

DRAFT

**State of Florida
JJDP State Advisory Group (SAG)
Finance Committee Minutes
Daytona, FL
Thursday, November 18, 2010**

SAG Members (11): O.B. Stander, Jacqui Colyer, Curtis Jenkins, Alan Abramowitz, Patti Pieri, Sophia Campbell, Ivan Tucker, Tony Jones, Jim Clark, Mitch Wilkins and Judge Daniel Dawson.

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Staff Present (6): Rex Uberman, Juliet Westmoreland, Cheryl Howard, Rhyna Jefferson, Pat McGee and David Kerr.

Mr. Stander called the meeting to order at 10:23 a.m.

Ms. Howard called roll.

Mr. Stander asked that there be a modification to the minutes by adding, "The Committee had a concern about the award period ending before the funds are spent".

A motion was made by Ms. Colyer to accept the minutes of August 23, 2010 with the modification; motion was second by Mr. Jenkins.

A list of cancelled awards was made available to the SAG as requested.

An annual report was provided on the Planning and Administration funds, an overall explanation of expenditures on salaries paid out of the federal award.

JABG 2007 and Interest

The federal award will expire on the November 26, 2010; there is a grace period of 90 days to spend the funds. There are currently 3 grants remaining JB804, C0125 and N1105, the dates have changed to the end of the grace period. Staff has informed the Committee that the funds will be spent.

In the summary at the bottom of the award the amount spent prior year has been changed from \$208,343 to \$71,468. The correction is reflected in the notes explaining the reason for the change.

There is approximately \$30,000 remaining in interest funds.

DRAFT

JABG 2008 and Interest

The end date of this award has been changed from May 31, 2008 due to the first draw down of January 2, 2009.

The O9125 Supreme Court grant only spent \$23,469 FY 09/10 they will spend the remaining balance of the \$59,776 in current FY 10/11. An amendment has been made to that effect. Change in staff caused the delay in spending the funds. Judge Dawson had concerns on Supreme Court not spending the awarded funds. SAG was of the understanding that it was mandatory Ms. Jefferson commented the language says, "Consult with"; the department will look into this further. We do not want to give back to the government funds that are for our communities.

On grants that have no movement, staff has indicated they are expected to spend the funds. SAG indicated there were concerns on H9125 Prevention PACT design and K9125 Evidence-Base. Ms. Jefferson advised the SAG that a memo would go out to the departments on the consequences if the funds awarded are not spent.

Ms. Pieri mentioned that during the training she attended for DJJ employees on the DRAI they also talked about the PACT. During the stage of determining whether we would use the PACT tool it would give base line information on the youth. Are they still going to provide the information if the youth comes back into detention a number of times there will be another assessment done and we will get a comprehensive history of that child that will go back to the original one? Are we still moving in that direction? How soon will it be before we can have some of that comprehensive information? Mr. Uberman indicated that he would provide that information to her during the afternoon meeting.

The TBD (to be determined) line for Community Capacity a solicitation for the \$315,856 will go out in January. If it goes out in January it will not give them much time to spend the funds. It will be difficult. An extension is possible if needed.

The interest has \$49,800.

JABG 2009 & Interest

M0125 has been added for \$60,000 to report, this is part of the \$170,000 for Health Services I0125, therefore the amount is now \$110,000.

The FAMU \$400,000 figure was not mentioned in the Quarterly meeting minutes of August on the SEC, although it was mentioned in the DMC committee minutes.

DRAFT

JABG 2010

No expenditures grants started July 1, will show on future reports.

2007 Title II

Court Administration Circuit 19 has a balance of \$9,845 that will be reallocated.

State Attorney Circuit 4 has \$14,800 to be reallocated program has been completed.

Non Violence Circuit 11 grant has had no movement; there has been a problem with the documentation submitted. The contract manager is working with organization to get the proof required to pay them. The contract is a cost reimbursement grant. Invoices have been received in hand. Staff provided information on those that had high balances.

Only 8 months remaining to spend Gender Specific funds. Solicitation went out late, and the Department is working with the provider on getting this money spent. Now that the Bureau of Contracts is involved the process has gone a lot smoother.

