# **DCJS Grants Committee Meeting**

## **September 15, 2016**

# Richmond, VA

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Chief Scott Williams. Members in attendance were:

Mr. Andy Block, Director, Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice

Chief Jeffrey Brown, Director of Campus Safety, Richard Bland College of William & Mary Police Ms. Karen Brown, Chair, Virginia Parole Board

The Honorable Vanessa Crawford, Sheriff, City of Petersburg

The Honorable Michael Doucette, Commonwealth's Attorney, City of Lynchburg

Mr. David Johnson, Executive Director, Virginia Indigent Defense Commission

Colonel Bobby Russell, Superintendent, Western Virginia Regional Jail

Ms. N.H. 'Cookie' Scott, Deputy Director of Administration, Virginia Department of Corrections

Chief Scott Williams, Director of Public Safety, Hampden-Sydney College Police

Mr. Richard Vorhis, Chief of Correctional Litigation Section, Office of the Attorney General

The Committee was meeting to review and recommend grants to the full Criminal Justice Services Board from the following DCJS grant programs:

## Byrne/Justice Assistance Grant

Ms. Janice Waddy (Manager of DCJS Grants Administration) explained that grants were solicited under the federal Byrne/JAG program in the following categories:

- Evidence-based criminal justice programming
- Body-worn cameras for law enforcement agencies
- Naloxone for law enforcement agencies

Forty-one (41) applications were received and reviewed by agency staff; 39 were recommended for funding totaling \$902,981. The two denied applications – from the Newport News Police Department and Radford University - are eligible for appeal. Other funds are available if the denials are overturned.

The denials were further explained by DCJS staff (Albert Stokes and Heather Smolka):

• Radford University's application requested \$74,510 in funding to conduct research related to accidental death and injury of youth as a result of unsecured weapons in the home. The research would provide information related to any decrease in incidents after the implementation of a firearms safety and storage class.

While the study and research do have value, the proposal was not directly related to criminal justice and law enforcement, but represented more of a health-related perspective.

• The application from the Newport News Police Department requested \$99,898 in funding to implement the Hot Spot Policing strategy, which targets policing in a specific area and deals with a specific issue, and have a researcher evaluate the program. The proposal requested overtime for officers and research costs.

Crimesolutions.gov, which is supported by the National Institute of Justice and the Office of Justice Programs (U.S. Department of Justice), has evaluated various Hot Spot Policing programs in recent years. Of the 61 evaluations, 13 were listed as 'effective' and 41 as 'promising'. There has already been sufficient research conducted relating to this policing strategy.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by David Johnson and seconded by Cookie Scott that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the 39 applications totaling \$902,981. There were no oppositions. Recusals came from Richard Vorhis, Cookie Scott, and Andy Block.

#### **CCCA**

Ms. Waddy explained that, as a result of a funding increase in the Community Corrections program for FY '17 and '18, grants were solicited to expand the pretrial programs to localities in Virginia that are currently unserved. Seven (7) applications were received and reviewed by agency staff; five (5) were recommended for full funding totaling \$1,362,874. The two denied applications – from the City of Petersburg (\$271,409 requested) and Prince Edward County (\$206,615 requested) - are not eligible for appeal as all available funds were appropriated.

Due to current budget uncertainties, and because these grants are funded with general funds, DCJS recommended delaying the start date for these grants until January 1, 2017, after the Governor's amended budget is introduced in December.

The denials were further explained by DCJS staff (Kenneth Rose). Mr. Rose explained how competitive this grant process was, and that staff knew ahead of time that the available funds would not cover all requests received. Staff reviewed and scored all applications based on several factors and funds were awarded to the programs they felt were most likely to succeed.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by Cookie Scott and seconded by Colonel Russell that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the five (5) applications totaling \$1,362,874. There were no oppositions. The only recusal came from Sheriff Crawford.

#### **VAWA**

Ms. Waddy explained that these grants were solicited to provide funding to law enforcement agencies to carry out aspects of changes in the law related to individuals subject to a permanent protective order and the possession of firearms. Five (5) applications were received and reviewed by agency staff; three (3) were recommended for full funding totaling \$128,922. The two denied applications – from the City of Fredericksburg and Clarke County - are eligible for appeal. Other funds are available if the denials are overturned.

The denials were further explained by DCJS staff (Julia Fuller-Wilson):

• Clarke County's application requested \$2,530 in funding for a project to help establish policy and handle storage of firearms related to the new law provisions regarding Orders of Protection. The funds applied for would enhance the County's current policy and train staff on the new policies and procedures regarding accepting firearms from protective order respondents.

