#### **NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**

# OF THE ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION AND AGENDA

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission and to the general public that the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission will hold a meeting open to the public on Thursday, May 21, 2015 beginning at 1:30 p.m. at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Office, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission endeavors to ensure the accessibility of its meetings to all persons with disabilities. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the Commission Office at (602) 364-1146. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

The Commission may go into Executive Session on any of the following agenda items for the purposes of receiving legal advice pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).

Agenda for the meeting is as follows:

I.	Call to Order and Roll Call Chairperson B	ill Montgomery
11.	Minutes of the January 15, 2015 Meeting	
	Approval of Minutes	P-F-T
Ш.	Executive Director's Report John A	. Blackburn, Jr.
	A. Staff and Program Updates	Info
	B. Budget Update	Info
	C. Legislative Update	Info
	D. Drug Enforcement Account (DEA) Audit	Info
IV.	Crime Victim Compensation Program	Larry Grubbs
	<ul> <li>Review, discussion, consideration and possible action on the</li> </ul>	ne following:
	A. FY15 Funding Reallocation	P-F-T
	B. FY16 State and Federal Funding Amount	P-F-T
	C. FY16 Designation of Operational Units	P-F-T
	D. FY16 Operational Unit State and Federal Funding Allocation	n P-F-T
V.	Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program	Larry Grubbs
	Review, discussion, consideration and possible action on F	Y 2016 program
	funding recommendation.	P-F-T

# VI. Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program Cycle 29 Grant Awards Tony Vidale

 Review, discussion, consideration and possible action on FY16 Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control (Cycle 29) Grant Awards.
 P-F-T

# VII. Update on the FY 2015 Substance Abuse Prevention and Education Grant Awards Tony Vidale

 Staff will update the Commission on the funding awards for substance abuse prevention and education projects.

#### VIII. Call to the Public

Those wishing to address the Commission need not request permission in advance. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

#### IX. Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting

• The next Commission meeting will be held on **Thursday**, **July 16**, **2015** at **2:00 p.m**. at Little America Hotel, Flagstaff, AZ.

### X. Adjournment

A copy of the agenda background material provided to Commission members is available for public inspection at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Office, 1110 West Washington, Suite 230, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, (602) 364-1146. This document is available in alternative formats by contacting the Commission Office.



# ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Action Requested:		T	ype of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2	2015		Formal Action/Motion Information Only Other	Minutes of the January 15, 2015 Meeting
TO:	Chairperson and C	omr	nission Members	
FROM:	John A. Blackburn, Executive Director	Jr.		
RECOM	IMENDATION:			
	nmission approve th ary 15, 2015.	e m	inutes of the Arizona Criminal Justice	e Commission meeting held
DISCU	SSION:			
N/A				
FISCAL	. IMPACT:			
N/A				
ALTERI	NATIVES:			
Not App	rove - Modify - Tabl	e		

#### Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Minutes January 15, 2015

A public meeting of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission was convened on January 15, 2015 at Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, AZ 85007.

#### Members Present:

Bill Montgomery, Chairperson, Maricopa County Attorney

David Byers, Vice Chairperson, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts

Joseph Arpaio, Maricopa County Sheriff, Paul Lopez representing

Joseph Brugman, Chief, Safford Police Department, by conference call

Timothy Dorn, Chief, Gilbert Police Department

Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff, Paul Wilson representing by conference call

Chris Gibbs, Mayor, City of Safford, by conference call

Robert Halliday, Director, Department of Public Safety

Mark Brnovich Attorney General, Don Conrad representing

Drew John, Graham County Supervisor

Barbara LaWall, Pima County Attorney, by conference call

Ellen Kirschbaum, Chairperson, Board of Executive Clemency

Sheila Polk, Yavapai County Attorney

Charles Ryan, Director, Department of Corrections

David Sanders, Pima County Chief Probation Officer

Daniel G. Sharp, Chief, Oro Valley Police Department

Mark Spencer, Law Enforcement Leader

#### Members Absent:

William Pribil, Coconino County Sheriff Steven Sheldon, Former Judge

#### Staff Participating:

John A. Blackburn, Jr., Executive Director Andy LeFevre, Public Information Officer Larry Grubbs, Program Manager Phil Stevenson, Director, Statistical Analysis Center Wendy Boyle, Executive Secretary

#### **Guests Participating:**

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Administrative Office of the Courts

#### I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Bill Montgomery at 1:30 p.m. Roll was taken and a quorum was declared present. Mr. Montgomery welcomed Don Conrad, designee for Commissioner Mark Brnovich, Attorney General.

