



## CVSD Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

CVSD Conference Room, Suite 150A (Lower Level)  
Thursday, June 25, 2015, 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

---

***Committee Members in Attendance:*** Steve Bellshaw, Erin Ellis, Jenna Harper, Kim Larson, Cheryl O'Neill, Bob Robison, Michele Roland-Schwartz, Robin Selig, Lauri Stewart, and Letetia Wilson

***Committee Members via Teleconference:*** Allison Cleveland, Desiree Coyote, Shirley Didier, Kat Kelley, Tim Moore (Daniel Staton), Rebecca Orf, Barb Palicki, and Tawna Sanchez

***Guests in Attendance:*** Jayne Downing and Cybil Stockman

***CVSD DOJ Staff Present:*** Caitlin Brown, Diana Fleming, Mackenzie Gray, Mike Maryanov, Cathy Relang, Shannon Sivell, and Becky Smith

***Committee Members Absent:*** Kris Billhardt, Sybil Hebb, Amy Holmes Hehn, Yelena Hansen, Kelsey LeBrun Keswani, Terri Neimann, Justin Nelson, Chanpone Sinlapasai, Vanessa Timmons, Merle Weiner, and Lynne Whiteman

---

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Robin welcomed the committee members, our guests from the DHS Advisory Committee, and CVSD staff in attendance. Everyone introduced themselves to the group.

### **Minutes**

The last CVSD Advisory Committee (AC) meeting was May 21, 2015. No corrections or additions were suggested.

- Letetia Wilson made the motion to approve the minutes
- Robin Selig seconded the motion

*The motion to approve the May CVSD AC Meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

### **Joint Allocation Discussion**

CVSD and DHS committee members gathered today to discuss the allocation formula options. The two committees will vote today and make recommendations to CVSD on how to proceed with the Joint allocations.

Two questions were put to the combined committees: 1) which formula, the "Blue" or "Orange", should we use going forward? 2) How do we address the "base" when there are funding increases?



Decisions on these two recommendations will provide guidance for future allocations and prevent both ACs from having to revisit the issue on a biennial basis.

There was a brief recap of the basic tenants of the equity formula including how base was determined, why counties do not all receive the same base funding and how new funds are distributed. Mackenzie demonstrated how the formula resulted in our current allocation numbers. The discussion also touched on the “tri-county” region and how the equity study recommended treating these three counties as a whole. Mackenzie also explained how both proposed options were true to the assumptions and intentions of the original equity study and resulting formula.

In the last biennium the legislature increased the allocation to the joint fund to \$8.4million (for a current total of \$9.9 million). The AC recommended bringing the nine federally recognized tribes into the Joint DV/SA formula based on enrollment numbers. This put them at the \$20,000.00 base in the formula- in line with the smaller counties of our state.

### **Allocation Formulas**

The AC had a lengthy discussion about the orange and blue options CVSD was offering. Current allocations are calculated using the blue formula.

CVSD then ran calculations which demonstrated how the funding allocations would change depending on which formula option was used. In both formulas, the smaller counties receive less of any future increase (until we reach \$16.46 million) because they are closer to their full funding goal than are the larger counties. The calculations showed that as time goes on the orange option brought up the larger counties quicker than in the current blue formula. In the current blue formula, the smaller counties reach 100% quicker while the larger counties are increasing towards the 100% goal at a slower rate.

Jayne provided some history on the formula and the conversations that led to adopting the current formula. She explained that the larger counties and programs wanted to give up some of their funding so that the smaller programs would get closer to the 100% mark quicker. This was done in the hope that then when the larger counties were at the bottom of the formula that the smaller counties would still help lobby and support the increases that would then help the larger counties.

The group discussed pros and cons of each formula presented and how equity is different to everyone. Lauri agreed that each has pros and cons but explained she believes the “orange” formula would be more equitable to all programs and strategically keep more programs involved in working with the legislature to continue to get increases in funding for everyone.



- Lauri made the motion to adopt the “orange” formula as what we would like to use as a basis moving forward.
- Kim seconds the motion.
  - Three members of the AC decided to abstain from voting, the remaining 12 members present voted Yes on the motion.

*The motion passed to adopt the alternative version, or the “orange” formula, starting with this award season and to continue using it moving forward.*

### **Allocating the Base**

There were two proposals for allocating the base: the stair-step option, which increases the base by a set amount as we reach funding benchmarks; or the sliding scale, which would steadily increase the base as funding increases.

Mackenzie again ran some calculations to demonstrate the effect both options would have on our total allocations.

- Jenna made the motion to adopt the sliding scale that would start at the \$9.6 million current funding level.
- Lauri seconds the motion

*The motion passes unanimously to adopt the sliding scale base increase that starts at the \$9.6 million current funding level.*

### **VOCA Update (VOCA Assistance; VOCA Training)**

CVSD indicated that the agency is looking at a long-term plan on how to allocate the new funds and that the AC would be updated as those plans became more concrete.

### **Open Forum, Announcements and Adjourn**

The Justice Reinvestment Act was discussed by the group.  
Brief update on VAWA Competitive process.

Next AC meeting is November 5, 2015 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at noon