The County's application was not complete and did not include a Project Description, a Needs Statement, or an Implementation Plan.

• The City of Fredericksburg's application requested \$32,949 in funding to be used primarily to train six law enforcement officers through three national training events.

The majority of the funding requested in the application was for national training for grant recipients, which is an unallowable expense and is not directly linked to the project scope outlined in the guidelines. In addition, the County did not adequately address how the funding would be used to assist in meeting the requirements of §18.2-308.1:4(B) of the *Code of Virginia*.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by David Johnson and seconded by Chief Brown that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the three (3) applications totaling \$128,922. There were no oppositions or recusals.

## **JJDP Title II**

Ms. Laurel Marks (Manager of DCJS Juvenile and Adult Services) explained that this one grant was for the salary and expenses of DCJS staff responsible for assuring Virginia's compliance with core requirements of the JJDP Act. Responsibilities include compliance monitoring and monitoring of jails, lock-ups, juvenile detention homes and juvenile correctional facilities to ensure the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, sight and sound separation of juveniles form adult inmates, and the removal of juveniles from adult jails.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by Chief Brown and seconded by Colonel Russell that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the application totaling \$75,166. There were no oppositions or recusals.

#### Victim of Crime Act - VOCA

Ms. Waddy explained that grants were solicited as the third part of the funding strategy to make available the large increase in federal VOCA funds. The first two strategies made additional funds available to existing programs in mid-2015 and a significant increase to existing programs and funding for new programs at the June Board meeting. The current grants are for existing and new programs and initiatives that complement or enhance existing base program funding.

Sixty-seven (67) applications were received and reviewed by both agency staff and outside reviewers; 60 were recommended for funding \$12,521,451.

The seven (7) denied applications – from the Central Virginia Legal Aid Society, Latisha's House Foundation, Mental Health America, Pearls of Hope, the Roanoke City Police Department, Samaritan's House or The Genieve Shelter– are eligible for appeal. Other funds are available if the denials are overturned.

The denials were further explained by DCJS staff (John Mahoney):

• The application from the Central Virginia Legal Aid Society requested \$450,168 in funding to expand their Sexual Assault Advocacy Fund, which is a unique initiative formed to provide legal information, advice and representation, as well as emotional support, resource referrals and clearinghouse services to under-represented and underserved survivors of domestic and sexual violence in Central Virginia. In addition, they would perform extensive outreach in the community, provide targeted information to students, seniors, the disabled, immigrants, LGBTQ and other community groups, support agencies and local governments about their legal rights, prevention and options in sexual assault, domestic violence, child support and custody, debt collection and other cases.

The application did not demonstrate a clear project, questions in the application guidelines were left unanswered, the target population was not clearly defined, and the application failed to justify the need for additional staff.

• The application from the Latisha's House Foundation requested \$236,049 in funding for healing the mind/body/spirit of 15 victims of crime/human trafficking. Funds would be used to: 1) incorporate The Change Companies evidence-based Interactive Journaling curriculum to compliment trauma-informed, mental health and substance abuse counseling and holistic life-skill programs; 2) expand literacy through a 'classic' children's/youth/adult book club to enhance verbal skills necessary for education, as well as healing the inner child through the characters' experiences in the books.

Supplantation was not addressed in the application when requesting funding for current staff; the VOCA Readiness Assessment was not included with the application, so eligibility was not able to be determined; several requested budget items and the request for new staff were not justified; and the book club was determined to be unallowable.

• The application from Mental Health America requested \$106,377 in funding for a new project to provide trauma-informed, trained peer support counseling to crime victims in recovery from mental trauma. The project would use Certified Peer Recovery Specialists to provide three-day peer recovery/counseling retreats for crime survivors in different regions of the state. The project would also provide non-emergency Warm Line mental health phone support.

The application was disorganized and incomplete. Technical components aside, the project description did not adequately explain or justify the proposal. The application lacked concrete details and data to justify the project.

• The application from Pearls of Hope requested \$255,051 in funding for a new project to serve a regional population of nearly 200 clients during FY16 in behavioral health services, substance abuse treatment and mental health counseling. The target populations were individuals characterized as victims of human trafficking and the underserved or unserved populations such as men and boys, African Americans, and the LGBTQ community.

The application did not clearly describe the proposed project; a budget narrative was not included, so the requested budget items were not justified and the reviewer was not able to determine if those items were allowable; supplantation was not addressed when requesting funding for current staff; the application did not follow the grant guidelines or formatting requirements; questions in the application guidelines were unanswered; and several requested documents were missing.