#### II. Minutes of the November 13, 2014 Meeting

Chairperson Montgomery called for a motion on the minutes. Commissioner Daniel Sharp entered a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held on November 13, 2014. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Robert Halliday and was unanimously approved by the Commission.

#### III. Executive Director's Report

#### A. Staff and Program Update

Executive Director Blackburn welcomed four new employees at ACJC. Marc Peoples is the Program Manager for the Criminal Justice Systems Improvement Program. The other three new hires introduced were Carlena Orosco, Research Analyst for the Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), Vernie Bruehler, Grant Coordinator for the Victim Services Program, and Jerod McDaniel, legislative intern. Phil Stevenson will be leaving the agency in February 2015 for a position in Washington, DC. Mr. Stevenson has been with the agency 8 1/2 years as director of SAC. ACJC has opened the recruitment process to hire for the SAC director position; however, there is no word on how the hiring freeze may affect the process.

Executive Director Blackburn updated the Commissioners on their appointments. Fourteen of the nineteen memberships have expired; all the Commissioners will continue to serve as long as the requirements are met from the original appointment, therefore everyone is eligible unless they resign or are replaced.

Tony Vidale, Program Manager of the Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program is working with the Department of Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health Services (DHS/DBHS) to utilize funds from a federal grant to focus on providing support to substance abuse prevention initiatives in Arizona. The grant is set to expire in September 2015 and totals \$650,000.

Also, ACJC was able to secure funding in the amount of \$250,000 from DHS/DBHS for an Adult Prevalence Survey that would fill in data gaps on adult substance use not collected from the Arizona Youth Survey.

Executive Director Blackburn stated ACJC will continue with the deaths in process reporting. The survey had been completed and submitted for several years; however, the Bureau of Justice Statistics contacted ACJC and stated the information was no longer needed. The law requesting the data was not reauthorized and the decision was not to continue the data collection. In December, Congress reauthorized the bill and ACJC is hoping to get the process started again. ACJC was concerned because this would be another 10 percent penalty for non-compliance against the Byrne JAG program. The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) penalty is being held off so there will not be a penalty this year; however, there will be 10 percent penalty for non-compliance to the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA). The penalties assessed per year are \$142,000, for a total of \$426,000 lost to date.

#### B. Budget Update

Executive Director Blackburn addressed that the state budget from the Governor's office would not be ready until Friday, January 16, 2015. ACJC had several budget items brought forth earlier and was seeking support but received minimal feedback. Chairperson Montgomery is looking at signing a letter seeking support for the issue of the Drug and Gang Prevention Resource Center funds to help pay for operations of SAC.

Executive Director Blackburn stated because of the reduction in state and federal funding, staff is looking at other options and funding sources to support the agency.

Chairperson Montgomery echoed on the context of the funding and also added that there will be a need for a place to breakdown the offenses in the state. Currently there is no responsibility or statutory mandate for an annual study to be done that would look at the Department of Corrections (DOC) inmate population. Information is also needed on the on-going trends involving recidivism, truth in sentencing, impact on crime rates, projected population in categories for different offenders, and the changing demand on classification on where people are housed. This would create a different impact on capital expenditures which raises the discussion for greater flexibility of funds.

Commissioner Ryan added the DOC publishes a monthly newsletter Corrections at a Glance that covers information on the prisons. Currently the prison system has over 42,000 inmates with projections to grow 960 inmates per year for the next three fiscal years. The bed population is forecasted to be at 3,000.

Chairperson Montgomery reiterated that information and analysis is incumbent to the criminal justice system in Arizona when making policy decisions to have reliable data over time.

#### C. Legislative Update

Andy LeFevre, Public Information Officer provided an update on the six drafted legislative proposals that were approved at the Commission meeting in November, 2014. Mr. LeFevre summarized three bills that furthered the work on the passage of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) bill which transmitted the information from the courts through the Department of Public Safety (DPS) up to the NICS. The other two bills relate to fingerprinting that created a cleanup bill and moved the section of fingerprinting into its own subsection. Another bill allows two biometric fingerprinting identification for the booking agency to collect fingerprinting information when it cannot be determined if prints were taken. The final bill concerns victim protection where the victim compensation program negotiates payment on behalf of a victim where the hospital or provider cannot collect monies over and above the agreed settlement.

