more clients with more complicated legal issues, either due to immigration issues or because of child custody matters, that require more services than someone who may just be passing through on their way to somewhere else. She said she has never been able to figure out why the program has fluctuations in service utilization, but the number has been fairly consistent. They have not seen a significant decrease. USAFV does not have a person on staff who is dedicated to just doing legal advocacy because it is such a small program. All three staff members strive to do legal advocacy for the clients who need it.

Ms. Andreen said she recalled from her days in Homer that legal advocacy issues are very time intensive. On USAFV's safety planning on follow-up, she noted that the application indicated that the program does safety planning when it is possible. She asked what the conditions were when it was possible. Ms. Crane said it would generally be with a crisis line caller who has chosen either to not come to the shelter, to go somewhere else for safety, or to stay in their situation. USAFV would do some safety planning on anticipating violence and taking steps to make sure a woman and her children are able to leave the situation in a safe manner before things escalate. Domestic violence often follows a pattern, and most victims are pretty smart about knowing what is coming. USAFV wants to help people avoid violence in the short term, whatever they decide to do in the long term.

Ms. Andreen thanked Ms. Crane for USAFV's management letters on the audits. USAFV was actually congratulated on how well their system works. Ms. Crane said they are a small program, and there will always be duplication of duties when it comes to check-writing and reconciling. They have tried to make it very clear to the board exactly what money is being spent and where

it is going, and it is very easily tracked by the documents that they use whenever making any kind of expenditure.

Ms. Andreen reiterated a comment that she had made to other programs, that the memorandums of agreement seemed to boilerplate and maybe did not necessarily reflecting the actual working particulars. Also, a couple of agreements were signed by the senior services and the police, but it indicated it was an agreement between the school district and USAFV. Ms. Crane said she made a note of Ms. Andreen's earlier comments on that topic, and she agreed she should fine tune the agreements.

Ms. Andreen observed that USAFV's was a very small budget request for a very dedicated organization. USAFV's staff accomplishes a lot in Unalaska.

Chair House mentioned that the statistics of 64 clients in fiscal year 2007 and 68 in 2008 are a lot of work for two staff members plus one executive director. She asked how they managed all of that. Ms. Crane said it was through flexibility and a lot of sharing of duties. They cross-train as much as they can so that any one of them is able to respond to whatever kind of need a client might have. Even though the program has had some challenges with retaining staff because of the cost of living and the wages the program can pay, the people that come to work at USAFV — and programs everywhere in the state — are there because they really believe in what they are doing.

Chair House praised the program for using QuickBooks. She noted that USAFV is well funded but it most likely could use some additional staff, and she wondered what Ms. Crane thought about that. Ms. Crane agreed that they could use additional staff. One of the issues the program has right now is that the physical location does not have room for more staff. They have been trying to hire a part-time outreach person for the rural immigrant domestic violence grant that USAFV got, and they have not been successful. They have also not been successful in hiring a part-time general outreach coordinator, so they are considering combining those two positions and opening a satellite office. That would serve USAFV well because the community is laid out with one side and another side. Some of the major employers are on the other side, and if there was a satellite office she was sure the client load would increase. It would also allow the program to do a lot more regular outreach, which sometimes tends to fall by the wayside because staff is busy rotating shifts to provide direct services.

Ms. Andreen asked what Ms. Crane meant when she wrote that USAFV had 98 unique clients, 42 of which were victims. Ms. Crane said the other 56 clients may be people who originally came to USAFV for domestic violence and sexual assault issues but are still receiving ongoing support that is not necessarily tied to any incidents of violence. Others are people dealing with other types of life crisis. USAFV has funds from Alaska Housing Finance Corporation that enable the program to help homeless people. Homelessness is a huge problem in Unalaska, mostly because of people who are fired from processing jobs or jobs on boats and then either do not have tickets out or are waiting to get tickets out. Because USAFV has the only crisis line in

the community, the program receives calls about all kinds of things — suicide, behavioral health, people looking for referrals for substance abuse, etc. USAFV also acts as the de facto food bank for the community using local and other funds, but not CDVSA funding. They have seen a lot of people experiencing food insecurity in the last six months.

Ms. McFadden said she was a little alarmed about the board composition diversity. She doubted that 86% Caucasian and 14% Alaska Native was representative of the community's population. Ms. Crane responded that the board's composition is representative of the population, because Unalaska's Native population is only about 8%. USAFV struggles with diversity on the board, as do all the local nonprofits. She was on the clinic board for years and that board also struggled with the same issue. Every time there is a board opening at USAFV they send letters and make phone calls to local organizations to recruit people. USAFV has not had that much response, and neither have other organizations. USAFV's board chair is a Native woman who is a strong leader in the community. The program also has a Native advocate on staff, and they are always trying to recruit staff, board, and volunteers from the population that it serves.

Ms. McFadden expressed support for USAFV's policy under services to be provided that if the program does not hear back from a client in three hours the program automatically notifies the Department of Public Safety. Ms. Crane said that people are not always happy about that. It is hard for adults to live in a place where there are so many rules and responsibilities, but it is for safety, and USAFV has to be consistent with it. USAFV is lucky to have such a good relationship with the Department of Public Safety.

For the allotted time for a summary, Ms. Crane stated that USAFV has over the years sought other funding from government agencies, corporate and private donations, and through local fundraising. The annual fundraiser was March 28, and they raised over \$12,000 in one night. USAFV enjoys a lot of community support. The program has been successful in many funding endeavors, but the state of Alaska and the City of Unalaska have been the sole consistent sources of funding. Without that support, USAFV would be unable to provide the services that they do. She said she did not envy the Council its job in having to make the funding decisions, but she appreciated the members' willingness to do so.

**Victims For Justice (VFJ) - Anchorage (statewide services)**

Presenter: Susan Sullivan (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$ 0
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$200,000

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Col. Holloway said he was a fan of VFJ, but he made the observation that VFJ was a new grant proposal this year, and there is never enough grant money to go around. He asked how VFJ would de-conflict with the other agencies for the overlap that will be almost impossible to keep from happening. Ms. Sullivan used Anchorage as an example, with STAR and AWAIC as the other agencies. She said she has a good relationship with those agencies and speaks to their

executive directors regularly. If a person comes to VFJ who is a victim of domestic violence and asks VFJ to represent them, the program will get a release and talk to the people at AWAIC about how things are going. If a case is going to superior court rather than district court, VFJ might be able to offer some services along the lines that they typically do for cases in superior court, and they are happy to do that. It is ultimately the victim's decision about where to be served, and VFJ is okay with that, and she thought STAR and AWAIC were as well. But for the most part the organizations collaborate and provide joint services for people, where VFJ might have something to offer that is unique.

Col. Holloway asked how else VFJ's services would be complementary to the other agencies that are already doing the dv/sa services, besides the under-served population that Ms. Sullivan spoke of in her presentation. He asked if Ms. Sullivan was thinking along the lines of VFJ's work in the courts. Ms. Sullivan said that particularly when domestic violence cases go to superior court VFJ can be helpful to AWAIC, because VFJ can provide their normal services such as court accompaniment, preparing victim impact statements, and so forth. The Violent Crimes Compensation Board (VCCB) has asked VFJ to work with the victims of sex trafficking, a population of victims that would certainly fall in the dv/sa category. VCCB asked VFJ to act as case managers because the people that the VCCB has in mind to provide services for need a whole array of services, and they felt that VFJ was uniquely set up to do that.

Col. Holloway commented that the evaluation process in VFJ's grant proposal seemed a bit vague. The proposal had indicated that VFJ was considering having an independent evaluator, and he wondered if Ms. Sullivan had any more information on that. Ms. Sullivan said they had not moved forward on that: the current funding streams have not required an elaborate evaluation system, however, they are working with 50 other agencies that are members of Anchorage United Way to establish a good system of evaluating agency services. That is a work in progress and does not start until 2011. The evaluation process for the FY2010 CDVSA grant, and for all other VFJ grants, would be rolled up into that one in particular. She did not have any specifics on how that would be set up. VFJ expects to do its first foundation survey this summer. VFJ has a unique database system called eTapestry where they are able to manage the case loads, as well as manage other interactions with people and groups in the community. They are working to make the eTapestry system an effective part of keeping track of all the information they would need to do a good evaluation.

Col. Holloway remarked that the organization has a lot on its plate. He asked — since all the CDVSA-funded groups are competitive for the funding, and the Council has to show results to be good stewards of the money that it is entrusted with — how CDVSA could know for sure that VFJ's services were going toward victims of dv/sa crimes.

Ms. Sullivan made it clear that she was not proposing that the CDVSA funding to VFJ be limited to the agency's work with victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. She was proposing that VFJ be the recipients of some of the funding that is designated by VOCA to be for the under-served victims, which specifically does not include dv/sa. She was also proposing that in

addition VFJ be considered for other funding that comes through the Council for management but is not specifically designated for dv/sa, for instance, the permanent fund dividend funding. She said she has observed CDVSA since its beginning and believes it has done a marvelous job of wrestling with very difficult issues of never enough money and many times more services needed than can be provided. The CDVSA is known to do an extraordinarily good job of making those sorts of decisions. She thought that was why the state continues to feed all victim services monies through CDVSA. She did not think it was the state's intention, as these decisions have been made incrementally along the way, to say that domestic violence and sexual assault are the only crimes and that those are the only victims that the state of Alaska can afford to assist. The state merely put those funds through CDVSA so the Council could do a good job of stewarding them. The VOCA funds in particular require that attention be paid to under-served victims. Ms. Sullivan said she wants VFJ to be the agency that does that. She would like to see the state of Alaska provide some significant amount of funding to that other half of the population of victims of violent crime who are not victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Referring to Ms. Sullivan's information about referring domestic violence and sexual assault clients to STAR and AWAIC, Ms. Satterfield asked how VFJ addresses statewide services, and if VFJ makes referrals to other programs around the state. She also asked if VFJ receives referrals from any of the domestic violence and sexual assault programs for that under-served population. Ms. Sullivan stated that she was sure the answer to the second question was yes but she could not immediately think of an example. Regarding the first question, she said VFJ works with Jake's Place in Dillingham. That includes a lot of people who have been the victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, as well as a whole range of other crimes. She said VFJ works with Jake's Place in Bethel with the substance abuse facility there. VFJ is broadening its reach and presented workshops in the past year in Barrow, Kenai, and Juneau. In the smaller communities VFJ is not able to provide the normal range of services that it provides in the larger communities, such as court accompaniment. The grief recovery workshops that they do are their best effort at helping people deal with the issues that perpetuate the cycles of being victimized and becoming then part of a substance abuse cycle and perhaps becoming an abuser as well.

Ms. Satterfield noted that VFJ's financial statements mentioned a couple of Department of Justice (DOJ) grants it received. She asked if those had been received or were still being projected. Ms. Sullivan stated that VFJ has received DOJ grants in the past, and they have one that has just been included in the federal budget. They expect that that money (\$400,000) will not be available to them for at least another year. It is an earmark, so it is hard to predict at the beginning how those will play out. The \$100,000 is a federal grant to create a state victims assistance academy. The \$207,000 is that portion of a larger DOJ rural services grant for victims of violent crimes that VFJ already has to expend in this year.

Ms. McFadden asked for more information about the Weed and Seed Program. Ms. Sullivan said it is a federal initiative through the Department of Justice to weed out crime and seed opportunity in neighborhoods that are in jeopardy. *[missing portion during tape change]* ...call it Steps to Respect. That Weed and Seed funding has ended. VFJ would like to continue that program.

Ms. Andreen echoed Col. Holloway's remarks by saying that she has always had the utmost respect and admiration for VFJ. The organization operated on a shoestring, starting with passion and commitment coming out of personal experience. She knew that the organization had been very instrumental in some systems changes over the years and involved in trying to change the judicial system, not just working with people one on one. She said she was concerned about a few things in the grant application where it said that because VFJ does not work with domestic violence and sexual assault victims the program does not have to deal with the provision of minimum necessities for program participants. She thought that would be an issue regardless of what crime took place. Ms. Sullivan recalled that she took that question to mean the provision of the kinds of necessities that someone might require at the time that they come to a shelter or at the time that they come to a rape crisis center. The clothing that Ms. Haag mentioned and the other necessities that Ms. Cordell's agency provides when people come to the shelter. VFJ is very seldom called upon to provide those kinds of necessities, and she assumed that was what that grant application question had in mind. She said she responded in the grant application about the sorts of other assistance that VFJ provides, but they very seldom are called upon to provide soap, shampoo, clothing, etc.

Ms. Andreen noted that the application stated in a couple of places (under accessibility and under goals and objectives), that when clients need translation services they are referred. She asked if VFJ ever brings translation services in to work with a client. Ms. Sullivan said they are able to do that, but what most often works best is if VFJ's advocate goes with the client to a place that provides translation services. Frequently, it is most important to have those services in court. So when they go to court, VFJ arranges for the translator to be there. In the majority of cases they have been able to find a member of a community, who may not be an official translator but who is a close friend of the family or a family member who has good English. It gets around some of the cost issues of other translation services, but most importantly VFJ uses that source because it works. The victim trusts that person to make a good translation, and that person is able to make himself or herself available for all of the times when the translation services are needed — going to court and hearings, helping to prepare a victim impact statement, etc.

Ms. Andreen commended VFJ for moving forward with the contract for the evaluation at the end of the projects. She encouraged VFJ not to wait until the end of the project. She offered to talk to Ms. Sullivan later about some low-cost options for getting consultation on some good evaluations. Ms. Sullivan said she would be happy to hear about that.

Ms. Andreen said she noticed there was no revenue listed out under the project income-cash. She asked if VFJ was receiving any fees, third-party payments, interest, memberships, donations, those kinds of things. Ms. Sullivan replied that, in general, no. VFJ is trying to establish a membership program but they put that under the category of donations and fundraising. VFJ does not charge for its services. They have an agreement with Victims of Crime Compensation Board, which generated about \$150 last year. So VFJ cannot project any significant cash income.

In the two-minute wrap-up, Ms. Sullivan stated that VFJ has seen an increase in people requesting their services, which they attribute to the increase in violent crime in the state, which they believe may be resulting from concerns about the economic recession. VFJ is not currently the recipient of any state funding, with the exception of a matching grant for the state victim's assistance academy, which is not part of the regular program. VFJ has come to CDVSA at this time because the requested grant will be critical in continuing the services to victims of violent crime that they have been able to provide for the past 24 years. The program is very grateful for the Council's consideration and looks forward to working with CDVSA.

**Women In Safe Homes (WISH) - Ketchikan**

Presenter: Naomi Michalsen (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$582,641
FY10 Core Services Grant Request .....	\$896,309

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Andreen said that WISH did a very good description of outlining the needs from the organizational perspective. Further, WISH has always worked very hard at getting the villages and their capacity built up with part-time advocates. She said she noticed that WISH alluded to increases in services provided in the abstract, but she did not see documentation that reflected those increases. Ms. Michalsen stated that WISH was one of the sites chosen for the Delta Project. The Centers for Disease Control is several years into that project, and WISH was able to get started right away. With a little funding, WISH has been very creative and innovative in providing services for a very active youth and children's program. They have also started the Girls on the Run program, with 15 girls. The girls will be running on May 16 in the Torch Run, which is a law enforcement fundraiser, and donating the money to Special Olympics in Ketchikan. WISH's relationships are blossoming, and the more they partner with people, the busier the program is. WISH has a 7% increase from the last quarter to this quarter. WISH had been virtually without people coming to the shelter and did not have strong relationships with law enforcement, the school district, or the rural areas. The program has been able to make some quick turn-arounds. WISH has been very active in the Domestic Violence Task Force in Ketchikan. With the help of the Delta Project, they have been active in the Ketchikan Wellness Coalition. The Coalition has five criteria that they are working on in the community of Ketchikan: domestic violence; coming together around kids; people in crisis; substance abuse issues; and year-round economy. The Ketchikan Wellness Coalition just decided to add the Delta Project, so the whole community of Ketchikan is seeing that prevention is really where they want to go.