Mr. Stander commented that he appreciated Ms. Jefferson's responses and he felt for the first time that it is being watched and pushed to get this done. Historically, we have not gotten the funds out in time for the provider.

Mr. Clark asked is it possible to allocate monies to areas we see problems in the state that does not necessarily go through an RFP process so that the funds can be spent?

RFP not required if government entity, the same for counties. SAG could identify areas or regions that we want to do a pilot project then put out an RFP for that area, it does not have to be statewide.

Mr. Clark said as related to transportation, we could say every district can provide some kind of transportation you have \$100,000 to reduce DMC and give it to them for one year if we were going to give them funds back like the Supreme Court.

Mr. Stander stated he was feeling much more comfortable that someone is riding herd on spending the funds we should not have to work hard to spend money. We could have a group look into at the next SAG meeting money that is coming down to add to initiatives.

DRAFT

Ms. Jefferson commented that we have a recommendation to get with Mr. Norman Campbell and do the transportation project and we could definitely look in to it.

Ms. Colyer mentioned one of the things that DCF does is if you let money lapse we redistribute it to contracts that are doing what we want to be done. We have never lapsed a dime, and the money is so scarce and too valuable. We let them now upfront if there are two quarters and no movement in the money.

Ms. Jefferson mentioned that a letter would go out to the providers. Ms. McGee had a good idea for the department to put in our RFA solicitations and contracts.

Ms. McGee commented Specialist are out there monitoring programmatic, fiscal and all of the above services some providers are unable spending their funds for whatever reason some things cannot be helped or controlled. We should look into contracts as we develop them to add a clause in there that at 6 months they will be monitored, followed up on and that if they cannot comply or spend 50% of the money the Department will come back and start subtracting may be 10% or 20% of the funds. They will see it when they apply they know already when they sign off on it in the application, then once they get the contract and see it again they know right up front that we mean business when we ask them to spend the money.

An example we had when we worked so hard and so long and frustrated over the JDAI, we want to know why an agency is not spending the money but where it is our fault we have not given them the reigns to spend the money they have the award but can not touch money. If stuff is getting stuck where is it getting stuck and what can we do to help improve it on both sides.

Judge Dawson's recollection was that DJJ would take a look at it. Very few states limit to 3 years. One of the problems is some of the programs that spend the money every year have a whole new staff of people and we could cut off somebody that is doing a really good job. Then we have some others that we never heard have that have no clue what they were doing other than putting it down on paper. Some of these are problems.

We always had a limit that an award could be no more than 3 years. This is something we put in place. But we could change that. The Feds are encouraging that we change that to 5 years.

If we did a hybrid, which is we put a certain percentage of it that would be about youth both 80% on going and 20% or whatever number we decide would be innovative programs and just look at that. We are always kind of rushing to get people to spend money down. We want to make sure they are spending on the areas we want to see.

DRAFT

Mr. Stander commented it is a good point for continuing a project, but not for managing money in the contract. You want the ability to extend that contract that is a different issue then giving them a longer period of time to spend the \$50,000 or \$100,000.

There are certain ones that are doing great if we increase the percentage of that we would have less concern to work on.

Florida statute on limitation is for 5 years with a lifetime renewal.

Let the Department look in to how we got to the 3-year rule.

It was determined that it would be faster to have staff look into whether there are legal impediments to the SAG making that decision they can make it happen a lot faster.

If we do change to 5 years we will have to do better of cutting people in mid term if they are not doing a good job. We do not want to extend a bad program for 5 years.

2008 Title II

There is very little movement. There is concern that there is only one year to spend these funds.

2009 Title II

No movement on this grant. Aftercare/Reentry awardees were posted November 4, 2010. Awardees are provided in the SAG book. There are some to be determined it was encouraged that these get out. Mr. Stander expressed a concern that there is one year before this federal grant expires.

2008 Title V & 2009 Title V

It will go out with Safe Schools in January.

Motion was made at 11:20 to adjourn made by Mr. Abramowitz second by Ms. Colyer.