Mr. LeFevre stated there were 250 bills introduced with half of the bills being apparent placeholders. The bills of interest include dealing with marijuana legalization and the use of the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP). Staff has reached out to legislators Steve Smith and Sonny Borrelli, heads of the senate and house public safety committees who were receptive to ACJC's legislative proposals.

Mr. LeFevre stated several stakeholder groups have been contacted that include the National Rifle Association (NRA) on the NICS bills and the Hospital and Healthcare Providers Association on what the impact on a victim's protection bill would look like for their system monetarily. Staff anticipates having sponsorships and committee assignments to start working on the process. Mr. LeFevre reported from the NICS task force meeting; the NICS through automatic transmission went online January 1, 2015 successfully.

The Executive Director's report was presented for informational purposes and did not require Commission action.

#### IV. Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program

#### A. FY 2016 Grant Program Funding Level

Larry Grubbs, Program Manager presented the recommendation from the Crime Victims Committee to set the program funding level for the FY16 Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program at \$1,570,000.

Mr. Grubbs reported that based on the revenue projections, the proposal increases the program funding level by \$320,000 to \$1,570,000 for FY16. The Commission was referred to the chart listed on page 12 of the agenda that reflects the financial status of the Crime Victim Compensation and Assistance Fund.

Mr. Grubbs explained the increased funding level is contingent upon legislative approval. The \$320,000 increase was submitted to the Governor as a budget issue for FY16, requesting an increase to the total appropriation from the Crime Victim Compensation and Assistance Fund by that amount. There will be opportunities to revisit the Crime Victim Assistance program size at subsequent meetings in March or May depending on when the legislature finalizes the FY16 budget.

Chairperson Montgomery asked the rationale for increasing the program size amount for the budget request. Mr. Grubbs stated one of the factors was to demonstrate the need to utilize the funds for statutory intent and the availability of the funding gives the Crime Victim Assistance Program the opportunity to serve additional victims of crime.

Commissioner Daniel Sharp entered a motion that the Commission approve the funding level for the Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program for FY16 be set at \$1,570,000. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Timothy Dorn and was unanimously approved by the Commission.

#### B. Grant Program Emerging Issue Funding Priority

Larry Grubbs, Program Manager stated that at the November 2011 meeting, the Commission approved the Emerging Issue Funding Priority as a means to fund programs providing services that address an emerging victim issue or an underserved victim population.

Mr. Grubbs presented the recommendation from the Crime Victims Committee that up to \$100,000 of the total program size for the FY16 Crime Victim Assistance Grant program be available to fund programs providing direct services to victims of human trafficking. During FY14, grantees currently funded by the victim assistance grant program reported serving over 97,000 victims of crime; of that number 168 were identified as victims of human trafficking. ACJC does not currently fund a program for victims of human trafficking as a program's primary beneficiary. This particular population has received additional attention due to the Super Bowl and former Governor Brewer's establishment of the Arizona Human Trafficking Council.

Mr. Grubbs referenced an Associated Press article published in December highlighting that nationally states have already implemented statutory changes that increased protections for human trafficking victims and increased penalties for offenders; however, the funding for these initiatives often lags behind the statutory changes. In that same article, Arizona was highlighted as one of the states that has implemented statutory changes related to human trafficking in April 2014, although funding has yet to follow.

Mr. Grubbs explained the funding priority that was established in 2011 by the Commission gives the crime victim assistance grant program the opportunity to respond quickly when emerging populations or issues are identified. Any funds that are not utilized under the human trafficking purpose area would revert back to the larger general victim assistance pool of funding for FY16. Applicants would be allowed to submit proposals under both general victim assistance and human trafficking purpose areas. The same program activities eligible under the general victim assistance grant program would also be eligible under the human trafficking purpose area the Commission may choose to prioritize the unique needs of victims of human trafficking.

Mr. Grubbs stated that contingent upon the legislative budget process, if the crime victim assistance grant program is funded at a different amount than anticipated, staff would bring the issue back to the Commission to review the program size and emerging issue priority.