Ms. Andreen asked how the agreement with the Ketchikan Indian Corporation works. Ms. Michalsen said WISH is just beginning to start the batterers intervention program together. WISH will be providing safety checks for people who are not tribal members. They have also talked about working on projects together, other than the small grant that they are partnering with them on. It is an important relationship that has been flourishing as well. Tlingit & Haida is another that WISH is very fortunate to be able to work with. It has been a rebuilding year, but it

has been overwhelmingly successful in the amount of support that WISH has received from everywhere. People really care about the mission of WISH and the people the program serves and want it to work. In order to realign with some of the suggestions that the Council made as far as doing an annual evaluation, maybe implementing a salary scale, etc., the largest funding increase that WISH is requesting is in the personnel services. The increase will pay for implementing a salary scale, to provide a 3% pay increase for staff, and to raise the base rate of an advocate's pay. Also, health care costs and fringe benefits have skyrocketed.

Regarding the volunteer program, Ms. Andreen said she saw something she did not see anywhere else and appreciated when WISH talked about the two-year plan targeting the baby boomers as well as the teens.

Ms. McFadden said she was alarmed by the statistics that the WISH application provided from the Ketchikan Police Department, where harassment went from 27 to 177, and the incidents of domestic violence and rapes went up. She liked how WISH tied in the need for services with all of that. She was also happy that WISH was able to contract out to get more advocates into the villages, especially since some of the places are not on the road system. She asked Ms. Michalsen to expand a bit on how WISH is able to do that.

Ms. Michalsen stated that Ketchikan is on an island, and all the places that WISH provides services to are on islands (Metlakatla, Wrangell and Petersburg), except for Hyder. It is difficult to get people into the shelter or to provide services for the rural areas, and they are definitely under-served. Regarding data, there is not a lot out there, so it is good to hear about the new data research funding available to CDVSA. But WISH is thankful for the data it has. The relationships that are really important to WISH are the police department and the Troopers. There was a huge domestic violence task force meeting in the first week of April with record attendance, and it was overwhelming to know that these were all people who care about domestic violence in the community. Speaking of records, there was a huge fundraiser for the first time, and WISH was just hoping to break even to get community support and build the reputation of WISH, and the program actually made a lot of money. WISH has been trying to keep everything together without a lot of staff. She went the first eight months without a finance person, so she was doing both jobs and was burned out. But she is back because she cares about the services and the community. She is from Southeast Alaska and lived in Petersburg, leaving there because of a domestic violence situation herself and using the services of WISH. She became a grandmother seven days ago and believes that for the children the programs have to help especially the rural areas that are very under-served. Fortunately, the relationships are there and the rural areas are begging for WISH's help.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that at the CDVSA funding meeting two years ago the Council was very seriously concerned about WISH. She said she has never in her many years of state government seen an agency come so far so quickly. She congratulated Ms. Michalsen and everybody in Ketchikan for doing a great job.

Ms. McFadden asked how much of an impact Ms. Michalsen has because she looks like them and comes from them and is able to bring more people in because they must immediately trust and believe in her. Ms. Michalsen said it is all about relationships. It does not matter if you are from a place or not, but it is about respect. Keeping a director around is so important, because otherwise you have to start all over again with those relationships. She was one of those Tlingit girls that wore the Norwegian dresses in Petersburg, so going back to Petersburg and asking to work with people was a natural thing to do. The same thing with the other places that she has been to. It has really been a benefit and has probably been a factor in how WISH has been successful.

Chair House inquired about Ms. Michalsen's education. Ms. Michalsen said experience and a life of hard knocks. She said she is still going to school and is totally inspired by SAFE's Ginger Baim graduating from the university today. Up until last year she was taking a class every semester, and she hopes things will even out so she can maybe take one class a year. Her background is in tourism and more of a cultural type ambassador. She has a convention management and tourism background and an associate's degree in arts and business. But her interest is in Alaska Native studies and social work, and she is in the right field.

Ms. McFadden asked Ms. Michalsen to tell the Council a success story that she has seen. Ms. Michalsen said the success story is about everybody in this room. The things that WISH has accomplished have not been by herself. Ms. Baim came to Ketchikan during Thanksgiving and provided technical assistance. CDVSA came, the Network came, people at AWARE and Anchorage, and all of the shelters have been so amazing in supporting WISH. It is not natural for her to take and not give, so she feels like someday WISH will be able to give back and help some of the other shelters. But the overwhelming support is really what has played the biggest part in the big turn around. If there are healthy people working in this field, people who are passionate about helping victims, then victims are going to feel more comfortable about coming to WISH and the services are going to increase. The children want to come to all the programs WISH has been offering, and it has a positive energy. That is one of WISH's biggest success stories. Everyone can share that success.

Ms. Michalsen said new rural positions offer hope and encouragement to Ketchikan's neighbors. They feel as if they are not alone, and they have become an extension of the network of statewide advocates. The new rural positions are an essential link and key to the services for their own communities. By sharing in the services, skills and resources, WISH's efforts will multiply and continue through the work of others. New and improved community relationships have flourished. Growth in the collaborative efforts to end violence in communities continues. WISH has more involvement in the schools, sitting at the table with the superintendent, doing in-services for the teachers, and talking about what kind of training they need. Prevention talk is becoming contagious. Youth are taking up the cause with great energy and enthusiasm. In Wrangell one girl went to the Lead On conference and, when she returned, got the community involved in pottery in a program called a Dish for WISH, and raised over \$1,000 to help people in Wrangell come to Ketchikan if they needed. This is the girl who will be competing nationally.

Ms. Michalsen said the essential funding that CDVSA provides has a big impact on the lives of many under-served women and children. She thanked the Council for its service, on behalf of the WISH board and staff and the victims of domestic violence and domestic assault. She said she was thankful there are people working continually in organizations like the Council and the Network to improve the lives of Alaskan families. She was thankful for her beautiful friends from the statewide shelters who have also supported the victims that WISH serves by sharing themselves, sharing information, giving advice, and offering help to the WISH program.

### **LUNCH BREAK**

Chair House called a break for lunch at 12:20 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2:00 p.m., with all six Council members present.

The Chair indicated that the agenda would be amended to take up an item regarding the budget before hearing the next set of grant application presentations.

### **FY10 BUDGET DISCUSSION**

Ms. Ashenbrenner make a correction to yesterday's PowerPoint presentation in her executive director's report that explained the CDVSA funding sources. It was on the second slide that talked about the final amount approved after the Legislature took a reduction to the CDVSA increment request. The amount for program grant increases that came out of that process was \$846,727, and not the full increment request that she unintentionally put on the slide.

Ms. Ashenbrenner added that the typo led to a number of questions about how the budget was developed. She explained what happens every year with the state budget for state administrators. It starts in August with internal discussions about what the budget will be and what will be supported. Things get more serious through time and discussions with the department, and then the department discussing the proposed budget with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the Governor's Office. Eventually all those discussions led to OMB making some decisions about what they are going to put in the governor's budget. Things move quickly for state administrators, and it seems like the last budget cycle has just concluded, and they are putting together numbers and trying to anticipate what the agency will need a year to 18 months ahead.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she started by talking to the Network about what they thought victim services programs would actually need and not what they thought CDVSA could get in funding, which has been the culture for a number of years because there has never been enough money. Programs had moved away from asking for what they needed and were asking for what they thought they could get. The Network worked under a tight time schedule to give CDVSA a number that they thought was what victim services programs needed. It was about \$1.2 million, and staff's first thought was "fat chance." In addition to that, she requested \$220,000 for

prevention projects because that was the direction the Council had been giving her since she came to work for CDVSA. Without a prevention program already developed, she had to make phone calls to find out what people could reasonably do to establish a new program in the prevention area in one year and what the cost estimate would be. The same for research, which has been an issue ever since she began doing dedicated domestic violence and sexual assault work in 2003. No matter whether she was in a community group, in front of the Legislature, or talking with the Council or the Administration, the lack of statewide prevalent data and impact data has been a subject of discussion. Gathering data is a compelling need. So she talked with some people to find out what it would cost for one year to get started, and that resulted in a \$290,000 request for research.

Ms. Ashenbrenner related that when she originally put the \$1.2 million increment for victim services in the budget request it was not going to fly. So she carved it down. But later Office of Budget and Management said they had a lot of permanent fund dividend money because of the big distribution last year and asked if CDVSA wanted more money. Of course she said yes, and was able to put in the \$1.2 million increment that her work with the Network had come up with. After talking to the Council, that is how the CDVSA budget was put into the governor's budget request. The Governor submitted that budget to the Legislature in December, and it went from there. Then came talking to the legislators and testifying to the subcommittees, explaining how the increment was developed and what the money would be used for.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said that CDVSA has its big budget, a little over \$12.5 million this year. Within that are some different lines: the grants line, which is what funds victim services primarily, as well as some other grants that are passed through that line. Another line is services, and that is most often what CDVSA would pay for what is not going out in grants but could be services being provided. What happened when the money got allocated is that the prevention request of \$220,000 and the victim services increment (which was actually \$1,387,900 originally) got put into the grants line. The \$290,000 for research got put into the services line because the Council did not anticipate granting that money out: the research engines to do a project like this in Alaska are really located in the university system. So CDVSA anticipated being able to do the research project by a reimbursable service agreement (RSA), which is an agreement between state agencies to get work done that they need done. Those kinds of things are in the services line of the budget.

Ms. Ashenbrenner related that she explained to the legislators what CDVSA was going to do with the monies, and there was a lot of support and positive feedback, especially for the prevention piece, but also for the research. The Senate fully funded, but when it got to conference committee they took a reduction because they wanted to give the Department of Corrections some of the PFD felon money. CDVSA does not have any general fund left in its budget; state money is all PFD felon funding now. So the conference committee took \$381,900 out of the CDVSA grants line, which is a 27.5% reduction to that line, which was both the prevention funding and the victim services, because there was no legislative direction as to where they wanted CDVSA to take that reduction from. So the Council applied that reduction to

each of the increments in the grants line. That ended up with a \$846,727 increment for victim services programs and \$159,273 for prevention projects. She said she had been given very strong direction from the Council at every single meeting she attended since taking the executive director position 2-1/2 years ago that CDVSA needs to have dedicated prevention funding in the budget. So she kept it separate and gave it the Legislature's 27.5% reduction.

Ms. Cordell of AWAIC in Anchorage said that education is an important component. She asked if those dollars were going to be in a separate competitive RFP; or if the money would be rolled into victim services with specific outcome measures, because the programs all do education; or if those dollars would be designated to the Network.

Ms. Ashenbrenner explained that she asked the Council to make a decision on the prevention funding, and the Council, earlier at this meeting, passed a motion to grant those dollars to the Network. She said she talked to Ms. Brown about the Network giving CDVSA a proposal as to what it plans to do with the funding. Part of that discussion reiterated what the Council has said many times, which is that at least a portion of those funds should be for some sort of statewide prevention campaign. CDVSA does not have the staff to support a prevention campaign, but the Network has established that expertise in their shop with the work that they have done with the Delta Project. So it only makes sense that the Network is well placed to inform the Council how best to use those prevention dollars. The Council has also been clear that it is interested in primary prevention. So for that reason she does not refer to these as education funds, because she wants people to be clear that the funding is for primary prevention in communities.

Ms. Cordell expressed concern that 20% of all the operational dollars that are available to 18 companies has now been allocated to one program to implement. She hastened to say that she was not passing judgment on the quality — she had not seen the application or what the outcomes are going to be for the prevention project. She said she was assuming that no one was asking her opinion, but she was stating a concern. She did the math on the operational increases, and the Council is now in the position of having to find \$2.7 million to cut from the operations increases that have been requested. At the same time, the Council is doling out \$160,000 for prevention.

Ms. Ashenbrenner thanked Ms. Cordell for her comments. She said the state increment is one increase for fiscal year 2010. But CDVSA does not use just state funds for grants to victim services; the Council also uses two primary sources of federal funding — the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant and the Family Violence Prevention & Services Act (FVPSA) grant. Both of those grants also have an increase. The challenging part is that when the Council holds its funding meeting in May or June each year, those federal agencies have not actually told CDVSA what they are going to give for that year. The VOCA increase could be up to 18%, but CDVSA used a conservative 12% increase in its estimate. The FVPSA grant will have a few percent increase. With those increases, the amount the Council will have to distribute at this funding meeting is \$1,001,493, which is in addition to what victim services programs got in fiscal year 2009. The Council will be adding that to the total funds to distribute. She asked Ms. Griggs for the total

amount of funds to be distributed.

Ms. Griggs said the total was \$9,698,632. She added that if the VOCA grant increase turns out to be larger than staff estimated, then she would ask the Council for permission to apply that additional funding according to the percentage of total funding that each program was granted at this meeting.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that the Sexual Assault Services Program (SASP) formula grant, which staff expects notification on soon, will be added to the funding stream for rape crisis centers, per the Council's vote yesterday. There is also legal advocacy grant money coming, which is an earmark. CDVSA just does not know how much that funding will be, but the Council will be adding new services this year. Finally, there is the federal economic stimulus funding that will be coming in to programs.

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

Program applicants were allowed three minutes to make an oral presentation to the Council on their FY2010 grant application, followed by up to 10 minutes for Council members to ask questions of the applicants. Programs were then allowed two minutes for final comments. Total funding available was \$200,000.

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

**Akeela, Inc. - Anchorage**

No one from Akeela appeared in person or by telephone to make a presentation.

FY09 Award.....	\$ 0
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....	\$50,000

**Alaska Family Services (AFS) - Palmer**

Presenter: Judy Gette (program manager)

FY09 Award.....	\$52,812
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....	\$52,812

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Noting that AFS developed its 36-week batterers intervention program (BIP) in FY01, Ms. McFadden asked how often AFS reviewed its curriculum to see if it was meeting the needs of its clients. Ms. Gette said they constantly update the curriculums. The BIP program is loosely based on a number of canned curriculums, but as they have added things to it, it has changed.

Ms. McFadden asked how the three-, six-, and 12-month monitoring works, and if AFS keeps good statistics to see how many of the people who are referred by the courts actually complete the program. Ms. Gette replied that the most reliable sources for the recidivism checks are

CourtView (the court system's online statewide information database) and the Department of Corrections, because trying to find these men to have an in-person call is often very difficult. She said that yesterday she reported on compliance and AFS getting accreditation: they had to set some particular goals for the BIP program, and the goal was that for all intakes they would attempt to have one-third of them complete the program. That is realistic because oftentimes men will come in and start but not complete. So it is a goal to improve and get those that start to complete the 36 weeks. AFS can also look at what is keeping the men from completing: it could be a transfer to another program, or a return to custody, or the program could just lose them.

Ms. McFadden asked if a man who does not complete the program, commits another crime, and gets referred back to AFS, has to start at the beginning of the program or continue where they left off. Ms. Gette said it depends on what the new crime was. If it was domestic violence-related, then they start over. Or if three months have lapsed since they last attended, then they start over.

Ms. Andreen said she recognized that it can be very difficult to find these men for recidivism checks. She asked if AFS also did victim checks, in addition to checking with the courts, police, and probation. Ms. Gette said they attempt to contact the men at the last known phone number. If they are on probation, AFS can usually reach them through the probation officer. If AFS has victim contact, they can follow up with that. They can also check with the shelter to see if the shelter has had contact with the victim.

Ms. Andreen said she did not quite understand how AFS computed the recidivism rate. It looked like dividing the number of re-offenses by the number of checks actually done, rather than the number of people that were checked. Ms. Gette said they did it that way because some of the bodies are going to be recounted, because it is at the three-, six- and 12-month marks. So it will be a high number of checks, but they want to know how many men re-offended out of that number of checks. AFS typically does about 20 checks a month, and if there was one person who re-offended, that would be 5% recidivism. Ms. Andreen said she challenged that way of counting, rather than looking at whether a person over a certain period of time has re-offended. Ms. Gette commented that there should be a standardized way of counting statewide.

Ms. Andreen mentioned that AFS was projecting monitoring 50 offenders for the fiscal year. Ms. Gette said it was about 20 per month, so way over 50 a year. Ms. Andreen noted that the grant proposal indicated that safety checks were done monthly, and the report for the last year was 91 clients and 131 safety checks conducted. She said that would equal just about 1.5 safety checks per client, although she recognized that some victims did not have a current partner. Ms. Gette added that some victims do not want further contact after she makes the initial contact. Ms. Andreen said that going from what would ideally be 12 safety checks a month down to 1.5 seemed to be a significant gap.

