

**VOCA Formula Meeting Agenda
November 7, 2022**

- Goal: Determine VOCA formula
- DSS, MO Senate, and MO House Introductions
- VOCA Recipient Introduction & Verification of Agencies Represented

VOCA Representative	Agencies Represented	Representative
MCADSV	77 DV and SV members (2 are also represented by Kids First)	Zak Wilson
MO Kids First	26 CAC members (2 are also represented by MCADSV) and Child Abuse VOCA Providers	Jessica Seitz
MO-CASA	18 CASAs	Leanne Reese
MAPA	75 PAs	Kathleen Tofall
MOPS	8 PA VOCA Providers	Darrell Moore
MSHP	2 MSHP programs	Lt. Scott Lance
FACT Board	Community Partnerships	Bill Dent
KC Mothers in Charge	AdHoc, Employment Connection, and KC Mothers in Charge	Christina Esteban
MADD	MADD – Statewide	Meghan Carter
Reynolds County Law Enforcement Advocate	Reynolds County Crime Victim Advocate Programs/Reynolds County Sheriff's Office	Marissa Morey
St. Charles County Family Court	St. Charles Family Court – Juvenile Division	Nickie Steinhoff
MO-CATE	Human Trafficking Statewide	Jordan Hawkins and Katie Rhoades

VOCA Fix

- Signed into law 7/22/21
- Goal was to help stabilize the fund
- Waived match requirements due to the pandemic
- Requires funds collected under deferred and non-prosecution agreements to be deposited into the CVF

Funding Levels

Federal Fiscal Year	Funding Received ¹	Fund Balance ²	Federal Cap ²	Missouri Allocation ³	% of Total ⁴
2017		\$13.082M	\$2.573	\$34.4M	1.3230%
2018	\$4.45B	\$9.171B	\$4.436B	\$61.8M	1.3950%
2019	\$4.95B	\$6.448B	\$3.353B	\$41.7M	1.2437%
2020	\$5.03B	\$4.42B	\$2.641B	\$30.9M	1.1700%
2021	\$7.74B	\$3.193B	\$2.015B	\$19.2M	0.9529%

2022	\$5.53B	\$3.029B	\$2.6B	\$26.3M	1.0115%
2023			\$1.75B ⁶		

Overall

- Competitive bid preferred, not required per VOCA Rule Section 94.104(e)
- Missouri's HB11 requires a competitive bid for VOCA
- Most states offer a competitive bid process, have an open solicitation, and determine funding levels based on available federal funding, population needs, etc.
- Most states fund existing providers due to their established performance metrics and the limited funding. If states choose to fund new providers, it is through a competitive process.

Missouri Overview

- Split into 7 regions that align with MCADSV effective 4/1/22
- Looked at several methods (funding top scores only based on their bid amount to the maximum allotted amount per region, expenditures both average 12 months, and a designated 12 months 10.1.20-9.30.21, sliding scale based on score, increasing CASA's only, Increasing CAC's only, increasing both CAC's and CASA's)

Potential Options for Missouri

1. "Hub" model: Iowa model- fund 1- 2 comprehensive DV/SV providers in each region and possibly sub grant out other services
2. Request for proposal with specific state specified requirements instead of a response that answers certain RFP requirements (reduced application)
3. Open solicitation, state discretion targeted funding to address specific needs and specific identified populations, gaps etc. (Washington model)
4. Formula for continuation of successful sub awardees, have a set aside line item, for new providers/projects that is competitive and up to the discretion of the SAA and funding amounts
5. Create statewide funding category for statewide providers, outside of the regional funding amounts (Idaho model)
6. Create formula based on a base amount and population, rather than number of victims served (Iowa model)
7. Create formula based on a base amount and number of victims served
8. Reduce funding allocations across the board
9. Altering current match requirements to sustain funds- example increase cash match requirements and reduce in kind match requirements, or increase overall match requirement above 20%
10. New provider's discussion- reducing funding, limiting number of providers allowed, etc.

Documentation

Iowa Hub Model

- Received \$13.9M for FFY22
- 6 regions - Implemented in 2013
- Providers:
 - 1 or 2 comprehensive DV providers based on the size of the region, and the same for SV
 - Comprehensive = all-encompassing victim servicing agency (Hub) that serves multiple counties
 - Same providers are funded each year
 - New providers are funded through the VOCA special project line item
- VOCA Funding – 3 years and if there are decreases, there are equal reductions
 - \$1.05, or 4.1% - Admin
 - \$1.2M, or 4.65% to Victim Witness Coordinators, MO equivalent is MAPA
 - \$167,000, or 0.65% CCR Teams (Coordinated community response team) such as SARTs and DARTs (Sexual and Domestic Abuse Response Teams)
 - \$2.2M, or 8.2% Survivors of Homicide Programs (underserved)
 - \$400,000, or 1.56% CITRC Central Iowa Trauma Recovery Center
 - \$1M, or 3.9% CVAD for TAO - Iowa Staff Training Advocacy & Outreach: Self Award (up to 10%)
 - \$765,000, or 2.98% State Hotline, in MO, refer to National hotline

Less:

 - \$1.5M, or 5.88% Foundation Culturally Specific, underrepresented populations
 - \$785,000, or 3.06% Coalition
 - \$2.7M, or 13% for VOCA initiatives
 - \$10.1M, or 40% total for each of the 4 categories
 - 60% base + 40% based on region population
 - 4 zones for homicide and other violence crime services
 - \$2.7M competitive awards for new providers
 - Open Solicitation, application submitted into grant management system, VOCA special projects is the competitive component and allows for new providers, new programs
- 10 Different application versions, based on solicitation type received)
- Peer review (internal and then external for applications received)
- FVPSA: \$1.2M, or 70% Shelter and 25% Non-Shelter
- Sexual Abuse: \$390,114 (MO SASP)
- STOP Violence Against Women Program (VAWA): \$1.7M – DPS
- Microsoft Word - Domestic Abuse Comprehensive FY20.docx (iowaattorneygeneral.gov)

Washington Model

- Prioritization of funding
- Funding for specific services or Funding for victims of specific crimes: 20%
- Set asides to address gaps in service and current needs of victims: 25.5%
 - Programs operated by and for historically marginalized populations, support for tribes, programs serving child abuse victims, system based victim witness assistance programs
- Support for maintenance of effort for current services: 51%
- Establishing a VOCA reserve fund: 3.5%

Idaho Model

- Received \$8.5M for FFY22
- 7 regions- 47 providers statewide
- 1 statewide allocation category which includes MADD, Legal Aid Services and the Idaho Anti-Trafficking Coalition
- Funding Period is 1 year (FY23)
- Open solicitation, funding is determined based on application, how the agency strategic plan aligns with the state strategic plan
- Each region has at least one DV and SV provider and one child abuse services provider, additional providers may be funded based on need and population
- Funding includes: VOCA, State DV Bridge, FVPSA, VAWA, State DV, and FVPSA ARPA
- Funding allocation: base level for priority categories for each region at the discretion of the Council
- Allocation for Service areas based on population
- Funding Authority: Idaho Admin Code r.16.05.04.023
- Council is made up of one representative for each region, members include Prosecuting attorneys, Family and Community Resource Coordinator, College Chair, LCSW, Sheriff, and City Attorney
- References:
 - Section 16.05.04.023 - VICTIM ASSISTANCE GRANT DISTRIBUTION, Idaho Admin. Code r. 16.05.04.023 | Casetext Search + Citator
 - FY2022 Funded Programs-12-16-21 (idaho.gov)
 - ICDVVA-Grants-Funding-FY2023-Updated-100322.pdf (idaho.gov)