Commissioner Sheila Polk agreed with the proposal. However, she stated that human trafficking cases in general that originate in another country and whether they are brought here for sex or labor, they would qualify as a human trafficking case.

The Commission also asked what impact the funds will have on other programs. Mr. Grubbs stated this would minimally impact current grantees and potential applicants that may not fall under this initiative.

Commissioner Daniel Sharp entered a motion that the Commission approve up to \$100,000 of the total program size for the FY16 Crime Victim Assistance Grant program be used to fund programs providing direct services to victims of human trafficking. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Timothy Dorn and was unanimously approved by the Commission.

#### V. Standard Violation Code Table Project

Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) presented the results of the Standard Violation Code Table. The Standard Violations Code Workgroup was formed because of inconsistencies between violation code tables that had been an obstacle and caused difficulty in matching charges and dispositions. The workgroup also reviewed A.R.S. violation codes and established a standard set for publication which can be used by all court and /or law enforcement management systems for charging defendants. The workgroup consisted of members from AOC, ACJC, Arizona Prosecuting Attorneys Advisory Council (APAAC) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT).

Mr. Reinkensmeyer addressed the impact of incomplete records that includes a risk to public safety and convicted persons having no criminal record. In Arizona, there are 116 citing law enforcement agencies that do not use all the same codes. ACJC maintains a high level table of criminal violations for DPS and the prosecutors at all levels have their own variation of the tables, many which may not be in court databases. There are also 10 court case management system with various sets of charge codes.

The AOC is committed to maintaining the comprehensive literal table for all offenses and all levels of offenses (civil, criminal and traffic) for agencies to use in their record management and case management systems and will provide updates after each legislative session. ACJC will continue to maintain the literal tables for criminal offenses, especially for fingerprint reporting and local violation codes for DPS, Arizona Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AZAFIS) and AZ Computerized Criminal History (ACCH) Systems.

Mr. Reinkensmeyer explained the Standard Violation Code Table is presented as a reference document and will be maintained by AOC under the direction of the multi-agency workgroup. The table will also include historical and current codes for felonies, misdemeanors, petty offenses and civil traffic violations. The benefits of the state-wide table consists of improved conviction and disposition reporting, meaningful statewide statistical reports, and improved identification requirements for information sharing projects.

This agenda item was presented for informational purposes and did not require Commission action.

#### VI. AZ Prescription Drug Misuse and Abuse Initiative

Phil Stevenson, Director, Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) reported on the review of the impact and outcome evaluation findings from the Arizona Prescription Drug Misuse and Abuse Initiative as well as the research brief series.

The first strategy of the Rx Initiative was to reduce illicit acquisition and diversion of prescription drugs. The results were 117 prescription drop boxes statewide collecting more than 15,000 pounds of unused and unneeded medications, and an increase in knowledge statewide of proper storage of prescription medications at 64.7 percent. The second strategy included a focus on increasing the use of Arizona's controlled substance and monitoring program (PDMP) as an effective tool that medical practitioners can use to improve patient care and self-monitor their prescribing habits. The third strategy includes the involvement of law enforcement and prescription drug diversion crime training to enhance prescription drug practice and policies in law enforcement. The fourth strategy emphasizes educating the public on the prescription problem, the risks of prescription medications, and tools on how to talk to youth on prescription misuse and abuse, as well as effective resistance strategies. The fifth strategy is the treatment component of the initiative. This covers the promotion of the Screening Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) as a screening tool for medical professionals to assess their patients; and create a substance abuse treatment locator.

Mr. Stevenson reviewed the decreases in past 30 day prescription drug use from youth in non-pilot counties and pilot counties. There was a larger decrease in two of the three pilot sites. There were also decreases in youth reporting prescription and alcohol use in Non-Pilot Counties, Yavapai County, Pinal County and Graham/Greenlee Counties. Finally, there were decreases in non-fatal poisoning related inpatient hospitalizations in non-pilot counties and pilot counties; however, there was a larger decrease in the pilot sites. There were increases in opiate/opioid related deaths in Non-Pilot Counties but a decrease in the pilot counties by one-fourth.