Chair House commented that the AFS BIP program's reported 5.3% recidivism rate was marvelous. She said she noticed that the program was entering recidivism data by hand and

wondered about using a computer. Ms. Gette explained that they use an Access program for keeping the client database, and once in a while she has an employee who understands it. She has asked people to try and archive it or make queries to pull information out, and she wished she had someone who knew how.

Ms. Andreen commended Ms. Gette on the client fee collection. It is not a huge amount of money, but it is enough that a good effort is being made to collect from the clients. Ms. Gette stated that because AFS has a substance abuse treatment program, she tries to model the BIP fee collection on that — which is putting clients on 30-day notice if they get a certain amount in arrears. A little pressure has brought the money in better.

In closing comments, Ms. Gette stated that, in working with this population, staff is constantly reminded of how difficult it is to change a well-entrenched pattern of behavior and core belief system. Staff has to remember that their primary duty is safety for the victims and children, while at the same time supporting and encouraging these men to make changes. It is rewarding to see men who have completed the program come back to group for what is called a tune-up: something is going on in their lives and they need to seek guidance from the batterers group again. She had a client tell her that he was working on the challenge of accepting his wife's computer activities. He told her that it had nothing to do with what she was doing but that it triggered for him a desire to demand that she tell him what she was doing. He came back to group to talk to the other men about the need to be on guard and vigilant for the old controlling thoughts and behaviors.

Ms. Gette said it is also rewarding to see the men that want to give back to the community. AFS has two clients that help with school presentations by telling their stories about image, negative peers, violence, drugs, and alcohol. They do these presentations in the schools and with the Mat-Su Youth Court. The presentations include a piece on trauma such that if any of the teens are struggling with victimization they can learn where to get help. The speakers are quite dynamic, and the teens write letters indicating what they got out of the presentations. AFS had a couple of State Troopers come in to the Wasilla High School presentation, and the prisoner who was doing the presentation that day made the comment that it was the first time he had not been nervous seeing an officer, because he wasn't doing anything wrong for a change.

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

Presenter: Brenda Stanfill (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$64,312
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....	\$64,312

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Ms. Andreen mentioned that IAC was projecting to serve 195 offenders in the next year, using the Duluth model. Ms. Stanfill said the projection was based on military personnel coming back to the area. She added that IAC uses the Duluth model with some twists in it. The Duluth model is basically a 24-week program, and IAC's is a 36-week program. There were a couple of areas

they felt they did not have enough time to address: one of those areas is sexual respect, which is a hard topic for the men to talk about, so they take it a little slower. The other area is the effects of domestic violence on the children, which was not in the original 24 weeks of Duluth. IAC found that many men have a really hard time thinking about the empathy part and about the impact on their partner, but also when they start thinking about the impact on their children. And as more studies have been done, and the things that BIPs learned from Dr. Linda Chamberlain, that has been added into the curriculum. IAC has some groups they call the process groups, where if there just seems to be a topic that the men are having a hard time with, IAC can expand on that topic. So it gives more flexibility to have 36 weeks instead of 24 weeks.

Ms. Andreen mentioned that staff receiving the basic 40 hours of training and then 60 hours in the model is very extensive training. She asked how IAC defines and computes recidivism. Ms. Stanfill said they do in-depth data tracking. Up until this point, they had two programs (LEAP and IAC) that were working together and that tracked data together, and that has been incorporated. On IAC's separate program, everybody who came in and completed three groups of the program went into the six-, 12-, and 18-month checks. As the program called and checked, which is done through victim safety checks — and they count if the victim tells IAC that the man re-offended, even if there is no law enforcement report. If the man is picked up for an assault against a person, that is counted as a re-offense. If it goes into the criminal complaints, IAC checks that monthly. Sometimes things do not make it all the way to the court, but if IAC knows that police went to their house, that is counted as a re-offense too, even if no arrest was made. If they looked at it that way for 18 months, people who completed the program are at about a 13% recidivism rate. If they include everybody who started but did not complete, the recidivism rate goes up to 22%. IAC only counts the men once, so if a guy re-offends 12 times during an 18-month period and does not make it back to the BIP program, he is only counted once. If he started the program again and completed a little part of it, then they would count him again.

Ms. Satterfield asked if the batterer population knows that there is just one program now, or if they see it as two separate programs. Ms. Stanfill said it is a new change so they will have to see. They have been working on their community first to recognize it. LEAP's curriculum was a little different than IAC's, but basically pulled together it is the same curriculum in both the prison and the community. So they can still have a smooth transition, but there is a sliding fee scale that is subsidized by IAC. So they see it as a LEAP program curriculum with the ability to enter a subsidized program.

Ms. Satterfield asked if the fees all go to LEAP. Ms. Stanfill explained that they had to recognize some savings, and one of the most expensive parts of the program was collecting fees, tracking the fees, and figuring out how much the men should pay. It is \$40 a week to go to a LEAP program. IAC's was always based on a sliding fee. IAC told LEAP that they would guarantee them \$30 a person on a contract, and then LEAP has to collect the rest if they can. That saves IAC a full-time person for tracking the money. Because the program is offered at LEAP's facility, IAC was able to rent out the facility they were using, so they can take the rent money to put in as matching funds. IAC had been putting in about \$45,000 to subsidize the BIP program,

money that was unrestricted and could have gone to victim services. Even collecting \$25,000 in fees did not pay for half of one person when including the fringe benefits. This was a way to cut the operating costs tremendously.

Ms. Satterfield asked if the victim advocate from IAC did the victim safety checks. Ms. Stanfill said yes. Noting that the grant application said they did the checks a minimum of once a month, Ms. Satterfield asked if they did the checks more often than that. Ms. Stanfill said they do for some, it depends on the person. Some women love to get the call while the man is in group, and then there are some that really do not want IAC to call, but they will call IAC. It is up to the victim what the program does. IAC calls everyone to do a basic orientation to make sure the victims know what they can access through the safety checks, what IAC can provide, where the program is located, safety planning, etc. IAC explains the limitations of the BIP, because one of the really important things is that they understand what the program is. IAC has found that one of the ways that a batterer gets better about being a batterer while going through the program is to create false hope and then somehow convince the victim that this program is about the victim. One man told his victim that he learned how to get her arrested, and she did not know any different until she was able to talk during a safety check. Due to that situation, IAC does not allow men to come to group unless IAC has connection with the victim within two weeks. If the program does not reach the victim, the man has to stop attending group until they can — because they do not want the man using that program. Usually once a month contact is what a victim will want, but many times if there has been a lot of things going on and she is very scared — especially if they are not together — she will ask for more safety checks than once a month.

Ms. Satterfield complimented IAC on getting the information on how to contact the victim, but IAC does not allow the man to participate in group unless they provide that information. Ms. Stanfill said you live and learn, and there is nothing worse than having a victim tell you how the program helped the man batter. That is a terrible feeling. IAC has made significant changes in the program as they learned, to make sure that victim safety is number one, that the victim has all the information, and that they have access to resources. The victims know that they can help IAC hold the man accountable and put some of the control back in their court, without having to do direct confrontation. IAC is very, very careful that the things the victims tell the victim safety advocate do not get back to the facilitator. They couch it in terms of "...it does appear that pets are being used or that fists are being raised..." The information can be incorporated in, but without specifically addressing Joe Smith and then him go home and retaliate against someone.

Chair House asked if IAC hired a professional to facilitate the BIP groups. Ms. Stanfill said they have a male and a female facilitator, both very experienced in what they are doing. One is a subcontractor and the other is an employee of IAC, who does the prison batterers program as well.

In closing, Ms. Stanfill said IAC considers the batterers program to be an integral part of their coordinated community response. The BIP tracks all of the noncompliance, and IAC turns those noncompliance forms into the district attorney on a quarterly basis. The district attorney has been

responsive in getting the petitions to revoke filed. The DA's office is trying a new thing in Fairbanks where they revoke the probation when they go back in. If the man does not show up in nine months, the probation is already revoked. IAC considers it to be a valuable part. They believe in working with the entire family, and working with the batterer is a necessary part. But IAC also realizes that there are limitations, and there are some people who are just going to choose not to. IAC addresses that by staying in contact with the victim continually and making sure that victim safety is their primary goal in this program.

**Ketchikan Indian Corporation Tribal Health Clinic (KIC) - Ketchikan**

Presenters: Susan Pickrell (behavioral health director) and Lynn Quan (domestic violence specialist)

FY09 Award.....\$48,313  
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....\$63,052

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Col. Holloway said he thought the KIC grant proposal needed a lot of work. There were a lot of problems with the recordkeeping that was submitted to CDVSA staff. If a BIP program is going to be serious about its work, it seems like the records need to be done on time, and the proposal needs to be finished correctly. The Council has to evaluate the grant proposals all the same, so just knowing that somebody has a good program is not enough. He asked if there were problems not mentioned that caused the state of the proposal and for the recordkeeping not being done very well.

Ms. Pickrell stated that in the last four years the KIC behavioral health department has had three different directors and two interim directors. That does not excuse the recordkeeping and the untimeliness of the reports. However, in reviewing the reports she found that they were no more than a week late, and she apologized for that. She was not there when those reports were done, but KIC has changed the recordkeeping process. KIC's coordinator of services, Glen Fazakerley, is now keeping a database on his computer where he enters information regularly, so hopefully late reports can be avoided in the future. Regarding the grant proposal, she was appointed as the director less than a month before the proposal was due. The problems with the proposal were entirely her fault, and she attributed it to inexperience with this particular grant. She said she thought KIC probably had one of the best BIP programs, but she realized that just having a good program did not excuse any of the problems. The community support and the strength of the program should be taken into consideration. The letters of support were very strong from just about every element of the community — from the court system, probation, and people working closely with KIC.

Col. Holloway indicated he had other questions along the same line, but the explanation from Ms. Pickrell pretty well answered those.

Chair House said the basic information in the KIC proposal was quite good, but she found it unorganized and lacking a lot of information. She observed that referrals from the court system

were down. Ms. Pickrell explained that at the time she prepared the proposal the referrals were down, but they have gone back up again. She spoke to Mr. Fazakerley about that, and he said the referral numbers tend to go up and down, depending on cycles that happen in the community. Ms. Quan added that Mr. Fazakerley has taken on the responsibility of doing substance abuse counseling, which was due not just to supervisory staff fluctuation but in the staff that covers that program, which is part of behavioral health. So that responsibility came into his lap unasked for, but it has taxed his time. New staff are coming on board now, as well as new supervision for the mental health and substance abuse programs.

Chair House stated that it was hard to grade the KIC proposal because it was so disorganized, and she almost gave up on it. She added that the summary was weak, for example, on how they met last year's goals, etc. She asked how KIC met its goals last year. Ms. Pickrell said that the percentage of people who completed the BIP program last year was fairly good. In terms of community education and community involvement, that is probably one of KIC's strong points for this program. The batterers program and the domestic violence program are probably the linchpins of dealing with domestic violence in Ketchikan. KIC is really at the forefront of that. She offered her apologies for not better representing the program, because she truly believed that they have two of the finest people. Ms. Quan is recognized as an expert all over the country in terms of her involvement in domestic violence, particularly with the medical community and educational programs. Ms. Pickrell said she has many years' experience in the area of behavioral health, and she apologized for the proposal, having been short-staffed for a period.

Ms. McFadden pointed out that, of the people who were referred to the program, there seemed to be a good number of people completing it. Ms. Pickrell said they have about a 75% completion rate. While they do not have a specific reporting model for calculating the recidivism rate, anecdotally they tend to have a very close relationship with the clients who complete the program. Mr. Fazakerley is probably one of the best facilitators, and he maintains a very close relationship with clients in keeping them accountable. He also keeps in close contact with the district attorney's office to make sure that the clients are compliant. KIC gets on it right away, because they recognize that if they let that go the clients either fall away or the relationship that the batterer has with their victim oftentimes suffers if they are not held accountable.

Ms. Andreen said she was intrigued by the information in the proposal that KIC is going to start videoconferencing to do outlying areas. She said that in her own department at the state of Alaska the recent move to videoconferencing between Juneau and Anchorage has made a huge difference in their ability to communicate. She said she was a little bit concerned about trying that with a batterers program, especially in light of all the transition that KIC has been through. She asked for comment on that.

Ms. Pickrell stated that KIC will be entering into a memorandum of agreement with the community of Metlakatla. KIC has been in discussions with Metlakatla for three years because there are no services at all there. They are an island and a reservation, and they have many batterers who do not get any services whatsoever. The judges cannot order them into a BIP

because there is nothing available in the community. The televideo that KIC is talking about would have a facilitator in Metlakatla.

Ms. Quan stated that the basis of the program is funded through the U.S. Department of Justice through grants to tribal governments. That is her responsibility. Mr. Fazakerley does all the reporting for the state. He also recognized that the program had trouble this year and that the Council was going to lambast them. She said they know they can do a good program and can do better than the past year.

Col. Holloway thanked the KIC representatives for their explanations, remarking that he has to make explanations for his own agency all the time and knows how it feels.

In the closing summary, Ms. Quan said she has been helping a woman since 2005. Initially this woman was ambivalent about the abuse, feeling she had no choice but to stay. Over the years, with help — financial as well as emotional, she has been able to get the courage to follow through on her desire to have a violence-free home for herself and her children. KIC has been able to pay her rent, fix her car, bring groceries, assist with all matters pertaining to court, paperwork and employment, and counseling for her children. The court system has followed through on holding the batterer accountable when he violated the restraining order with harassing phone calls, and he was arrested and charged with 13 counts of violation. KIC has provided him with one-on-one mental health counseling, the batterers intervention program, as well as some help through the employment and training program to help him get on his way. KIC is also still working with the woman weekly, because change does not happen easily or as quickly in this field as everyone would like. Ms. Quan said if she did not believe that their efforts improve the safety, quality of life, and the future for victims, as well as the ability for perpetrators to change their behavior, she would not be able to continue to do this work.

**LeeShore Center (LSC) - Kenai**

Presenters: Cheri Smith (executive director) and Barbara Waters (program co-facilitator)

FY09 Award.....\$ 0  
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....\$26,000

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Chair House said she read the LSC proposal with a lot of interest and thought it was well done. She recalled that LSC had a psychologist on board. Ms. Smith said that Dr. Shoemaker was wonderful and had done the batterers program for many, many years. Unfortunately, he moved out of state. She spoke about the collaboration that LSC has been doing for the last three or four years with the Kenaitze Indian Tribe. She had approached the tribe's director and asked to get them more involved, and through some grant funding they were able to have one of the Kenaitze Indian Tribe staff people, who was a licensed clinician, go through mentorship with Dr. Shoemaker. LSC was hoping that person would move into a co-facilitator position. But LSC was able to contract with her after Dr. Shoemaker left, so the clinician through the Kenaitze Indian Tribe is the BIP facilitator — and it has worked perfectly.

Chair House mentioned that there was a small piece of information missing from the grant proposal. Ms. Smith said she made a mistake and sent in the wrong budget summary. The proposal submission was early, and she was notified of the mistake and faxed in the correct information. LSC has no overhead for the program, and their request is to pay for the cost of facilitators. The program groups are conducted at the clinician's office at Kenaitze Indian Tribe. It is important to continue the BIP, and LSC will continue, whether they receive CDVSA funding or not. But anything the Council can do to help would be greatly appreciated. Their request is not a lot of money.

Chair House asked how many clients LSC expected to refer. Ms. Smith clarified that LSC pays the Kenaitze Indian Tribe to provide the facilitator services.

Ms. Satterfield commended LSC, saying that a 36-week program is great, but a 48-week program is even better. Ms. Smith said that research is finding out that the longer term a program is, the more beneficial it is, not only for victim safety but to help the men actually use the tools that they are gaining. Researchers are looking at best practice being at least 56 up to 72 weeks.

Ms. Curran asked if there was a specific curriculum that LSC was using in the 48 weeks. Ms. Smith explained that they cover five different pieces: power and control is the main segment; empathy and compassion; stress management; etc. LSC, like Fairbanks, is incorporating a piece on the effects of violence on children, which she believes is extremely important.

