**VOCA Stakeholder Meeting 05.01.23 at MOCADSV 9am-12pm**

**Attendees:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Cheryl Robb Welch | Tara Shahangian |
| Zak Wilson | Wade McDonald |
| Jamie Padgett | Ken Chapman |
| Jessica Seitz | Jeriane Jaegers-Brenneke |
| Benjamin Johnson | Tina Utley |
| Tiffany Johnston | Leanne Reese |
| Patti Custer | Patrick Luebbering |

1. **Funding Allocation discussion**

- Jessica – Said suggestion
- Jamie – Used information already had
- Tiffany – Previous data did not include ARPA
- Jeriane – Updated numbers
- Cheryl – Why would we include ARPA funding?
- Jeriane – It was not allocated across the board, only to large agencies, so this skewed the numbers.
- Tiffany – There is $17M left in ARPA unallocated.
- Zak – Establishing categories, while was past, can have variance based off the priorities that are established. May need to drive more money into this category. Based on the SARs, fine, were thinking underserved was overrepresented and funding shifted to others. Wanted to know where the systems based where broken up.
- Jamie - About 50% of underserved and 25% DV. Establishing it, but knowing that it is still flexible. Don't have to be set in stone with what they are currently.
- Jeriane – Do we put caps on awards?
- Zak and Cheryl – No
- Jamie – What period is this?
- Tiffany – The timeframes include the 6th contract and current contract (04.01.22 to current)
- Jamie – 6.8% previously and not 6% of underserved
- Tiffany – Most of the ARPA money went to all 7 of the contracts. The ARPA funding was heavy in DV providers. Although the total dollar amount was total contract amount on the prior sheet, it truly only reflect non-ARPA funds reported to DOJ.
- Leanne – Numbers don't seem right.
- Jeriane – Are we setting up percentages? And what are those? And how do we justify moving the funds around?

- Jessica – Need to justify the decision. %'s imply formula. Yes, have to justify the awards. If it is competitive, someone will be upset.
- Jeriane – I am not saying it is right or wrong, just how we justify it.
- Tiffany – OVC has announced priorities this year which include: historically marginalized populations and agencies that haven't received funding before. Human trafficking is a huge priority this year too.
- Tina – Not fair to put a cap on it. Would be hard to do it by services too.
  Need to make
- Tiffany- Need to make equitable funding decisions for agencies within the same category. Such as looking at shelter size to ensure that contract amounts are equitable, Same argument with the CASA'S.
- Leanne – With the funding going down, everyone is set at the amount in 2017. As the funding is going down, not sure how open it will be. Cap on if new program, certain funding. All would have been better off being a new program than an existing program. Back to what Zak is saying. Part of it is what DOJ sets as the priorities.
- Jeriane – Should we set percentages?
- Tiffany- Agencies have %'s for different categories which is broken out on the sheet
- Cheryl – The answer will be no.
- Wade – Formula needs to be inside the competitive process, or inside the process.
- Jessica – Still thinks some organizations do not fit.
- Jeriane – Will do a legal review.
- Jessica – Justify it and do a review. Not a competitive review.
- Cheryl – What is written doesn't seem applicable. Fine going to legal – looks like prevention and not legal services. Why were they awarded in the first place?
- Jessica – Just think some don't fit.
- Jamie – Still foster care parts.
- Jessica – Foster Adopt Connect KI and 10.
- Jamie and Jessica – These need to be reviewed.
    - Foster Adopt Connect KI & BI
    - Missouri Alliance for Children and Families
    - Central Missouri Foster Care & Adoption
    - Foster and Adoptive Care Coalition of St. Louis
- Jessica – Wants legal counsel. Has a really large award. They are outliers.
- Group – Expenditure levels cut
- Pat - $5M is in house. $30M in senate. It will go to conference. Should know by Friday. Apply new methodology.
- Jessica - Still committed to original timeframe. Extending at same level. Go in 25 with the new methodology.
- Cheryl – There is a national advocacy of putting into GR.
- Jessica – On site visits. Have you seen the variance in awards and size of agencies. Things have not been adjusted. Would like to discuss whether we can discuss unit of service. Not overall cap, but it is time for them to compete.

- Pat – Cap has a really organized agency and get funding. Can't award them $10M. Weeding out small programs. % of thing could.
- ? – Part of it seems like expenditure priority. Prioritizing staff and cars.
- Jeriane – Some states do only allow for certain things.
- Jamie – Better way to look at it. No capital improvements.
- Cheryl – Promotional materials, not transportation. Transportation needs are increasing. Cut it out. Also looks at needs assessment. That is really, what we are wanting to gather.
- Tiffany – Transportation has been an identified gap across the board.
- Jessica – Would be helpful to get that information. If we are approaching a cliff of 50%, would prioritize and what people would prioritize. If funding dropped if 50%, staff and will put a lot of things on hold for 1 time expenses. There is an argument that transportation is an ongoing operating expense. Would not call it a unallowable expense. Can probably list programs that could be cut if going to list funding by 50%.
- Patti and Tiffany – Outside of personnel and benefits some recent requests for spending larger amounts of money are for Upgrading phones and systems.
- Tiffany – Most are using DVSS ARPA funding to make one-time purchases such as vehicles.
- Jessica – To identify underserved.
- Pat – Thought missing major categories.
- Jessica – On title, might just say we have prioritized the types of crime.
- Tina – Are new priorities covered?
- Tiffany – New providers and marginalized communities are the DOJ priorities. Can also add to the other category.
- Survey:
    - Change title to remove violent
    - Update to include questions on marginalized communities
    - Add gun violence
    - Update the underserved
- Send out communication to the larger group