Mr. Stevenson talked about lessons learned and the next steps for improvement to the initiative. Some of the improvements consist of enhancements to the prescription drug monitoring program such as the morphine milligram equivalent daily dose data, referral to treatment methods, the need for earlier prevention strategies, and monitoring unintended consequences of opioid drug usage to heroin use.

Mr. Stevenson concluded the presentation with information on the SAC research briefs with the emphasis on collecting, maintaining and sharing criminal justice data for our stakeholders. The SAC briefs are broken down by Arizona Youth Survey (AYS) data that includes the AYS Overview, Youth Marijuana, Under-age Drinking, Prescription Drugs and Youth Bullying. The other project briefs consist of Arizona's Prescription Drug Initiative, Trends in Violent Crime, Trends in Property Crime, and Gang Threat Assessment.

Commissioner Sheila Polk acknowledged the projects and the quality of work that the SAC unit produces and provides for the Commissioners. Mr. Stevenson was thanked for all the impeccable results on the data provided as well as his leadership.

This agenda item was for informational purposes and did not require Commission action.

#### VII. Call to the Public

Chairperson Montgomery made a call to the public. Vice Chairperson David Byers informed the Commissioners that a rule change petition was filed this week to move forward the Warrants Project and urged that comments can be taken through March, 2015. No other members of the audience addressed the Commission.

#### VIII. Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting

The next Arizona Criminal Justice Commission meeting will be held on **Thursday**, **March 19**, **2015** at the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, 1110 W. Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

#### IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. Blackburn, Jr. Executive Director

Audio recording is available upon request.

III-A

# ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Action Requested:		Type of Action Requested:	Subject:				
May 21, 2	015	☐ Formal Action/Motion ☐ Information Only ☐ Other	Executive Director's Report				
TO:	Chairperson and C	ommission Members					
FROM:	ROM: John A. Blackburn, Jr. Executive Director						
RECOM	RECOMMENDATION:						
Informa	Information Only						
DISCUS	SSION:						
Executiv	e Director Blackbur	n will update the Commission on the sta	ff and program activities.				
FISCAL	IMPACT:						
N/A							
ALTERN	NATIVES:						
N/A							

III-B

# ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:				
May 21, 2015	<ul><li>☐ Formal Action/Motion</li><li>☐ Information Only</li><li>☐ Other</li></ul>	Executive Director's Report				
TO: Chairperson and C	Commission Members					
	FROM: John A. Blackburn, Jr. Executive Director					
RECOMMENDATION:						
Information Only						
DISCUSSION:						
Executive Director Blackbur	n will update the Commission on the sta	ate and federal budget.				
FISCAL IMPACT:						
N/A						
ALTERNATIVES:						
N/A						

III-C

# ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Action Requested:		Type of Action Requested:	Subject:			
May 21, 2	2015	<ul><li>☐ Formal Action/Motion</li><li>☐ Information Only</li><li>☐ Other</li></ul>	Executive Director's Report			
TO:	Chairperson and C	Commission Members				
FROM:	FROM: John A. Blackburn, Jr. Executive Director					
RECOM	MENDATION:					
Informa	tion Only					
DISCUS	SSION:					
Executiv	Executive Director Blackburn will update the Commission on legislative issues.					
FISCAL	IMPACT:					
N/A						
ALTERN	NATIVES:					
N/A						



# ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Action Requested:		Type of Action Requested:	Subject:	
May 21, 2	015	☐ Formal Action/Motion ☐ Information Only ☐ Other	Executive Director's Report	
TO:	Chairperson and C	ommission Members		
FROM: John A. Blackburn, Jr. Executive Director				
RECOM	MENDATION:			
Informat	tion Only			
DISCUS	SSION:			
Executiv	e Director Blackburr	n will update the Commission on the I	DEA audit.	
FISCAL	IMPACT:			
N/A				
ALTERN	IATIVES:			
N/A				

IV-A

#### ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

#### **Request for Commission Action**

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2015	<ul><li>☐ Formal Action/Motion</li><li>☐ Information Only</li><li>☐ Other</li></ul>	FY15 Crime Victim Compensation Funding Reallocation

**TO:** Chairperson and Commission Members

FROM: Larry Grubbs, Program Manager

Crime Victims Services

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission approve compensation funds for the current FY15 be reallocated to operational units in accordance with Table VS-1 of the agenda using the fund sources identified.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

ACJC crime victim compensation program staff closely monitors county victim compensation expenditures throughout the fiscal year. Periodically it is necessary to adjust the original allocation to meet demand for compensation benefits statewide. The purpose of these adjustments is to reallocate compensation funding to those counties with enough demand to expend additional compensation funds by the end of the fiscal year.