Ms. McFadden inquired if the requested funding would mean LSC would not be \$10,000 in arrears like they are this year. Ms. Smith stated that the other BIP that was operating in Kenai closed its doors in December 2007. So in one year's time the referrals have doubled back to LSC, and they are building back up. She said a new policy was instituted in 2003 that batterers have to pay for class the night that they attend, and they discontinued putting the fee on credit. Even with that, LSC still went in the hole, because the other BIP cut LeeShore's referrals in half. They need to be able to pay the facilitator what they are worth, and \$26,000 a year is a good value. The facilitator loves what she is doing, and if LSC were to lose her, the program would not be able to find somebody for what they can afford to pay.

Ms. Satterfield asked if that would still work, if LSC only received half the \$26,000 request. Ms. Smith said that any amount of CDVSA funding would be helpful.

In the allotted closing summary, Ms. Smith said it would be wonderful to get the full \$26,000, but she recognized that the Council was working with limited funding for batterers intervention programs. LSC would appreciate any assistance. They have been doing this work for 20 years, and it is vital to insuring that victims are safe. LSC has a good record for helping some of these men go on and make wonderful changes in their lives, and also in the lives of their families. To make the record clear, because of a comment Peg Coleman made earlier, Ms. Smith stated that there is no tension between LeeShore and South Peninsula Haven House, and there never has

been tension. Ms. Coleman's comment had to do with a couple of Council members talking four years ago about the two shelter programs combining services — and the tension came from the possibility of losing one shelter. The two programs are very supportive of each other.

**Providence Valdez Behavioral Health (PVBH) - Valdez**

Presenter: Susan Whitefeather (new director)

FY09 Award.....	\$9,000
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....	\$8,831

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Col. Holloway said he found the proposal general in the way that it was written, and he would like to have had more specifics. He asked how many Providence expects to serve next fiscal year. Ms. Whitefeather replied that she left that out because they do not actually know. She attended the recent logic model training, and they encouraged Providence to stop putting numbers in when the numbers were not based on any kind of reality. The court-ordered numbers in general have gone down, and nobody knows why. The referrals may go back up, but Providence does not feel they are honestly able to anticipate those trends. Providence does not have control over who shows up for the program, because the perpetrators are ordered by the court.

Chair House said it was interesting that Providence was asking for less than the FY09 grant award. Ms. Whitefeather replied that her predecessor left the program with admittedly some deficits that she is working on. For example, Providence was not extending the sliding fee scale to people for intake, which meant that if the people could not afford to come for their intake they were in violation of their sentence. Providence's intake is not up to the standard that she considers it needs to be on, and that is her first project when she returns to Valdez. So Providence does not want to ask for what the program does not deserve.

Ms. Andreen stated that she found some things to be alarmed about in the Providence grant application. She said Ms. Whitefeather was up front about having some problems and attributed it to having four new police officers hired two years ago, and that the officers are not making the arrests. Ms. Whitefeather said the officers are not making the arrests, but she did not know why. Her administrator had another conference with the police chief today about that, and she spoke with him for about five minutes before this meeting. She did not know the outcome of that meeting. Providence has worked with Advocates for Victims of Violence (AVV) to get with the trainer for the police from the academy and try to get them some more training. Providence knows that there are (domestic violence) calls and that the AVV shelter is busy, but the batterers intervention program does not see the orders coming in the door.

Ms. Andreen observed that, in addition to there not being training for the police, the courts are not making the referrals to a BIP. She said it looked like the system was broken. There was a task force but that is now defunct as well. Ms. Whitefeather said they are reinstating the task force in June and holding the meeting at the end of the community care providers meeting

because it is the same group of people, and they do not want to go to yet another meeting every month. She said Providence meets with the court quarterly, and the judge says that if he is given a plea bargain of a lesser charge that the prosecutor and the attorney agree upon, he does not have a choice but to go with that. So that is why she instituted anger management programming, because Providence is seeing a lot of plea bargains down. Ms. Andreen said that was the first that she had heard that a plea bargain is not eligible for a batterers intervention program. Ms. Whitefeather said that when they plea bargain, it out of a domestic violence charge. The judge is willing to sentence the person to anger management, but he says that he cannot sentence them to a domestic violence program when they do not have a domestic violence charge. She said she is not an attorney so she cannot say if that is accurate or not, but that is the philosophy of the court.

Ms. Andreen said she was also concerned about offering anger management, because it is known that anger management does not work for batterers, regardless of how you get them there. Offering something rather than nothing actually can be more damaging to victims than it is to not have anything there. There is a false sense of security. Ms. Whitefeather said that what they are doing to try to prevent that is that it is not a standard anger management program, although they call it that. They are really slanting it towards victimization of others, rather than asking the tell-us-your-innermost-feelings kind of program. Also, Providence is getting releases when a person is a batterer (because they are getting people in the anger management program who are not batterers) so that they can refer them to AVV, and AVV can do that safety check and service follow-up.

Ms. Andreen inquired how long the program actually is, because the application seemed to indicate various lengths and different phases. Ms. Whitefeather said the program is 24 weeks in one year and 48 weeks in two years. The groups meet every other week, and there is homework in between. The second phase program is for people who re-offend or who non-comply.

Chair House asked who did the group facilitating. Ms. Whitefeather said she and Rochelle Tanner co-facilitated. Her own doctorate is in human services, and her masters is in psych counseling.

For her closing summary, Ms. Whitefeather thanked the Council for the opportunity to appear and said she would pass along to their grantwriter, whom she partnered with, the comments about the grant. She hoped to be a lot more involved in the application next year, now that she knows what it requires, since this was her first go-round with it. Although Providence Valdez Behavioral Health is a small program, recidivism rates are just about zero. They attribute this to the fact that they can give a lot of individualized attention, that people in a small community know each other, and Providence hears about things almost before they happen. Providence commends AVV for its strong partnership, because a lot of the program's effectiveness hinges on that coordinated community effort and AVV's support.

### **South Peninsula Haven House (SPHH) - Homer**

Presenter: Peg Coleman (executive director)

FY09 Award.....	\$25,563
FY10 BIP Grant Request .....	\$37,611

*Questions/answers after presentation:*

Col. Holloway said the grant request included an increase, but did not explain how SPHH identified the need for an increase, and did not give any numbers. Ms. Coleman replied that Homer has a very transient community, so there are times when there are 20 men in the room and other times when there are nine. Some people leave, or go fishing, or go to jail, and there are compulsive misdemeanants who keep coming in and out of the group. It makes it hard to plan. Sometimes they hold two groups a week, with a little advance planning. Because there are so few other services, she has had to have clinical level people facilitating the group, and that is a cost. SPHH would like to move to a more formal two groups a week. The other rising need is returning veterans. SPHH has three very young men in the group who are parenting solo, and they have asked for additional things. There are a couple of programs that do DVIP-Dad, so that when they are done with the group there is an additional Parenting After Violence training. It is badly needed; there are no other services in the area. SPHH is keeping really good records and has monthly status meetings with the district attorney. Because of the transient community, SPHH may have 20 active cases, but they may be doing safety checks on up to 30 others. The safety checks vary because it is up to the victim. SPHH refers the safety checks to an advocate who handles it. A lot of women say do not call us.

Ms. Coleman said that the batterers intervention programs need to get on the same page on a statewide basis. The state does not have a unified definition of recidivism. When counting those things and having self-reporting, that is an interesting way to do assessments. She is also concerned about the assessments used for lethality. She sees that some or most lethal cases, as per the police, as per what is seen by the batterer's history, when programs are doing the lethality assessments with the women, they are very minimized. So there are some serious things to look at on a statewide basis, to get consensus, and have more transparency between the programs. She echoed what Cheri Smith of LeeShore said, that there is no problem between the Kenai and Homer programs. That was an outside thing before. She has absolutely no problem when one of the SPHH men wants to go to the LeeShore program, which is a bit longer.

Ms. Coleman stated that on any given week SPHH is full. They debrief the facilitators, and a big problem is that if you look at the material it talks about the power and control dynamic, and if you look at the intake, some of that material contradicts each other. It is saying that mental illness and substance abuse are not a reason or a cause for violence, yet the programs do an extensive history on the intakes on those things and do not do anything with those histories. She wonders what is up with that. When there are no other services to send people to, SPHH is often dealing with people who have some multiple barriers in a batterers program who absolutely need to be there, but without SPHH monitoring them — if SPHH were to screen them out, there would be no monitoring system — there would be jeopardy. She thought the police officers and the State Troopers would say the same thing about that program. Also, they have had some men from the Russian villages in, and that is always an interesting thing. Somebody from those

villages will say, "If I can't beat my wife, who can I get to do it?" SPHH is not going to fix that in 36 weeks.

Referring to the criteria for eligibility, Ms. Andreen asked if SPHH accepted self referral and Office of Children's Services (OCS). Ms. Coleman said they accept OCS because oftentimes SPHH knows it is a safety issue with the family, and the monitoring needs to happen for safety. SPHH does not accept self referral, because her experience is that the person is probably using it in a custody case.

Ms. McFadden asked how long the two facilities at SPHH have been separate. Ms. Coleman said forever, because it is an issue of safety. They rent a separate building for the batterers intervention program. The program has dealt with some really violent people: there is a reason that people bring their partners or families to the isolation at the end of the road in Alaska. And she absolutely believes that people can change, but it is a coordinated community effort. It is not because the batterer sits before the judge and says they love Peg, because they don't love Peg. But the batterer knows that they are being held accountable and that they have to answer to the judge on what they have learned in class, so they better pay attention.

Ms. McFadden asked for Ms. Coleman's number one concern about BIPs in Alaska and what she would do to correct it. Ms. Coleman said she would look at the definitions and look at what service providers are really being asked to do. There are so many models out there, but if you look at the research, it is important to compact the time between when referrals are made and when classes start, if there is going to be any efficacy to the work. Second is to get on the same page as to how the numbers are counted. If she were to do a recidivism rate based on self report or even court report, it would be 5% or lower. But sometimes she knows things because Homer is a small community. It is really hard to know things and not be able to bring it to the batterers group because it would make it unsafe for that family.

Col. Holloway said he assumed the delay between arrest and trial and sentencing was what Ms. Coleman was referring to. Ms. Coleman said yes. She said there is also the issue of a lot of plead downs. SPHH will still take those if it is documented on an arrest report that it was clearly a domestic violence arrest. She has told the judge and the district attorney at the time that if SPHH was going to continue with the BIP, then she wanted to do it well or they would be making it dangerous. Those systems need to have SPHH's back. Because as a woman who had done those groups, her trying to hold the men accountable without any flexibility is physically unsafe, if there is not that follow-through by the system.

Col. Holloway inquired if there was a change because something happened, or if there was a new judge, or if somebody decided that the court system needs to do more. Ms. Coleman said several things happened. The first time she came before the Council she said that if it could not fund SPHH well enough to do a batterers program in Homer then not to fund at all. Her reason for saying that was that she was so appalled at what she saw happening with an unsupervised group. Facilitators have to be educated and trained: with the dynamic of the group, it is so easy for

facilitators to drift and collude with the men and to make it about something that is happening there and get off the mission of it. If the BIP program does not have the backup of a court system saying it will hold a man accountable, you will get what happened in Homer of a guy saying that the men figured out that if they get court ordered to the program and they don't go, nothing happens to them. She carried about 60 case files to the then district attorney's office on a Sunday and they went through each case cleaning them up. There is no statewide tracking system, which is another thing she would like to see changed.

At 3:30 p.m. Chair House indicated that the Council had concluded the schedule for hearing program presentations for FY10 grant funding.

**DISCUSSION ON THE PROCESS FOR MAKING FUNDING DECISIONS**

Col. Holloway suggested that the Council set some guidelines for tomorrow's discussion on making funding decisions, and decide how the primary and secondary reviewers' scoring was going to count. If there was time, he proposed making any decisions about programs that would be eliminated from consideration. He said he made these suggestions because typically it takes a long time just discussing the process, and doing it now would be especially helpful for new Council members.

Chair House requested that the CDVSA administrative officer go through the budget for the Council members' benefit.

Ms. Griggs outlined the following for fiscal year 2010:

Victim services funding available.....\$9,698,632

\$367,200 was from alcohol funding from the Department of Health and Social Services

\$7,427,252 was coming from permanent fund felon funds

\$1,193,808 was from VOCA funding\*

\$710,372 was from FVPSA\*

\* estimates — federal funding amounts not confirmed yet.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she agreed with Col. Holloway's suggestion that taking off the table those grant proposals that were completely non-responsive would be a good first step. At the last funding meeting staff had a spreadsheet for recording the Council's scores for each proposal and tabulating the results. Ms. Griggs stated that Council members had indicated that this time they wanted to wait until after their discussions before posting the grant proposal scores.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that the scores of the proposals, along with the very brief overviews and Q&As of the last two days, are tools that will be used to guide the funding decisions. But in addition to that, the reason the Council is so diverse is so that the members can apply the expertise in their respective areas to the decisions. One method is to find the proposals where

everyone agrees on the funding amount and make those decisions first. Then those that warrant further discussion to come to agreement upon could be taken up next. The Council does not need to vote right away, or they can take a non-binding vote in order to see where things are and let the discussion be ongoing. Even a vote can be changed by another vote later on.

Chair House asked Council members to review their own scores against what they had seen and heard at this meeting and make sure they had everything organized for tomorrow.

As a former CDVSA executive director, Ms. Andreen said that the process has definitely changed over the years. She proposed starting tomorrow by looking at any potential applications that might be non-responsive and deal with those first. Next would be to go through the list of proposals and have the primary reviewer for each proposal present their score and recommendation for funding, followed by the secondary reviewer's score and recommendation. The Council could then see if there was a general concurrence and put that information on the board as being generally agreed upon. They could then go back through the proposals that needed further discussion and decide if the funding should be different than requested.

Ms. Satterfield referred to the Network's Peggy Brown talking earlier in her presentation about applying a 13% or 20% increase to the FY09 grant awards, depending on whether a program was urban or rural. She pointed to staff's spreadsheet that listed the programs by name, the FY09 grant awards, and what an increase would be, based on their urban or rural location. It was something to work with. Some programs requested less than the 13% or 20% increase, so the Council could decide to fund those at their requested level. That would remove some decisions off the table, so the Council could start individually reviewing the programs that requested more and deciding on those.

Ms. Andreen said she was uncomfortable using the 13% and 20% increases the Network developed to generate an overarching budget increment number, because she did not think that it was ever intended to be the automatic funding level. The Council heard a lot of information that could impact how much a program is awarded, and to start out from the Network's calculated increase amount is kind of artificial. Some programs may need more than the 13%/20% increases, and others may need less.

Ms. Satterfield agreed that the 13%/20% increases would just be to get a requested increase number on the table for discussion beyond that. The Council would be going through the individual programs and making a decision on whether that size increase would be appropriate or not.

Ms. McFadden stated that Council members spent a lot of time filling out scoring sheets on the grant proposals, but to her what the program representatives had to say at this meeting clearly outweighed the scoring sheets. She encouraged Council members to take into account whether a program had a grantwriter on staff or whether they were short-staffed and wrote a bad grant. She wanted to look at the needs of the various communities and what the program representatives

said and to not just do it numerically.

Ms. Griggs informed the Council that staff must collect all the scoring sheets for the record before leaving the meeting tomorrow.

Ms. Curran commented that she did not go through the process of reading all the proposals and weighing the contents just to say that it should not be counted. When she has done these things before, they started with the scores and then quibbled about the exceptions, etc. The process seems to work that way because there is a starting point for rank ordering the proposals, and then other factors can be used to move proposals up or down or out.

Chair House supported that idea because it provides a grading system and a talking point.

Ms. McFadden said she might skew the Council. She was not saying that the scores were not an important tool because members put a lot of time into them. But she wanted to consider what program representatives said, and if a program only had a new director for 30 days and their grant was not well-written, she did not want that program to be penalized. She said that ranking programs numerically by scores would do that because the scoring considers whether a program provided all the information requested, etc.

Ms. Ashenbrenner mentioned that the reason that staff does not collect the score sheets until after the decision process has been completed is because Council members can change their scores based on what they have heard in the presentations and answers.

Col. Holloway proposed that members could take the initial scores they recorded as they read the grant proposals, modify the scores based on what they heard at this meeting — which would address Ms. McFadden's concerns — and then after the discussion where a member may be convinced to change a score, that is what goes in the final column. The final score takes everything into account and means something. As Council members look at the specific issues that have to do with a program's location or need, they could add more to an award for special circumstances, if need be. However, if done carefully, the final score will factor that last part in.