• The application from the Roanoke City Police Department requested \$74,514 in funding for a full-time Special Victims Services Program Manager, who would be responsible for coordinating and maintaining weekly referral meetings between local services agencies to be known as the Domestic Violence Service Team, implementing the Lethality Assessment Program, coordinating and scheduling community outreach, and overseeing volunteer efforts.

The project is to provide coordination and training efforts and has a minimal focus on direct victim services (required by VOCA), and the project failed to identify an underserved population to be served.

• The application from Samaritan House requested \$62,500 in funding to expand their Crisis Services Program to include case management services for human trafficking and domestic violence victims who do not come into their emergency housing.

The project scope was unclear and the application was duplicative of another received by the same program (the second application was recommended for award).

• The application from The Genevieve Shelter requested \$444,465 in funding for a new project to assist the Western Tidewater Safe Haven with introducing supervised visitation, safe exchange, and a Legal Clinic that addresses domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse and/or stalking to Virginia's rural population.

The application included significant missing and/or incomplete sections and the budget narrative did not well-justify or explain many requested items, did not address non-supplantation, and did not identify sources of match.

Three (3) applications for which staff recommended reduced funding from what was requested (by 20% or more) – from Children's Hospital of The King's Daughters, The Laurel Center and the Virginia Center for Policing Innovation –were appealed.

• The application from the Children's Hospital of The King's Daughters requested \$376,441 in funding from the New Initiative Victim Assistance Grant Program to expand their Child Abuse Program's capacity to serve child victims of maltreatment in a timely, efficient, and effective manner. Services would include the provision of case management and family advocacy, forensic interviews, forensic medical examinations and evidence-based mental health treatment.

Funding was recommended at a reduced level of \$133,708. The reductions focus on the elimination of costs that are not fully justified or may be supported with other funds.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by Chief Brown and seconded by Sheriff Crawford that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the application at the requested funding level of \$376,441. There were no oppositions or recusals.

 The application from The Laurel Center requested \$498,461 in funding to provide comprehensive community-based and shelter-based intervention services for children ages 3-18 that are exposed to domestic violence for up to six months in order to reduce the long-term negative effects of their exposure.

Funding was recommended at a reduced level of \$175,000 with special conditions. In the appeal, The Laurel Center included a revised proposal at \$298,731 for consideration.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by David Johnson and seconded by Michael Doucette that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the application at the revised funding level of \$298,731. There were two oppositions (Karen Brown and Cookie Scott) and one abstention (Richard Vorhis). There were no recusals.

• The application from the Virginia Center for Policing Innovation requested \$1,000,000 in funding in order to upgrade their VINE system. VINE3 is a technological advancement to the existing system (a statewide automated victim notification system present in all of Virginia's local and regional jails and the DOC). VINE3 would improve the physical safety and emotional well-being of victims by facilitating direct access to services that respond to their psychological and physical needs while empowering them to engage in the criminal justice process.

Funding was recommended at a reduced level with special conditions. VCPI did not include the required match in the requested budget, but indicated their ability to provide the match. The federal award is to be reduced to \$800,000 and make provision of required match a condition of the award.

Based on discussion and the information provided, a motion was made by Chief Brown and seconded by David Johnson that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the application at the revised funding level of \$800,000 in federal funds plus the required match. Recusals came from Cookie Scott and Karen Brown.

In addition, a motion was made by Michael Doucette and seconded by Chief Brown that the full Criminal Justice Services Board accept the Committee's recommendations as a whole regarding the VOCA grants and approve the 60 recommended for funding totaling \$12,721,451. There were no oppositions. Recusals came from Cookie Scott, Richard Vorhis and Michael Doucette.

### **Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC)**

Ms. Waddy explained that DCJS is responsible, by authority of the Appropriations Act, to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the prevention of Internet crimes against children. As in previous years, DCJS is making two grants - one to the Southern Virginia ICAC Task Force (within the Bedford County Sheriff's Office) and the other to the Virginia State Police – to support the Northern Virginia ICAC Task Force. The grants are for \$475,000 each. This is informational only for the Criminal Justice Services Board; no action is required.

Because of the timing of the meeting today (meeting just prior to the full Criminal Justice Services Board meeting), it was not possible to allow grantees who are eligible to appeal the Committee's decisions to do so. In order to allow for appeals, the Appeals Committee will meet to review any appeals requested and present them to the full Board at the December meeting. Those Committee members who volunteered to participate on the Appeals Committee were Cookie Scott, Sheriff Crawford, David Johnson, and Richard Vorhis.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 AM.