The Crime Victims Committee will meet and make a recommendation to the Commission.

#### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Significant – Reallocation of up to \$115,000 in FY 2015 crime victim compensation funds to county programs.

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

**TABLE VS-1** 

	CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATION PROGRAM  FY 2015 PROPOSED CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATION REALLOCATION										
COUNTY	REQUESTED AMOUNT	ORIGINAL FY15 ALLOCATION*	EXPENDITURES REIMBURSED AS OF 4/25/15*	PERCENTAGE EXPENDED AS OF 4/25/15	RESTITUTION / SUBROGATION BALANCE	12 MONTH EXPENDITURE RESERVE*	RESERVE OVERAGE >\$1,500	ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENT	REVISED REMAINING ALLOCATION	REVISED TOTAL ALLOCATION	CALENDAR YEAR 2014 TOTAL EXPENDITURES*
APACHE	\$ -	\$ 65,778	\$ 38,691	58.82%	\$ 51,757	\$ 43,303	\$ 8,454	\$ -	\$ 27,087	\$ 65,778	\$ 38,604
COCHISE COCONINO	-	81,475 130,134	5,500 75,578	6.75% 58.08%	60,211 122,938	51,256 169,402	8,955	(40,000)	35,975 54,556	41,475 130,134	34,384 109,484
GILA GRAHAM		70,477 47,504	5,224 7,220	7.41% 15.20%	69,323 27,209	57,317 27,652	12,006	-	65,253 40,284	70,477 47,504	40,355 13,186
GREENLEE LA PAZ	-	33,766 47,852	9,194 4,259	27.23% 8.90%	11,230 22,196	14,858 35,617	-	-	24,572 43,593	33,766 47,852	3,337 38,341
MARICOPA MOHAVE	115,000 -	1,964,525 169,880	1,526,966 93,349	77.73% 54.95%	1,376,131 58,904	1,734,962 195,711	-	115,000	552,559 76,531	2,079,525 169,880	2,030,295 112,122
NAVAJO PIMA	-	91,610 657,581	30,105 378,311	32.86% 57.53%	113,124 323,415	92,504 646,850	20,619	(75,000)	61,505 204,270	91,610 582,581	73,099 637,663
PINAL SANTA CRUZ	-	182,981 47,232	86,820 16,077	47.45% 34.04%	167,246 26,041	133,869 37,719	33,377	-	96,161 31,155	182,981 47,232	183,848 19,414
YAVAPAI YUMA	-	146,863 154,842	90,526 81,478	61.64% 52.62%	184,755 130,025	177,964 145,555	6,790	-	56,337 73,364	146,863 154,842	130,248 229,616
TOTAL	\$ 115,000	\$ 3,892,500	\$ 2,449,299	62.92%	\$ 2,744,506	\$ 3,564,540	\$ 90,203	\$ -	\$ 1,443,201	\$ 3,892,500	\$ 3,693,994
*includes admir	nistrative expend	ditures									

IV-B

#### ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

#### **Request for Commission Action**

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2015	Formal Action/Motion Information Only Other	FY16 Crime Victim Compensation State & Federal Funding Amount

**TO:** Chairperson and Commission Members

FROM: Larry Grubbs, Program Manager

Crime Victims Services

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission approve the total state and federal allocated funding for the FY16 Crime Victim Compensation Program be set at \$3,943,600, and expended in accordance with the budget in Table VS-2 of the agenda.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Based on prior year expenditures, state revenue projections, the approved total legislative appropriation for FY16, and available federal funds, staff proposes the total program allocation be set at \$3,943,600 with expenditures made in accordance with the attached budget. The total program size includes \$2,543,600 in state compensation funds and \$1,400,000 in federal VOCA compensation funds.

The Crime Victims Committee will meet and make a recommendation to the Commission.

#### FISCAL IMPACT:

Significant – Expenditure of \$3,943,600 in state and federal Crime Victim Compensation funds for FY16.