Backing up what Ms. Curran and Col. Holloway said, Ms. Andreen reported that in the Department of Health and Social Services now their funding awards are based on the score. But what DHSS review committees do not see is the actual budget, which is scored separately as part of a formula. That process is done in a closed-door session because the DHSS commissioner or division directors have the final say. She said that the scores are a good starting point for her in this CDVSA process, and she would review all the grant proposals to see where she wanted to adjust scores. Regarding the budget amount, she revised what she said earlier and suggested looking at what the programs requested, and then if any Council member wants to make an adjustment based on what was said at this meeting, they can propose that as a change at that point in the discussion. The reason is that some presenters indicated they were new at this, were unaware there was money available for increases, they asked for \$ in their application, and they

really needed \$\$\$ and gave the reason why. The written proposals were the starting point, and then people verbally addressed the current situation. It behooves the Council to work off that amount.

Chair House checked with Council members on their thoughts about grant proposals that were missing information that was provided later and whether that should be penalized.

Ms. McFadden recommended no action if the program was able to get the information to staff in time for the Council to read it when they were scoring the proposal.

Col. Holloway said he did not have any problem with that either. But when the Council gets to the scoring discussion and they are looking at the low scores, they have to decide what is an acceptable low score (maybe a 3) but where the program has done a better job or has a bigger need so they get a higher score, versus those that have a lower score (maybe below a 3). The Council needs to discuss why a proposal got that lower score. The CDVSA does not have money to throw away at everything. So if a program is not doing what they should be doing, or not running it the way it should be run, or it is just unacceptable to the Council, he did not think the Council could give the program funding if they are not showing that they can be responsible with it. That is what he meant by discussing the scoring. Then when the Council gets to coming up with how much money can be divided, maybe a program does not get funded, and that money goes to some other program that has an acceptable score.

Chair House stated that the Council needs to determine what each score represents: if 5 is outstanding, if 4 is very good, if 3 is acceptable, etc. Ms. Andreen said that would sort of evolve as the Council starts looking at the scores tomorrow. There tends to be a cutoff where programs fall.

Ms. Ashenbrenner offered an administrative comment regarding the incomplete grant applications. The RFP has a fairly tight time frame for submission, for getting the information compiled, for staff review, for packaging and sending to Council members, and for scoring. She said she was not necessarily recommending that the Council knock proposals down on their grant awards because they did not meet a technical requirement. But she asked that it be looked at in the context of the discussion, because if there is absolutely no accountability for... *[tape change, a missing section]* ...it really affects the efficacy of the whole process. It is not there for those people who have complied, who have read the grant fairly, who have gone to the preproposal meeting and have asked questions, and who have read the RFP requirements posted on the web site. So she asked the Council to consider that.

Ms. Satterfield said she agreed with the executive director. She added that this was the first time she was aware of where grants were received and the CDVSA staff sent out an email to programs informing them of missing parts and allowing so much time to correct that. She thought it made these grants much more complicated to read because the attachments were stapled on the back end. So she agreed the Council should give consideration to that — how

much was up for discussion. The programs that submitted their grant applications on time, with all the documents, that is how the Council should base them on. She was also not comfortable with the programs that put in a dollar request and then came before the Council and said they wanted to increase the request. Once one person did it, the people who had spoken before them would have come back, if they could have, and said they wanted to do that too. She urged going with the dollar amount requested in each grant proposal that was received on time and not any add-on that they came up with after they learned about more money in the CDVSA budget.

Chair House proposed talking about charging a penalty fee for incomplete grant proposals, although not an exorbitant fee. She mentioned \$500, adding that it might be too high or too low.

Ms. McFadden questioned why CDVSA was even accepting the late documents. Ms. Ashenbrenner replied that these programs are the community domestic violence and sexual assault programs in the state of Alaska. CDVSA has a competitive grant process. Would the Council not fund a shelter in Kotzebue, just as an example, when nobody else can do it? The reality is that it would be unsafe for communities for the Council to defund and close down a program for not meeting the technical requirements of an RFP. However, there needs to be some sort of accountability to convey that this is serious business, that the CDVSA is granting a lot of money, and things need to be done correctly. She said she would not recommend any sort of across-the-board fine. But when the Council is discussing how much of an increase to give a program, she asked that the lack of being able to comply with RFP requirements be considered. Some of the incompletes were very small technical things, like not putting in the letter of intent but getting the proposal in on time. Other instances of non-compliance were pretty significant, like not having any budget pages. But every program that staff asked to provide the correct documents did comply, except for Emmonak.

Ms. Andreen said that if people feel that there has to be some level of accountability, in her mind she would look at the scores and look at why something ranked lower than another program, and part of that would be responsiveness, clarity of the proposal, those kinds of things. Maybe Council members should knock off so many points if a program was late, if people felt that just taking that type of non-compliance into consideration in the general discussion would not be enough.

Chair House indicated that she liked the idea of reducing the points in a proposal's score by whatever amount the reviewer wanted to do so, factoring into the grading the fact that anything was missing from the original application.

Ms. Satterfield said that with the grant applications that she found difficult to read because missing parts were stapled to the back, that was reflected in how she scored the proposal. So it is already there in her scores. She was not suggesting that because programs made mistakes in the grant application that it would disqualify them from receiving funds. But she agreed with Ms. Ashenbrenner that it should be something that is taken into consideration, as far as giving a program an increase above their FY09 award — if it is reflective of more than just a simple

technical error. Some errors may reflect administrative problems that are even occurring in the program as well.

Chair House said she supported that view. Her scoring also reflected if there were any missing documents that were submitted later. She checked with other Council members and everyone was in agreement.

Chair House said the next item to discuss was whether to consider only the funding request in the grant application or to also consider the add-ons that programs talked about in their verbal presentations.

Ms. Andreen agreed with sticking to the budget amount requested in the original grant application for purposes of the discussion starting point. Col. Holloway said he agreed with that as well.

Chair House ascertained from all the Council members that they agreed with that. Ms. Ashenbrenner wrote the points of agreement on the flip chart so people could keep track of them at a glance.

Col. Holloway reiterated an earlier point that the reviewer scores from reading the grant proposals could be amended to account for anything heard during the verbal presentation. So those programs that maybe could not write as well but were able to verbally describe some aspect of their services better, that could be factored into the final score.

Ms. Ashenbrenner recalled that at the 2007 funding meeting the final score that was compiled was the score after any adjustments had been made based on the presentations and any Council discussions.

Ms. Satterfield pointed out that the score sheet had a column for the original score and another column for the final score.

Council members indicated to the executive director that they intended to chart only the final scores for each proposal, by each reviewer.

Col. Holloway suggested taking up funding for the batterers intervention programs first on tomorrow's agenda, because the total funds available are only \$200,000. Everyone agreed.

Saying that Lauree Morton probably had more experience with the funding process than anyone else, Ms. Ashenbrenner checked with staff listening by telephone to see if they had any comments. Ms. Morton indicated she had nothing to add and that the general description of the decision-making process was consistent with what the Council did with both the VAWA grants and other funding decisions in the past year. She added that Ms. Andreen's recommendation about starting with input from the primary reviewer on whether they agree with a funding

request or if it should be higher or lower, followed by the secondary reviewer, and then other Council members is also very consistent with how the Council has made funding recommendations throughout all the years of her experience.

Chair House challenged Ms. Andreen's assertion that the Council could award funding above what a program had requested. She added that the Council had already agreed that only the budget request amount in the original proposal would be considered. Ms. Andreen said that was not her understanding of what the Council had agreed upon.

Col. Holloway said he interpreted the Council agreement to be that the starting point for the discussion would be the funding request that a program submitted in its written grant application.

Ms. Andreen used AVV in Valdez as an example, because the program representative verbally asked for more funding in their presentation yesterday than they requested in their grant application. AVV's FY09 award was \$281,000. They requested \$294,323 for FY10 in their written application, which is a \$13,000 increase. Her understanding of the process would be for the Council to list out the scores for all the proposals. Then the primary reviewer would first say, for example, that they agreed with AVV's funding request of \$294,323. The secondary reviewer could then say they disagreed and that it should be higher. Then the rest of the Council could say they agreed it should be higher or whatever. In the past, the process has resulted in three lists of proposals: the agreed-with amount, the higher amount, and the lower amount. If there is consensus on an agreed-with amount, then that proposal is taken off the table and is a done deal. Then the Council looks at the higher amount list and the lower amount list and ultimately ends up balancing the books, because there is not enough money to fund all the increases.

Ms. Ashenbrenner used AFS in Palmer as an example, because their FY10 request was the same as their FY09 award amount — no increase. But AFS came in with some supplemental material, as was requested, because they determined that they really needed more than their FY09 award amount. Her understanding was that the Council agreed to start with each program's requested amount in their original grant application budget. But the Council would have a discussion about whether to give AFS, for example, more than they originally requested.

Chair House said that was not her understanding.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that when she wrote on the flip chart "For starting point of budget discussion look at original request," she thought Ms. Andreen's point was that that was where the Council would start and then have a discussion about whether or not to consider the additional request that was verbally asked for.

Ms. Andreen agreed with that summary and added that additional funding could be for other things as well. It could be that a program has asked for an increase, and the recommendation from the primary and/or secondary reviewer might be for just a portion of that. Or it could be a recommendation for a decrease. Or it could even be a recommendation for more than what the

program requested, for example, for a 3% cost-of-living across-the-board salary increase when the program requested a 2% increase. It is possible to recommend giving a program more than what they have asked for, and it has happened in the past.

Ms. Ashenbrenner remarked that if the Council does not allow for consideration of the additional requests, it really changes the picture.

Chair House stated that the reviewer grading was done on the funding amount that programs submitted in the original proposals, and the scores will be totally distorted if the Council starts making increases or allowances. Grading is done on the facts before you, so she did not see how the Council could change anything higher.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that the Council could legally change it. She added that this issue might need a motion because she could sense that there was not agreement among Council members.

FOR THE PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION, MS. ANDREEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT LIMIT THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF EACH AWARD TO NO MORE THAN THE ORIGINAL BUDGET REQUEST IN THE GRANT APPLICATION. MS. SATTERFIELD SECONDED.

Ms. McFadden said she had no problem with not accepting after-the-fact information. But she wanted something in there that if any part of after-the-fact information dealt with more money for an employee or a director or something like that, that the Council take a look at it, to back what Ms. Andreen said.

Chair House made the observation that Ms. McFadden's suggestion was a change to the motion.

Ms. Andreen stated that she intended to vote against the motion because it is two months after the grant applications were submitted, and the Council has additional information. Regardless of why an agency came in and made a verbal request for more funding, she thought there were considerations and information from being able to have some dialogue with the programs that gave her a clearer idea of what she thought their funding levels should be. It is important for the Council to include all the information in its deliberations.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Curran, Satterfield, McFadden

Nays: Holloway, Andreen

The motion passed, 3-2. [No vote by the chair unless there was a tie]

Ms. McFadden requested reconsideration, saying that she was confused and wanted programs that needed additional funding and had requested it after the fact to have the opportunity to get it. She changed her vote to No.

Roll call tally after reconsideration:

Ayes: Curran, Satterfield

Nays: Holloway, Andreen, McFadden

The motion failed, 2-3. [No vote by the chair unless there was a tie]

Ms. Ashenbrenner reiterated the intent of the motion: for the starting point of budget discussions, the Council would look at the original grant request. She asked if the words "and may increase or decrease the request" would make the intention clearer. [there was no audible response]

### **DECISIONS ABOUT NON-RESPONSIVE APPLICATIONS**

Ms. Andreen asked staff which proposals had not fulfilled the minimum requirements of the grant application, from staff's perspective.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said one was Emmonak Women's Shelter, because CDVSA did not receive proof that EWS is a viable nonprofit that is eligible to accept a grant from the state. That made EWS not eligible.

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT DISQUALIFY THE TWO GRANT APPLICANTS THAT DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OR REQUIREMENTS, THOSE BEING AKEELA, INC. AND EMMONAK WOMEN'S SHELTER. MS. McFADDEN SECONDED.

For the record, Ms. Ashenbrenner explained why Akeela did not meet the minimum requirements. Akeela applied for funding for a batterers intervention program, but the agency did not have an approved program, nor did they have an application in to the state to request approval.

On an outcry vote, the motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Responding to a question that was inaudible, Ms. Ashenbrenner explained that the RFP was written so that ongoing programs that have been funded for many years did not have to provide as much information as any new programs might have to provide. That was done under the assumption that Council members were fairly familiar with the programs by reading the quarterly reports and maybe participating in other funding meetings. In addition to the proposal, and scoring that proposal, and the presentations that were done, it is also fair and right to consider the other information from quarterly reports that is available in the supplemental materials in the meeting packet. Also provided to the Council were scoring sheets from staff that gave information about program compliance with past audits and reporting requirements over the last two years.

## **RECESS FOR THE DAY**

Chair House recessed the meeting for the day at 5:00 p.m.

---

Wednesday, May 6, 2009

## **CALL BACK TO ORDER**

Chair House called the funding meeting back to order at 9:20 a.m. All six Council members were present at roll call to form a quorum.

## **DISCUSS AND DETERMINE FUNDING DECISIONS**

Ms. Griggs had prepared a spreadsheet showing the average of Council scoring for each victim services grant proposals (*this spreadsheet is on file at the CDVSA office*).

Chair House indicated that the Council would take up the batterers intervention program grant requests first.

## **BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS - FY10 FUNDING DECISIONS**

Ms. Griggs displayed a similar spreadsheet of score averages for the batterers intervention program grant proposals (*this spreadsheet is on file at the CDVSA office*). She summarized the FY10 funding available for the batterers intervention programs, and the sum of the six grant requests, as follows:

FY10 funding available for BIPs:	\$200,000
Total grant requests:	<u>\$252,618</u>
Shortfall	\$ 52,618

The funding requests were from AFS in Palmer (average score 44), IAC in Fairbanks (average score 51), KIC in Ketchikan (average score 35), LSC in Kenai (average score 50), PVBH in Valdez (average score 47), and SPHH in Homer (average score 44). The Council had voted the day prior to disqualify the funding request from Akeela, Inc. in Anchorage because the agency did not have an approved batterers intervention program (BIP) or an application in to request approval.

Chair House indicated that the primary reviewer and the secondary reviewer would be the first to indicate whether they agreed with a program's funding request or if it should be lower or higher, starting with AFS.

**AFS - Palmer:** Ms. McFadden said she agreed with the request for \$52,812, which was the same as their FY09 award. Ms. Andreen said it should be lower. Ms. Satterfield supported a decrease. Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, and Chair House agreed with the requested amount.

**IAC - Fairbanks:** Ms. Andreen said she agreed with the request for \$64,312, which was the same as their FY09 award. Ms. Satterfield agreed with the request. Chair House, Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, and Ms. McFadden agreed with the requested amount.

**KIC - Ketchikan:** Col. Holloway wanted a decrease from the requested \$63,052 [the FY09 award was \$48,313]. Chair House and one unidentified Council member supported the request.

**LSC - Kenai:** Chair House supported the request for \$26,000 [they received no CDVSA funding in FY09]. Ms. Curran also supported the request. Ms. Andreen indicated a decrease, for the sake of discussion. Ms. McFadden, Col. Holloway, and Ms. Satterfield supported the request.

**PVBH - Valdez:** Col. Holloway supported the request of \$8,831 [the FY09 award was \$9,000]. Ms. Andreen wanted a decrease. Ms. Satterfield indicated a decrease. Ms. Curran, Ms. McFadden, and Chair House supported the request.

**SPHH - Homer:** Ms. McFadden wanted a decrease from the requested \$37,611 [the FY09 award was \$25,563]. Col. Holloway supported the request. Ms. Andreen supported the request. Chair House wanted an increase.

Chair House opened it up for comments and discussion.

Ms. Satterfield recommended decreasing AFS by \$11,000 from the current level of funding. That would come out of the administrative - tech person, equipment, and contractuels. The other BIPs are not using funds for those areas. And she wanted the Council to be able to fund the Kenai program, which received no CDVSA funding in FY09.

Ms. Andreen indicated she agreed with Ms. Satterfield's rationale for decreasing AFS by \$11,000.

Chair House said she could live with a decrease of \$11,000. Ms. McFadden indicated she also agreed with that.

