



CVSD Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

CVSD Conference Room, Suite 150A (Lower Level)
Thursday, May 22, 2014, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members in Attendance: Desiree Coyote, Shirley Didier, Jenna Harper, Leona Ike, Kim Larson, Cheryl O'Neil, Bob Robison, Michele Roland-Schwartz, Robin Selig, Merle Weiner, Lynne Whiteman, and Letetia Wilson

Committee Members via Teleconference: Steve Bellshaw, Erin Ellis, Terri Neimann, Justin Nelson, Rebecca Orf, Barb Palicki, Jennifer Ott (for Daniel Staton), and Vanessa Timmons

CVSD DOJ Staff Present: Shannon Sivell, Becky Smith, Cathy Relang, Jeanette Ewald, Mackenzie Gray, Jordan James-Largent, and Caitlin Brown

Committee Members Absent: Vanessa Becker, Kris Billhardt, Kris Boler, Allison Cleveland, Yelena Hansen, Sybil Hebb, Kathryn Kelley, Tawna Sanchez, and Chanpone Sinlapasai

Welcome and Introductions

Robin welcomed the committee members and CVSD staff in attendance, and everyone introduced themselves.

Minutes

The last CVSD Advisory Committee (AC) meeting was held January 23, 2014 at the Catholic Charities office in Portland. The draft version of the minutes was sent to the AC prior to this meeting via email for review. There were no proposed edits to the January minutes.

- Kim Larson moved to approve the January minutes as written.
Michele Roland-Schwartz seconded.
The motion to approve the January CVSD AC meeting minutes passed unanimously.

SASP Application Review: Jeanette

Jeanette gave some background on the process used to develop the SASP application. A SASP Subcommittee was formed to provide input into the response to the OVW annual solicitation narrative that describes how Oregon will implement distribution of SASP funds. The subcommittee met numerous times to discuss the federal SASP solicitation and the development of the RFA for the 2014 SASP application.

CVSD conducted two surveys to identify the gaps and priorities for services to survivors of sexual assault; the first survey had 32 responses from the Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (DV/SA) Grantees. The second survey had 14 responses from representatives from Underserved



populations. The SASP subcommittee used these survey results to develop funding priorities which included addressing one or more of the gaps identified in the surveys.

Leona asked if the surveys were sent directly to the counties or grantees and if a response was received from Warm Springs. Jeanette explained that the process included sending the surveys to all the DV/SAs and to the nine (9) federally recognized Tribes of Oregon. To see if a response from Warm Springs came in the list would have to be reviewed again but based on memory Jeanette does not think Warm Springs responded to the surveys [DV/SA Grantee surveys representing Tribal members were received from NAYA, the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians and the Umatilla Indian Reservation; surveys from underserved populations representing Tribal members were received from NAYA, and the Umatilla Indian Reservation].

The SASP Subcommittee decided to award bonus points for frontier counties; there are 10 counties that meet the definition of frontier (defined as having populations of 6 or less residents per square mile). There are 100 standard points and they received 10 bonus points if they served one or more of the frontier counties. The Subcommittee also discussed the option of awarding bonus points to Sexual Assault (SA) specific organizations since this solicitation is specifically for sexual assault services. After a lengthy discussion Subcommittee members opted to not award bonus points to sexual assault specific agencies as the members felt that based on their experience they should be scored on the merit of their application alone. It was also decided to not award bonus points to population specific organizations. The only bonus points awarded this year were for the ten (10) frontier counties and they were awarded the 10 bonus points after the reviewers score them on the merit of the application.

The SASP Request for Application (RFA) will have an 18-month cycle this time as we are trying to transition to a calendar year to align with the Muskie Annual Progress Reports; the next cycle will be a 24-month cycle. We also didn't indicate a maximum on the award amounts this year; instead, the RFA indicated a total funding amount and stated that we would fund at least 5 projects. We completed a Minimum Qualifications (MQ) review internally; this was done by the fund coordinator assigned to the applicant's county. Only one applicant did not pass the MQ review and it did not get passed on to the SASP review committees. This application included many unallowable activities that when removed would not be a viable project. The 16 remaining applications were assigned to the SASP review teams. There were two teams, each team had eight (8) applications to review.