Ms. Griggs noted that AFS - Palmer's award currently stood at \$41,812.

Chair House stated that the Council was in agreement that IAC - Fairbanks should get the same funding as FY09, \$64,312.

Chair House suggested decreasing KIC's request by \$20,000. Ms. Andreen said she was thinking of maintenance level funding for Ketchikan, which was \$48,313 in FY09. She said KIC Tribal

Health Clinic had a poor grant application, but she thought the program appeared to be relatively solid. Since there is no additional funding for the Council to give out this year, she would support in the ballpark of last year's award.

Ms. Satterfield concurred with Ms. Andreen about keeping KIC at their FY09 award level.

Col. Holloway said he could live with leaving the Ketchikan program at their FY09 funding. He thought KIC needed to do some work, but they are working on that. KIC has an important program that is valuable in a different part of the state.

Ms. Curran also supported KIC staying at the FY09 award level. Ms. McFadden agreed.

Ms. Griggs indicated that KIC - Ketchikan currently stood at \$48,313.

Chair House had earlier expressed support for LSC's requested \$26,000.

Ms. Andreen said she was thinking more in the range of \$20,000 for LSC. Kenai's is a good, solid program by virtue of the grant application. The program has been in existence for a long time and is serving a high number of clients. FY10 is LSC's first request: she would like to see them funded more than \$20,000, but she was thinking in terms of balancing the BIP budget.

Ms. Satterfield recommended \$15,000 for LSC, the rationale being to fund the existing programs at their FY09 funding levels and add a new program and still come out at the same budget amount as last year. It would mean one other existing program (besides AFS) maybe taking a cut.

Ms. Andreen suggested a non-binding vote at this point because there were three numbers on the table for LSC - Kenai. It would help move the process along.

Chair House asked to hear from all the Council members before taking any such action.

Ms. Curran said she would really like LSC to get the \$26,000 requested, but she realized there was not enough money in the budget. She said she could go with \$20,000.

Col. Holloway indicated he would support \$15,000. Ms. McFadden also supported the \$15,000 number.

Chair House said LSC's was a well-written grant proposal, and the BIP has the capability of producing results in the Kenai area. This is not a new program; they just were not funded by CDVSA in the last couple of years. She advocated again for the \$26,000 requested, saying the Council was nitpicking a little bit on this one.

Ms. Satterfield stated her agreement that LSC's is a very good BIP, and it would be great to fund

them at the \$26,000 amount. But to go that high for LSC would mean having to cut deeper into the other programs. There was one other program she wanted to cut a bit, but the rest of them should be funded. So \$15,000 of funding would enable keeping the other programs funded and not have a huge impact on the two programs that she thought could be cut a little bit in order to fund the program in Kenai.

Chair House suggested leaving any decision on LSC until the Council had considered the remaining two BIPs on the list. That meant looking at Providence Valdez Behavioral Health in Valdez next.

Col. Holloway said he continued to support leaving PVBH at the FY09 funding level of \$9,000.

As primary reviewer, Ms. Andreen recommended eliminating the funding for the Valdez BIP. She said she has some very serious concerns about them. The program is going through a very difficult time with law enforcement, but it seems like the effort has evaporated. She has concerns about how the program has been developed and the services they are providing, and she was not sure that the program was really getting to the essence of what a batterers intervention program is supposed to be.

Ms. Satterfield said her initial thought was to cut PVBH by \$4,000, and that represented the dollars requested for sending the staff to Oregon for training. But in order to fund LSC in Kenai, she would support Ms. Andreen about not funding PVBH, based on the problems that the program has had. She also did not believe that PVBH had been servicing many clients there yet.

Ms. McFadden disagreed, saying she wanted to fund the program at the requested \$8,831 level. To her, it was a small amount, and she was confident that PVBH could develop a good program with the money. She thought the Council was funding other programs whose scores were lower than PVBH, so obviously Council members thought that the program was doing a job.

Ms. Curran said that, considering the fact that Providence asked for less in FY10 than they received in FY09, giving what they asked for would be the way to go.

Ms. Andreen stated that at this point in time she questioned whether or not PVBH was even meeting the standards as a batterers intervention program.

Ms. Ashenbrenner ascertained that CDVSA staff members Lauree Morton, Linda Hoven, and Ann Rausch were listening by telephone and were prepared to answer any questions. She asked the associate coordinator for the Valdez BIP to speak to the question about whether Providence was currently meeting the standards that are required. Chair House also asked how many clients PVBH was serving.

Ann Rausch reported that she just returned from doing an on-site of the Providence Valdez BIP program. She had not written the on-site report yet, but there are number of problems with the

program. At this time, PVBH is not in compliance.

Ms. McFadden inquired if PVBH had the potential to become a good batterers intervention program, or if there were so many problems that it would take more than the requested funding to bring it up to standard to provide the services required for that region. Ms. Rausch replied that it was a difficult question; at this time, she thought PVBH was rebuilding the program. They are out of compliance in the sense of safety checks and rebuilding what their program is. Providence has gone through a great deal of transition the last couple of years, and they are rebuilding their memorandums of agreement, and rebuilding their task force. The program is at a beginning place, and it will take a lot of work to rebuild the program and rebuild the quality assurances and relationships in the community. Her on-site audit found that PVBH was out of compliance in a lot of areas that CDVSA would like to see a batterers intervention program be at, and there are a number of different issues happening at this time. While the amount of funding Providence requested would help rebuild the program, she was not sure how far such a small amount of money would go in that process.

Ms. Andreen asked for confirmation of her recollection that CDVSA was not to start and establish programs but to fund existing programs that have already met the standards and are operational. Ms. Griggs said that was correct. BIPs have to have state approval, and if PVBH is not currently in compliance, that would be something to look at. She added that she thought PVBH could come back with a grant application in two years, once they got the program up and running.

Chair House said that the latest information from staff meant that the Council's decision was down to whether to fund or not fund Providence.

MS. ANDREEN MADE A NON-BINDING MOTION THAT THE COUNCIL DEFUND THE PROVIDENCE VALDEZ BEHAVIORAL HEALTH BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAM. COLONEL HOLLOWAY SECONDED.

On an outcry vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Ashenbrenner asked an administrative question about whether staff should be calling the roll on these motions and recording the results, or whether to wait until the end of the BIP funding discussion.

Chair House stated that the Council would wait and take action as a total process. She said the next BIP to consider was SPHH in Homer.

As primary reviewer of SPHH, Ms. McFadden said she had recommended a decrease from the requested amount, because of the funding needed to cover requests from other programs.

Ms. Satterfield stated that SPHH should stay at its FY09 award amount of \$25,563. Col.

Holloway and Ms. Curran agreed.

Ms. Andreen said she was looking at SPHH's request to hire a part-time program coordinator to be responsible for tracking program participants, which would relieve the executive director of those duties. She asked if there was any support for increasing SPHH by \$5,000.

Ms. Satterfield said she did not know where that \$5,000 would come from, other than cutting from one of the other programs that the Council had already tentatively decided upon. Doing the math, she said that granting LSC in Kenai \$20,000 (not previously funded) would come from pulling \$11,000 out of AFS Palmer and \$9,000 out of Providence Valdez. That would not harm any of the other programs.

Ms. Andreen concurred with that summarization and added her support to maintaining FY09 funding for SPHH Homer. Chair House said she also agreed with holding SPHH to the FY09 award level of \$25,563.

Ms. Andreen asked for a quick reconsideration of the \$20,000 to LSC Kenai and whether to reinstate any of the current \$11,000 decrease to AFS Palmer. Ms. Satterfield continued her support for the \$11,000 cut. Chair House agreed with that too.

Col. Holloway said he did not agree with the suggested \$11,000 decrease for AFS Palmer and wanted to add \$5,000 back into it. That would mean granting LSC Kenai \$15,000 instead of \$20,000.

Ms. Andreen stated that she would be comfortable with that. Ms. Curran said that would be fine with her. Ms. McFadden indicated she supported that change. Ms. Satterfield said she would rather stay with \$20,000 for LSC Kenai. Chair House also stated her support for \$20,000 for LSC.

Speaking in favor of decreasing AFS Palmer by \$11,000, Ms. Satterfield said that it was for the administrative costs portion of the budget. None of the other programs factored in the CEO, director of administration, human resource manager, accounting clerk, receptionist, facility manager, IT tech, and all of receiving, all of which totaled about \$5,108. AFS also had equipment in the budget for \$3,100, and none of the other programs had that. AFS had some contractual (\$2,660) that the other batterers programs were not using the CDVSA funding for. This was how she came up with the recommended \$11,000 decrease. She did not think it would impact the facilitators or the supplies they may need for the program.

Ms. Andreen thanked Ms. Satterfield for her thorough analysis of the suggested decrease to AFS's request. She said she looked at the number of clients that AFS Palmer proposed to serve and compared it to the number of clients that LSC Kenai proposed to serve, which was more than AFS. She returned to her support of an \$11,000 decrease for AFS Palmer and to giving LSC Kenai \$20,000.

Col. Holloway indicated he could support that, as did Ms. Curran.  
Ms. Griggs listed the tentative FY10 batterers intervention program awards, per the Council's preceding discussion.

MS. ANDREEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT FUND THE COMMUNITY-BASED BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS IN THE FOLLOWING AMOUNTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010:

AFS - Palmer.....	\$ 41,812
IAC - Fairbanks .....	\$ 64,312
KIC - Ketchikan.....	\$ 48,313
LSC - Kenai .....	\$ 20,000
SPHH - Homer.....	\$ 25,563
Total .....	\$200,000

MS. CURRAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: McFadden, Satterfield, Andreen, Holloway, Curran

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

### **VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAMS - FY10 FUNDING DECISIONS**

Ms. Griggs once again read aloud the average of Council scoring for each victim services grant application.

Chair House indicated that the primary and secondary reviewers would first state whether they agreed with a program's funding request, or if they thought it should be increased or decreased, starting with AFS. Then other Council members would indicate their recommendations.

Ms. Ashenbrenner asked if "same" meant the same as the FY09 award amount or the same as the FY10 request. Council members indicated that it meant the same as the FY10 request.

**AFS - Palmer:** Chair House recommended granting the requested amount of \$505,041, which was the same as their FY09 award. Ms. Curran agreed with that. Other Council members concurred with the primary and secondary reviewers.

**AVV - Valdez:** Ms. Curran said she believed they should get their FY10 request of \$294,323. Ms. McFadden agreed. Ms. Andreen and Ms. Satterfield both said they wanted an increase over the FY10 request. Chair House supported the requested amount.

**AWAIC - Anchorage:** Ms. Satterfield recommended a decrease from the requested \$1,376,786.

Chair House supported a small decrease, but not a great deal. Col. Holloway indicated he recommended granting the requested amount. Ms. Curran and Ms. McFadden also supported granting the FY10 request. Ms. Andreen spoke for a decrease.

**AWARE - Juneau:** Ms. Andreen and Ms. Curran indicated they wanted to fund the FY10 request of \$705,780. Ms. Satterfield spoke for an increase. Chair House, Ms. McFadden, and Col. Holloway all supported the requested amount.

**AWIC - Barrow:** Ms. Satterfield recommended an increase from the requested \$367,620. Col. Holloway supported the requested amount. Ms. Curran and Ms. McFadden also spoke for the requested amount. Chair House and Ms. Andreen recommended an increase.

**BSWG - Nome:** Ms. Satterfield recommended a decrease from the requested \$479,745. Col. Holloway also supported a decrease. Ms. Curran, Ms. McFadden, and Chair House all spoke for a decrease. Ms. Andreen favored funding at the requested amount.

**CFRC - Cordova:** Chair House recommended funding at the FY10 request of \$120,964. Ms. McFadden spoke for a slight decrease. Ms. Curran, Col. Holloway, and Ms. Andreen supported the requested amount. Ms. Satterfield favored a decrease.

**IAC - Fairbanks:** Ms. Curran indicated she wanted to fund the FY10 request of \$1,000,891. Chair House supported the requested amount. Ms. McFadden and Col. Holloway spoke for the requested amount. Ms. Satterfield and Ms. Andreen favored a decrease.

**KWRCC - Kodiak:** Ms. Satterfield recommended an increase from the \$344,971 requested. Ms. Curran supported the requested amount. Ms. McFadden spoke for an increase. Col. Holloway, Ms. Andreen, and Chair House were for the requested amount.

**LSC - Kenai:** Ms. Andreen stated a decrease from the FY10 request of \$840,896. Ms. Satterfield indicated a decrease. Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, and Chair House supported a decrease. Ms. McFadden agreed with the requested amount.

**MFCC - Kotzebue:** Ms. Satterfield indicated a decrease from the requested \$454,164. Col. Holloway also said a decrease. Ms. Curran, Ms. McFadden, Chair House, and Ms. Andreen all supported a decrease.

**SAFE - Dillingham:** Chair House recommended funding at the FY10 request of \$562,373. Ms. Andreen spoke for the requested amount. Ms. Satterfield favored an increase. Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, and Ms. McFadden agreed with the requested amount.

**SAFV - Sitka:** Ms. McFadden supported the FY10 request of \$406,206. Chair House recommended a decrease. Ms. Andreen, Ms. Satterfield, Col. Holloway, and Ms. Curran spoke for the requested amount.

**SCS - Seward:** Ms. Satterfield recommended a decrease from the requested amount of \$135,670. Ms. Curran was for the request. Ms. McFadden, Chair House, Ms. Andreen, and Col. Holloway supported a decrease.

**SPHH - Homer:** Col. Holloway supported the FY10 request of \$366,016. Ms. Satterfield spoke for an increase. Ms. Andreen, Ms. Curran, Ms. McFadden, and Chair House indicated they were for the requested amount.

**STAR - Anchorage:** Ms. Andreen indicated she wanted a decrease from the requested amount of \$837,117. Ms. Satterfield also spoke for a decrease. Col. Holloway and Ms. Curran indicated a decrease. Ms. McFadden wanted an increase. Chair House supported the requested amount.

**TWC - Bethel:** Ms. McFadden supported the FY10 request of \$966,349. Ms. Satterfield was for an increase. Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, Ms. Andreen, and Chair House indicated they were for the requested amount.

**USAFV - Unalaska:** Chair House spoke for the requested amount of \$166,277. Ms. Curran also supported the FY10 request. Ms. Andreen, Col. Holloway, and Ms. McFadden all were for the requested amount. Ms. Satterfield wanted an increase.

**VFJ - Anchorage:** Ms. Satterfield indicated she wanted a decrease from the FY10 request of \$200,000, but she wanted the program funded. Col. Holloway supported a decrease. Ms. Curran, Chair House, and Ms. Andreen also wanted a decrease. Ms. McFadden spoke for granting the requested amount.

**WISH - Ketchikan:** Ms. Andreen indicated she wanted a decrease from the requested amount of \$896,309. Chair House was for a decrease. Col. Holloway, Ms. Satterfield and Ms. Curran supported a decrease. Ms. McFadden indicated support for the requested amount.

Having finished the first pass at considering the grant awards, Chair House opened it up for specific comments on the proposals.

Ms. Satterfield mentioned that there were a couple of programs where the majority of Council members supported granting the FY10 requests and she was the lone dissenter. She asked to address those first and move forward from there.

Ms. Griggs stated that the whole Council agreed on a decrease for MFCC in Kotzebue. She suggested starting there.

Ms. Satterfield said she supported a decrease for MFCC, not only because of problems with the grant application, but because of staff's report on the untimely financials. She wanted the program to get continued funding in that region, and she recommended going with the FY09

level of \$306,101. She also proposed a special grant award condition regarding MFCC's software program and getting the financial reports submitted on time. CDVSA staff, with a grant award condition in place, can follow up on that by September, which is the first quarter of FY10. She recalled that MFCC had said it would take them about two months to get the software up and running. It is very important for the program to be compliant in that area.

Col. Holloway, Ms. Andreen, and Ms. Curran expressed agreement with Ms. Satterfield's recommendations and justification.

Ms. McFadden asked if any of MFCC's request was for software upgrades. Ms. Hoven said she could not recall that there was. She added that Maniilaq is a very large umbrella organization, and they have central accounting. Within the program, they do some basic tracking of their grant. Ms. McFadden indicated that she supported the FY09 funding level.

Chair House also supported MFCC at the FY09 level.

Ms. Griggs stated that the other two programs where the Council was all in agreement, except for one person, were BSWG Nome and VFJ Anchorage.

Ms. Satterfield recalled that she was the lone member to recommend a decrease for BSWG Nome, and by that she meant funding the program at the FY09 level of \$474,871. This was for similar reasons to MFCC. Part of the reason given for the poorly written grant application was stormy weather. She wanted to see the program become more compliant with the funding level they are getting currently. BSWG's client level really decreased, maybe through no fault of the people working there, but that needs to be monitored as well.

The other Council members agreed.

Regarding VFJ in Anchorage, Ms. Satterfield stated that she supported funding at least two victim advocate positions, which would be \$82,000. VFJ fills an incredible role, especially in Southcentral Alaska, particularly with the homicide cases. Very recently, VFJ was providing a great deal of support to the families of two domestic violence homicides, and the agency does that quite a bit.

Chair House said she thought the funding for VFJ should be no more than \$50,000. Ms. Andreen remarked that \$50,000 was more the amount that she was looking at also.

Col. Holloway stated that he agreed more with Ms. Satterfield. The value that VFJ brings as an organization, the fact that CDVSA is funding them is worth something, as well as the two positions.

Ms. McFadden indicated that she would support the \$82,000 that Ms. Satterfield proposed. She had wanted to give VFJ \$100,000, half of the requested amount, because of the unique services

that they provide in dealing with all the social elements in Alaska. But she would support \$82,000.

Ms. Curran said she agreed with \$82,000 for VFJ. Both Ms. Andreen and Chair House signified that they could support that.

Saying that she did not know that this would change her perception, Ms. Andreen pointed out that the programs that the Council was looking at maintenance level funding, as well as one that was eliminated, are the Native village-based programs. That is something the Council has to be cognizant of, in terms of capacity, and why is that the way that it is. It is not likely something that can be solved as part of this funding process.

Chair House said she agreed with Ms. Andreen's comments, adding that the Council should look especially at the Bush area and the Native issue, as much as there is a tendency for those to be overlooked. *[tape change - missing part]*

Chair House suggested starting at the top of the list and reviewing the programs that the Council had not taken any provisional action on yet, starting with AVV Valdez.

Ms. Satterfield said she had recommended an increase over their FY09 award, but it was a very small amount, \$14,000 for the total. AVV had asked for an increase of \$13,275.

Ms. Andreen stated that she wanted to see AVV get an increase because they asked for some additional funds in their verbal presentation, and they seem to be a solid program that is working hard. She was not promoting giving AVV all of what they verbally requested, but she could support giving them \$300,000.

Ms. McFadden and Ms. Satterfield indicated that they supported \$300,000 for AVV Valdez.

MS. ANDREEN MOVED A NON-BINDING MOTION THAT THE COUNCIL INCREASE ADVOCATES FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE IN VALDEZ TO A TOTAL GRANT AWARD IN FY10 OF \$300,000. MS. SATTERFIELD SECONDED.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated her understanding that these types of informal motions were non-binding and did not require a roll call. She cautioned, though, that if there is disagreement, it will be hard to track backward if the Council decides to award more than the funds available for distribution.

Ms. Griggs said that the Council had tried binding motions in the past, and it took longer and meant the Council had to make any changes by formal motion later on.

MS. ANDREEN WITHDREW THE MOTION. THE SECOND CONCURRED.

Ms. Andreen proposed a straw vote for a funding level of \$300,000 for AVV in Valdez. The vote was 3 for \$300,000 and 3 for \$294,323.

Ms. Curran commented that it went from Ms. Satterfield's proposed increase of an additional \$725 over AVV's request to an additional \$5,677 over their request, with nothing in between. It did not make sense to her to make that leap at this point in time.

Ms. McFadden changed her vote to support the \$294,323 level.

Ms. Satterfield said the additional increase she proposed was less than \$6,000, which is warranted because Valdez is such an isolated community.

Ms. Griggs ascertained that the Council had reached provisional agreement that AVV Valdez would be funded at the FY10 requested amount of \$294,323.

Moving on to AWAIC in Anchorage, Ms. Satterfield said she recommended a decrease from the FY10 request but an increase of \$165,000 over their FY09 award, to bring the total to \$1,255,979.

Ms. Andreen calculated that it would be a decrease of \$120,807 from AWAIC's requested amount. She stated that AWAIC is a good, solid program that has an incredible amount of work and services they provide. In light of the total CDVSA funding available, she thought AWAIC's requested increase of \$285,807 was too much. She proposed reducing the amount of the increase down to \$85,000.

Chair House agreed that AWAIC is a well-run and managed, but the program is taking in people from all over the state. Most of the programs operate within a certain defined area, but AWAIC's is not a defined area. The program is bursting at the seams, and she did not think an additional \$85,000 was adequate to take care of 55 extra people at their doors right now. She advanced \$200,000 for the increase over the FY09 funding level.

Col. Holloway and Ms. Curran indicated support for Ms. Satterfield's suggestion of a \$165,000 increase for AWAIC.

Ms. McFadden asked to revisit this decision, because at this point she leaned toward giving AWAIC their full requested increase, unless someone could point to where AWAIC was asking for too much or the money was not going to good use.

Ms. Andreen stated that AWAIC does an incredible job, and one of the issues that came up in the presentation was staff salaries. She said she looked at the executive director's salary, as well as the rest of the staff, in particular the range that happens. She thought people should be paid adequately, and it is about policy and putting philosophy into place. AWAIC are doing really well for that, and their salaries seem to be fairly competitive across the board. That is one of the

things that she is very concerned about that most of the programs do not seem to get to. She has been sitting in these meetings, off and on, for almost 30 years, and the salary issue comes up over and over again. The reality is that it will not change until the programs decide individually that it is going to be a priority. Sometimes you have to make really tough decisions, and she totally understood that. That said, she thought AWAIC had a good system in place, and they need to be supported. There are greater needs elsewhere in the state. This is difficult because you cannot come up with a formula for the number of people served, and there is not a fast and easy rule for it. This is one where AWAIC is in good shape, but they need more money, and they should get more money. She just did not think that they had justified the extraordinary needs that she heard about from some of the other programs. That was why she was supporting a lower increase than the other increase numbers put forth.

Chair House noted that three numbers had been put forth for AWAIC's increase: \$85,000 by Andreen, \$165,000 by Satterfield, and \$200,000 by herself.

Ms. McFadden stated that she looked at how much the Council supported for other contractual and commodities, and when she did the numbers it came to around the \$80,000 mark. So she could support a \$85,000 increase over FY09 for AWAIC.

Chair House said that she could amend her recommendation of a \$200,000 increase down to a \$165,000 increase.

Ms. Ashenbrenner tallied the comments thus far and came up with four members who had expressed support for a \$165,000 increase for AWAIC. Ms. Griggs said that would bring the total FY10 award for AWAIC in Anchorage to \$1,255,979.

Chair House called a break at 10:45 a.m. When the meeting reconvened at 11:00 a.m., she indicated that the next program up for discussion was AWARE in Juneau.

Ms. Andreen stated that she had initially recommended an increase for AWARE, but she wanted to revise that and go with the same as AWARE's request for FY10.

Chair House, Ms. McFadden, Ms. Curran, and Col. Holloway all supported AWARE's requested increase (either having stated so earlier or because they changed their previous stance). Ms. Satterfield asked for consideration of another \$5,000 increase, saying that there are additional operating costs in an isolated rural area. She added that the Council does not want to harm any victim services program, even knowing that CDVSA is unable to offer everybody the amount of funding they want.

Ms. Andreen offered the suggestion to leave AWARE the same as their request but to flag it for another review if there are some additional funds at the end of the process to be distributed. Ms. Satterfield said she was fine with that.

Chair House stated that at this point AWARE in Juneau would be awarded \$705,780, with a flag to discuss an additional \$5,000 later.

The Council moved on to look at AWIC in Barrow. Ms. McFadden and Ms. Satterfield stated their support for the FY10 request of \$367,620.

Ms. Andreen said she was very impressed with the grant application. AWIC is part of the North Slope Borough, so they have some systems in place that are very beneficial. But because it is rural, and because the costs are so extensive, she thought that if the program had had a more experienced executive director, they would have requested a larger increase than \$10,502. She proposed increasing AWIC's request by an additional \$25,000 to cover general increased costs. In their presentation, AWIC spoke of higher utilities and just general expenses going up. She would not specifically earmark the \$25,000 for anything.

Chair House and Col. Holloway added their voices to Ms. McFadden and Ms. Satterfield for staying with AWIC's requested amount. Ms. Satterfield noted that, through no fault of the program's, they have a high operating cost from being part of the Borough that is always factored in.

Ms. McFadden indicated that she could support an additional increase for AWIC Barrow if Ms. Andreen could go with \$15,000 rather than an extra \$25,000. Ms. Andreen said she could. Ms. McFadden added that she could see giving them more than they requested due to the uniqueness of Barrow and it's remote location and the high utility costs. She said someone earlier mentioned AWARE as being in an isolated rural area, but obviously Barrow is a little more remote than Juneau.

Ms. Andreen recalled that AWIC reported that it cost \$1,000 to make a trip out to one of the villages, and those villages are even more isolated than anything most people can imagine.

Col. Holloway said he did not think there was going to be that much money to divide up, and requests were far over the funds available for the Council to disperse. A person could pick a dozen other locations that are in the same shape as Barrow.

Chair House tallied the preferences and called it four for staying with AWIC's FY10 requested amount and two for increasing that amount. Ms. Griggs recorded that at this point AWIC would be funded at \$367,620.

Chair House said the next program for discussion was CFRC in Cordova.

Ms. Satterfield noted that CFRC was asking for an additional \$26,724 over FY09. She recommended dropping that to a \$20,000 increase.

The other five Council members agreed with that recommendation. Ms. Griggs stated that a

\$20,000 increase from FY09 would bring CFRC Cordova to \$114,240 for FY10.

Chair House said the next program for consideration was IAC in Fairbanks.

Ms. Satterfield recommended a \$123,000 increase over IAC's FY09 award amount, which was a decrease from what the program had asked for. Ms. Griggs stated that it would bring IAC's request to \$944,133.

Ms. Andreen, Col. Holloway, and Chair House said they agreed with that. Ms. McFadden and Ms. Curran had earlier voiced staying with IAC's requested increase of \$179,758. Chair House stated that IAC's is a wonderful program, especially when they feed the people staying in the shelter three meals a day. Ms. Curran said she could live with reducing the increase to IAC to \$123,000. That left IAC at \$944,133 for the time being.

Chair House asked for comments on the next program, KWRCC in Kodiak.

Ms. Satterfield stated that she had earlier spoken for a small increase to KWRCC, but she was willing to go with funding them at their FY10 request. Ms. McFadden said she also recommended an increase, but she was willing to support the requested amount. The other four Council members were in favor of granting KWRCC's FY10 request. Ms. Griggs recorded that KWRCC stood at \$344,971 at this point.

Chair House stated that LSC in Kenai was next up for discussion.

Ms. Andreen said that salaries were something she was concerned about with LSC Kenai. She proposed decreasing the funding request by \$140,000. Col. Holloway supported that.

Ms. Griggs indicated that a \$140,000 reduction to the requested amount would bring LSC's FY10 award level to \$700,896.

Ms. Curran, Ms. McFadden, Chair House, and Ms. Satterfield agreed with the reduction.

The Council next took up SAFE in Dillingham. Previously, five Council members supported the FY10 request of \$562,373, and Ms. Satterfield had favored an increase. She said now that any increase would have been fairly minor, and she would support going with the same. Ms. Griggs recorded that SAFE was at their requested level for now.

Chair House said the next program for consideration was SAFV in Sitka. Previously, five Council members supported the FY10 request of \$406,206, and Chair House had recommended a decrease from that amount. Chair House now stated that she would reduce the FY10 increase to \$40,000, instead of the \$62,860 increase requested.

Ms. Andreen stated that SAFV was another program where she was very concerned about their

salaries. Chair House changed her position to support the full increase requested. Ms. Griggs recorded that SAFV Sitka was at the FY10 requested level for now.

The next program for discussion was SCS in Seward. On the first round, five Council had spoken for a decrease from the requested amount, and Ms. Curran supported the program's request of \$135,670.

Ms. Satterfield recommended that SCS Seward receive \$20,000 above their FY09 award level. The program has requested a \$45,723 increase.

Col. Holloway said he had been thinking of a \$25,000 increase, but he could support \$20,000 just as well.

Ms. Andreen stated that she appreciated SCS's presentation, and she thought the program was doing some good work in Seward. However, she was concerned about the amount, which she recalled was \$35,000, that was added to the budget for personnel for the administrative tasks. So a \$20,000-\$25,000 decrease in their request was appropriate. She understood that programs have to pay for administrative work, but given the CDVSA's limited funds, that seemed like a high amount for personnel.

Ms. Curran said she had supported SCS's original request, but looking at what the Council has reduced another program already, she could support a \$20,000-\$25,000 decrease.

Ms. Satterfield reiterated that her recommendation was to grant SCS Seward \$20,000 above their FY09 award level.

Ms. McFadden asked to flag SCS for giving the program the other \$5,000, if there were additional funds available at the end of the process. Col. Holloway made it clear that he supported a \$20,000 increase over FY09.

Ms. Griggs recorded that SCS Seward would get \$109,947 for FY10, based on what the Council just discussed.

The next program up for consideration was SPHH in Homer. Previously, five Council members had supported the requested amount of \$366,016, and Ms. Satterfield had spoken for an increase. At this point, she joined the others in supporting the SPHH request.

Ms. Griggs recorded that SPHH Homer's FY10 award level was at \$366,016 on this round.

Chair House said the next program to discuss was STAR in Anchorage. In the first pass through, four Council had recommended a decrease from the requested amount of \$837,117. Ms. McFadden had asked for an increase, and Chair House had supported the requested amount. STAR's request represented a \$255,771 increase over their FY09 award.

Col. Holloway proposed decreasing STAR's requested increase to \$190,000 over FY09. Ms. Curran said she agreed with that.

Ms. Andreen proposed a larger decrease, to \$125,000 over the FY09 award amount.

Ms. Satterfield said she would like to see a bigger decrease than Col. Holloway proposed but less than Ms. Andreen's recommendation. Her number for STAR's increase was \$145,000 over FY09.

Chair House recommended \$175,000 over the FY09 award amount.

Col. Holloway changed his support to Ms. Satterfield's recommendation of an increase for STAR of \$145,000 over FY09. Ms. Andreen also was on board with that. Ms. Curran joined in supporting \$145,000.

Ms. McFadden said she could settle for decreasing STAR's FY10 request, but she could not agree with such a large amount as \$145,000, unless someone could provide some reasons that warranted the size of the decrease.

Ms. Andreen said there was no question that STAR was doing an excellent job and providing a lot of services in Anchorage. She just did not know if there was enough of an increase in services to justify that large of a percentage increase.

Ms. Satterfield stated that she agreed with Ms. Andreen, especially in light of knowing about the other programs that will experience cuts. She stood by her recommendation of a \$145,000 increase over STAR's FY09 award.

Chair House continued to advocate for not reducing STAR by that much. She said that STAR is the only specialized rape crisis center in the state.

Ms. Ashenbrenner clarified that Anchorage is the big community that has an individual stand-alone rape crisis center and a domestic violence shelter. But every other program that gets CDVSA funding serves a dual purpose and provides both those services. STAR does not provide statewide rape crisis services; those are provided locally.

Ms. McFadden said she could see a decrease from STAR's request in the range of \$100,000 that would take away the communications, mileage, dues and subscriptions, and things like that. However, because four Council members were supporting a \$145,000 increase from FY09, which represented roughly a \$110,000 reduction from STAR's request, she would change her support to that level.

Ms. Griggs stated that a \$145,000 increase from FY09 would bring STAR Anchorage to \$726,346 for FY10.

The Council next considered the funding request from TWC in Bethel. Previously, five Council members were for staying with the FY10 request of \$966,349, and Ms. Satterfield had spoken for an increase. This time, everyone was in agreement to grant TWC's request for FY10, for the time being.

Chair House said the next program on the list was USAFV in Unalaska. On the first run-through, five Council members were for staying with the FY10 request of \$166,277, and Ms. Satterfield had wanted an increase. This time, all six members agreed with staying with USAFV's request for now.