One team reviewed the LGBT, elderly, and youth applications; AC members on the team were Jenna Harper and Terri Neimann. The second team reviewed the rural, immigrant, tribal, and Latina applications; the AC member on the team was Michele Roland-Schwartz. Applications needed to score 70 out of a possible 100 to be considered for funding. Only one application fell below the required 70 points and was not considered for funding. After scoring the applications, the team members discussed and ranked the applications.

The minutes on the discussion and recommendations for the SASP Application Review process are confidential.



Equity Formula and Tool / Joint Updates: Becky S.

In July 2013 the CVSD AC met about the allocations of the joint funding. To further discussion while we are not faced with allocation decisions for the joint funding, we have created a brief document explaining the allocation formula as simply as possible. Edits and comments are invited and should come to Becky S. by email so the document can be finalized. It will then be distributed to everyone to have and refer to.

Leona brought up concerns with the District Attorney's (DA) role in the allocations. CVSD staff explained that this formula is for the DV/SA programs and not the DA Victim Assistance Programs (VAPs) and that none of the grant decisions are made with the politics of the individual counties in mind. The heart of the document is how we allocate the Joint DV/SA funds from CVSD with the intent to support meaningful access for survivors across the state. This is the equity formula, it is our attempt at creating a more accessible and easier to understand version than reading the entire Equity Study Report. This also updates the formula to include the nine (9) federally recognized Tribal Nations in Oregon.

VOCA Update: Cathy

It was announced this week that the Credit Suisse bank agreed to plead guilty to one count of helping American account holders evade U.S. income taxes. As part of the plea agreement, the Swiss bank will pay monetary penalties totaling \$2.6 billion, of which \$1.3 billion is a criminal fine which, together with a \$400 special assessment, will be deposited into the Crime Victims Fund.

VOCA uses funds from the Crime Victims Fund which collects Federal criminal fines and penalties and does not use taxpayer dollars. We have not received our FY14 allocation yet. As of May 2014 the House Appropriations Committee approved the appropriations proposed by its Commerce, Justice and Science subcommittee, which includes a \$770 million VOCA cap. On June 5, 2014, the Senate Appropriations Committee proposed a \$775 million cap on the Crime Victims Fund for FY 2015. The National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators (NAVAA) has approached Congress with a different approach to the VOCA cap with the hope of raising the cap for FY 2015. Instead of just asking for a specific dollar amount they are asking to adopt a long term policy of setting the annual cap at the amount deposited into the Fund the previous full fiscal year. The VOCA cap would be set at the FY 2013 deposits (since the 2015 appropriations is determined in 2014, the "previous year" refers to 2013). The total deposits in 2013 were \$1.489 billion. This actually returns VOCA to the original, pre-cap days with the intent of fully distributing each year's deposits.

Cathy is in the process of creating review teams for the 2014 VOCA Competitive application. The teams will be made up of five (5) with members from the CVSD AC represented on each team. There will be two (2) reviewer orientations in June. Each VOCA category review team will meet during July and rank the applications in their category. This will be followed with a meeting of the entire AC on August 7 to make final recommendations.



Technology Grant Update

Mackenzie informed the Advisory Committee that CVSD applied for a technology grant from OVC. If awarded grant funds CVSD would have funding for the following technology upgrades: an upgraded system for teleconference meetings at CVSD, the ability to record presentations for future viewing, and training on how to build reports in the currently existing E-Grants system.

Legal Assistance Network Grant Update

Shannon explained the regional focus and partnerships involved in the Legal Assistance Network Grant that CVSD will be submit to OVC. These grant opportunities, the Technology Grant and Legal Assistance Network Grant, are part of Vision 21 from OVC.

Summary and Next Meeting

You will hear from CVSD shortly to schedule the special teleconference on the final recommendation for funding a sixth SASP application. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be on Thursday, August 7th at 8:30 a.m. The meeting will be at the CVSD office in Salem to review the ranking of the VOCA Competitive applications from the review committees.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.