WISH in Ketchikan was the last program for consideration on this round of looking at FY10 program funding. Previously, five Council members supported a decrease from the FY10 request of \$896,309, and Ms. McFadden had spoken for WISH's requested amount.

Col. Holloway suggested cutting WISH's requested increase over FY09 to \$145,000. The program had requested an increase of \$313,668. Ms. Andreen, Ms. Curran, Ms. Satterfield, and Chair House expressed their agreement with that paring back of the requested increase.

Ms. McFadden said she disagreed with the size of the decrease for WISH Ketchikan. Her suggestion was to give the program at least \$200,000 more than what they got in FY09. She said she did not support the whole \$313,668 requested increase, and could even support an increase of \$150,000.

All five other Council members indicated that they were fine with a \$150,000 increase over the FY09 award amount for WISH Ketchikan.

Ms. Griggs stated that an increase of \$150,000 from the FY09 award level would bring WISH to \$732,641 for FY10. She continued by informing the Council that at this point they had awarded \$433,478 more than was available to disperse. That meant the Council would have to reduce the funding to programs by that amount.

Col. Holloway asked staff to calculate percentages that could be applied to the programs. Then the Council could look at the results and go from there. There was an at-ease as Ms. Griggs took a few minutes to do the calculations on staff's spreadsheet.

Starting with AWARE in Juneau, Ms. Andreen said the Council had earlier flagged the program to look at adding another \$5,000 if funds were available at the end of the process. But in light of the Council having over-awarded at this point and the need to make further cuts to the FY10 requests, she proposed reducing AWARE by an additional \$12,000.

Ms. Satterfield suggested reducing AWARE's requested increase to \$116,000, instead of the \$122,702 they asked for. She estimated that to be about 20%. Ms. Griggs said AWARE would

be at \$699,078 after that adjustment.

Col. Holloway recommended giving AWARE Juneau about \$105,000 over the program's FY09 award.

Chair House said the next program to review again was CFRC in Cordova. Ms. Satterfield suggested granting CFRC an increase of \$19,000 over their FY09 award. Ms. Griggs said that would bring CFRC to \$113,240.

Chair House said the next program to look at again was LSC in Kenai. Ms. Satterfield recommended an increase over the FY09 award of \$112,000. Ms. Andreen indicated her agreement. Ms. Griggs recorded LSC Kenai at \$671,367 for FY10.

The next program to review again was SCS in Seward. Ms. Satterfield suggested funding SCS \$18,000 over their FY09 award level. Ms. Griggs said that would bring SCS to \$104,947.

STAR in Anchorage was the next program to get a third review. Ms. Satterfield recommended funding STAR by \$116,000 over the program's FY09 award. Ms. Andreen proposed that the increase over FY09 be \$100,000. Chair House, Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, and Ms. McFadden expressed their agreement with the \$116,000 increase.

Ms. Griggs recorded STAR Anchorage at \$697,346 for FY10.

Chair House said the next program to review again was TWC in Bethel. Ms. Satterfield recommended funding TWC at \$160,000 over their FY09 funding. Ms. Andreen, Chair House, Ms. McFadden, Ms. Curran, and Col. Holloway all agreed.

Ms. Griggs said that would bring TWC Bethel to \$959,186.

WISH in Ketchikan was the next program to get a third review. Ms. Satterfield suggested funding WISH at \$117,000 over their FY09 award level. The other five Council members indicated their support for that funding level.

Ms. Griggs recorded WISH Ketchikan at \$699,641 for FY10.

Ms. Andreen proposed decreasing VFJ in Anchorage to \$50,000 for FY10. Col. Holloway disagreed with that. Chair House and Ms. McFadden agreed with the \$50,000 level. Ms. Satterfield said she still wanted to support two advocate positions with salary but no benefits, at \$82,000. Ms. Curran stated that she agreed with funding the two advocate positions. Chair House proposed a compromise at \$60,000. Ms. Andreen said she could live with \$60,000.

Ms. Andreen remarked that funding for VFJ has always been difficult for the Council to consider because the program does not fit the broader mission of the CDVSA. VFJ was originally funded

to meet a specific VOCA grant requirement, and she thought things had shifted over the years. She said VFJ is an incredible organization in the work that they have done, but she was concerned, when looking at the needs across the state, that the Council was putting \$82,000 into a program that does not meet the primary mission of the CDVSA. She acknowledged that some of the clients that VFJ serves are the clients that the Council has pledged to respond to. So this was not easy, but she was concerned about funding a broader scope at the expense of the primary target group.

Col. Holloway and Ms. Satterfield indicated they could support \$60,000 for VFJ. With that, there was consensus at \$60,000.

Ms. Griggs and Ms. Ashenbrenner had been keeping a tally of the results and informed the Council that the total FY10 awards, after applying all the decreases just discussed, were \$300,084 over the funds available.

Col. Holloway observed that two courses to follow were to once again reduce the programs with the larger increases, or to pick particular programs to reduce. He did not think that any program deserved to be "picked on" any worse than any other program. As a starting point for this round, he proposed not funding any program more than 15% above their FY09 award amount.

Chair House said another method that looked workable was to cut all the programs by 3%, and that should be close to the \$300,000.

Ms. Andreen stated that, although the method might be the fairest, she was concerned about the programs that were getting a small increase to begin with being harder impacted by a 3% decrease.

Ms. Satterfield asked which programs would be getting less than a 10% increase at this point in the deliberations. Ms. Griggs said AWIC in Barrow and AVV in Valdez. Ms. Andreen added that there were some programs that were not getting any increase at all. Ms. Satterfield proposed taking 3% away from every program that was currently at a 15% increase or above, just to see what it looked like. Ms. Andreen observed that the decrease might have to be more like 4% to eliminate the \$300,084 deficit the Council was currently at.

Ms. Griggs requested a short break so staff could work on the calculations. Chair House granted that request.

When the meeting returned on the record, Ms. Griggs stated that staff applied a 4% decrease to any program that was on the board as getting a 15% or higher increase over FY09. That resulted in \$8,147.56 left on the table.

Ms. Andreen proposed that the Council review the funding levels of the more urban programs one more time, before applying any across-the-board reduction of FY10 funding increases. She

was concerned about cutting too much out of the rural programs: they consistently have lower salaries; they have fewer resources; and there have been huge increases in travel costs, utilities, and basic fixed costs. The programs she had in mind were in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and possibly Kenai. She said Sitka and Ketchikan are small enough communities that they really do not have the level of resources that Juneau has. Juneau is the third largest community in the state.

Ms. Ashenbrenner mentioned a recent newspaper article about a study the McDowell Group did on the cost differentials around the state. The article reported that Juneau costs were 11% higher than Anchorage.

Ms. Andreen said she was not certain she would cut any of the urban programs, but she thought the Council needed to start by looking at those areas first, which she preferred to do over reducing the rural programs' requested increases any further.

Ms. Andreen read aloud the list of programs and the tentative FY10 funding levels after the last cut of 4% was applied.

Ms. McFadden made the observation that it looked like the urban programs had taken quite a cut with the 4%, and it was her opinion that there was no need to reduce them further based on their geographic location.

Ms. Andreen replied that it was not so much the geographic location as the access to additional resources.

Ms. McFadden mentioned that VFJ had indicated they were getting a federal earmark, so one idea would be to take the FY10 CDVSA funding and redistribute that. Ms. Satterfield noted that VFJ's Susan Sullivan had said that they did not know when that funding was coming.

Ms. Satterfield asked Ms. Andreen if she could identify any programs and recommended cuts, so the Council had something to work with. Ms. Andreen said she did not have anything specific in mind, and had just introduced the general concept for discussion.

Col. Holloway stated that he could see what Ms. Andreen was saying, but he thought Council members took a lot of that (the fact that rural programs do not have access to as many resources) into consideration as they were scoring the grant proposals. Maybe not all of it. But he was not convinced yet that the Council should look again at cutting the urban program increases further.

Ms. Andreen said that programs slated to get a 20% increase over FY09 were WISH in Ketchikan, USAFV in Unalaska, TWC in Bethel, STAR in Anchorage, SAFE in Dillingham, LSC in Kenai, CFRC in Cordova, and AWARE in Juneau. Most of those are rural programs. She said that if she were to do a proposal it would be to take a look at reducing STAR in Anchorage and LSC in Kenai.

Ms. Satterfield supported taking another look at STAR.

Ms. McFadden asked why the Council was considering reducing some programs further when there was about \$8,000 left on the table. Ms. Andreen said it was because the starting point was not the FY09 grant awards but what the programs requested. STAR requested so much more than what the Council actually had to distribute.

Ms. Satterfield stated that if the increase to STAR in Anchorage was reduced by a small percentage, then that amount plus the \$8,000 could be added back in to some of the rural programs that are taking some hits now.

Col. Holloway commented that doing that would not add much back to all the rural programs, but it would hurt one or two programs to accomplish it. To follow that concept, the split would need to be rural versus urban, and it would mean including all the urban programs to make any measurable difference.

Ms. McFadden asked which rural programs Ms. Andreen and Ms. Satterfield had in mind. [there was no response]

Chair House suggested looking at SAFV in Sitka for a small cut as well, because its FY10 increase so far was 18%, and she thought the number of clients at that program was down from the previous year. She asked for confirmation of that from CDVSA staff listening on line.

The CDVSA associate coordinator for SAFV, Ann Rausch, spent a couple of minutes researching that information.

Ms. McFadden asked if staff had anything they used to define what is rural and urban. Ms. Morton replied that they did not, other than the generally accepted definitions of urban and rural. Urban programs are both road-connected and not road-connected. Ms. Ashenbrenner commented that the urban/rural definition is an old Alaska discussion: a couple of places it is in statute and a couple of places not. For purposes of the federal Office of Violence Against Women, they define any community in Alaska as rural, except for Fairbanks and Anchorage. Other definitions might be off-road or X number of miles from a major community of X size. So there is no standard definition, and the Council could spend a lot of time trying to define it at this meeting.

Col. Holloway recommended that the Council stay with the FY10 funding levels developed so far and divide up the \$8,147 among the programs or pick one to give it back to. He did not support going any further with the proposal that the Council had been discussing.

Ms. McFadden said she supported Col. Holloway, and if the left-over money were divided evenly, it would be \$407.30 to each program.

Ms. Curran also indicated that she supported Col. Holloway's recommendation.

Ms. Satterfield stated that she would support the recommendation about giving the left-over back to the programs, unless Ms. Andreen could identify specifically what she wanted to do about the urban/rural idea so the Council had something specific to consider. Further, if the Council opted to distribute the \$8,147, she did not favor doing it across the board, but rather the Council should identify some rural programs to get the money.

Ms. Andreen proposed reducing STAR in Anchorage by an additional \$25,000.

[tape change] When the recording resumed, Ann Rausch was explaining the clients served numbers for SAFV in Sitka, saying that the numbers were much higher (in prior years), and the way services were counted, they were able to be duplicative. But for FY09 that is not the case, so it is going to be hard to compare the two years. The information that could be most helpful is that SAFV is on target for the number of shelter nights and personal support services for FY09. The program has provided 1,267 shelter nights for 44 adults and 783 shelter nights for 34 children. So far this year, the number for personal support services is 2,073.

Chair House thanked Ms. Rausch for doing the research.

Responding to prompting from Ms. Satterfield, Ms. Andreen said she went through the list, and the programs she was most interested in the Council looking at giving the leftover money to were CFRC in Cordova, SAFV in Sitka, TWC in Bethel, USAFV in Unalaska, and WISH in Ketchikan.

Chair House said she would not be comfortable with SAFV Sitka. She supported giving half the \$8,147 to CFRC in Cordova and half to AWIC in Barrow (sic).

Ms. Andreen mentioned USAFV in Unalaska as one she was looking at because the program is small and hardworking, and they have a limited number of staff. Chair House voiced her agreement with that one.

Chair House summarized the deliberations so far as dividing the \$8,000 between CFRC in Cordova and USAFV in Unalaska.

Ms. McFadden asked for an explanation of why there was a bigger need in Cordova and Unalaska, versus dividing the leftover \$8,000 evenly among the programs, or versus any other particular program.

Ms. Andreen said it ended up being six of one or half dozen of the other, although her intention was not to belittle what the programs were doing. With Cordova and Unalaska in particular, they are very small programs with very limited staffing. The Council has an opportunity to provide a little bit more to them. So rather than give \$400 across the board, she would rather get a little bit more bang for a buck and give Cordova and Unalaska \$4,000 each.

Ms. Satterfield voiced her agreement with Ms. Andreen. Col. Holloway, Ms. Curran, Ms. McFadden, and Chair House all said they could go with that.

**LUNCH RECESS**

Chair House called a short recess so people could avail themselves of the lunch that had arrived. It was a working lunch, and deliberations continued after the break.

**VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAMS - FY10 FUNDING DECISIONS (Continued)**

Ms. Griggs reported that with the last allocations to CFRC in Cordova and USAFV in Unalaska before the lunch break, the Council had allocated all the FY10 victim services funding available for distribution at this meeting. She read aloud the final award amounts as she had recorded them on a spreadsheet.

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT ACCEPT THE FOLLOWING FISCAL YEAR 2010 FUNDING AWARDS TO THE VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAMS, AS LISTED BELOW:

AFS - Palmer.....	\$ 505,041
AVV - Valdez .....	294,323
AWAIC - Anchorage .....	1,205,739
AWARE - Juneau .....	671,115
AWIC - Barrow.....	367,620
BSWG - Nome.....	474,871
CFRC - Cordova .....	112,784
IAC - Fairbanks .....	906,368
KWRCC - Kodiak.....	344,971
LSC - Kenai .....	644,512
MFCC - Kotzebue.....	306,101
SAFE - Dillingham .....	539,878
SAFV - Sitka.....	389,958
SCS - Seward .....	100,749
SPHH - Homer.....	351,375
STAR - Anchorage .....	669,452
TWC - Bethel.....	920,819
USAFV - Unalaska .....	163,700
VFJ - Anchorage.....	57,600
WISH - Ketchikan.....	671,655
Total grants .....	\$ 9,698,632

MS. CURRAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: McFadden, Satterfield, Andreen, Holloway, Curran

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0. [The Chair did not vote unless there was a tie]

## **OTHER MATTERS**

### **CDVSA Interim Executive Director:**

Ms. Ashenbrenner announced that the Department of Public Safety was supporting CDVSA by freeing up Katie TePas to be the interim executive director for a couple of months until the Council can hire someone permanent for the position.

### **Crime Reporting Statistics:**

Col. Holloway stated that there is a big difference between UCR (Uniform Crime Reports) reporting for statistics and what really happens in the state. Right now there is a law on the books that apparently means that the Department of Public Safety can accept statistics from police departments, but there is nothing that requires the police departments to give DPS the statistics. He said he has asked the Alaska Association of Chiefs of Police to submit a bill — and he thought Representative Olsen from the Kenai would be doing that — that will require all police departments in the state to submit major crimes statistics, along with DUIs and DVs, to DPS, so that the department has an accurate counting of the crime all the way across the state, including the different types of sexual assault. This year, he has had to go out to get sexual assault statistics all over the state. He has sent letters to all the police departments asking them to give the statistics to DPS, and only three have responded. He said the way it is done now does not give an accurate picture of how many legitimate domestic violence calls and arrests are made. With proper reporting, DPS will have something it can use when it goes to the Legislature, so that legislators understand what the department is saying as it relates to Alaska's laws. He asked that if anyone can support that bill with their local police department and legislators when it comes out, that would be very much appreciated.

## **FUTURE MEETING DATE**

Chair House asked if the Council should set its September meeting date now. Ms. Griggs suggested that she send an email to Council members to find out where they want the September meeting to be held and what date would work for them. Chair House said that would be fine.

Ms. Ashenbrenner noted that the Council will have to hold an ad hoc teleconference meeting sometime between the quarterly meetings in order to make the executive director hire.

Ms. McFadden expressed her appreciation to Ms. Ashenbrenner for helping her as a new Council member and making her so knowledgeable. She said she would miss her wealth of knowledge

and all her kindness. She led everyone in a round of applause.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There was no further business to come before the Council, and the meeting adjourned at about 1:00 p.m. on May 6, 2009.

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

Confidential Office Services  
Karen Pearce Brown  
Juneau, Alaska