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

**TABLE VS-2** 

CRI	ME VIC	TIM CON	MPENSAT	TION PRO	GRAM
	P				
	1	10010	AM BUDG	<b>/</b> _	
State Co	ompensati	on			
	_		FY14	FY15	FY16
	Beginning	Balance	2,560,665	2,753,767	2,473,867
	-3	Revenue	2,551,700	2,367,300	2,385,800
	Adm Adj	/Reversion	-	, ,	,
			5,112,365	5,121,067	4,859,667
	Expenditu	ıre Plan			
	State	e Allocation	2,257,545	2,542,500	2,543,600
		Admin	101,053	104,700	104,700
			2,358,598	2,647,200	2,648,300
	Ending Ba	alance	2,753,767	2,473,867	2,211,367
Endaral	VOCA Co	mnonootio	•		
reuerai	VOCACO	mpensation			
			FY14	FY15	FY16
	Beginning	Balance	-		
	Revenue				
		2010 grant			
		2011 grant	573,400		
		2012 grant	694,450		
		2013 grant	130,621	828,879	
		2014 grant		571,121	280,079
	201	5 grant est			1,119,921
			1,398,471	1,400,000	1,400,000
	Expenditu		1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	Expenditu Ending Ba		1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	-		1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	-		1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	-		-	-	-
	-		1,400,000 - FY14	1,400,000 - FY15	1,400,000 - FY16

IV-C

#### ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

#### **Request for Commission Action**

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2015	Formal Action/Motion Information Only Other	FY16 Designation of Victim Compensation Operational Units

**TO:** Chairperson and Commission Members

FROM: Larry Grubbs, Program Manager

Crime Victims Services

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission approve the designation of the 15 County Attorney's Offices as operational units for the FY16 Crime Victim Compensation Program.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The Commission is required to annually designate one operational unit (OU) for each county, to receive an allocation from state and/or federal compensation fund sources, and to administer the Crime Victim Compensation Program for that county. In accordance with compensation program rule R10-4-104(A) all 15 County Attorney's Offices submitted a request in writing to be designated operational units for FY16. Staff proposes continuing the current designation of the County Attorney's Offices as operational units for FY16.

The Crime Victims Committee will meet and make a recommendation to the Commission.

#### FISCAL IMPACT:

Significant – Administration of \$3,943,600 in Crime Victim Compensation funds for FY16.

#### ALTERNATIVES:

IV-D

#### ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

#### **Request for Commission Action**

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2015	Formal Action/Motion Information Only Other	FY16 Operational Unit State & Federal Funding Allocation

**TO:** Chairperson and Commission Members

FROM: Larry Grubbs, Program Manager

Crime Victims Services

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission approve the allocation of \$3,943,600 in state and federal crime victim compensation funds, as proposed in Table VS-3 of the agenda, to operational units (OU) for the FY16 Crime Victim Compensation Program.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Table VS-3 reflects the dollar amounts proposed for allocation to each operational unit for the 15 counties. The allocation formula approved at the March 2013 Commission meeting includes the following process steps:

- \$50,000 of the state funds retained in emergency reserve (R10-4-102.D);
- Five percent of most recent federal VOCA award allocated to ACJC for administrative costs;
- Fixed administrative allocation of state funds to each OU (R10-4-102.I);
- A base allotment of \$25,000 to each OU (R10-4-102.C.1);
- A 60% reimbursement to OUs spending other local funds on compensation benefits during the previous fiscal year (R10-4-102.H);
- The remaining balance is distributed as follows:
  - 50% based on prior years' program benefit expenditure average (R10-4-102.C.2);
  - 30% based on average share of crime (R10-4-102.C.4);
  - 20% based on population (R10-4-102.C.3).

The Crime Victims Committee will meet and make a recommendation to the Commission.

#### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Significant – Distribution of \$3,943,600 in Crime Victim Compensation funds to county compensation programs in FY16.

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

**TABLE VS-3** 

# CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATION PROGRAM FY 2016 CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATION ALLOCATION \$3,943,600 TOTAL STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING

COUNTY	FIXED ADMIN. ALLOCATION	AVAILABLE FOR COMP BENEFITS	FINAL ALLOCATION TOTAL	% OF TOTAL ALLOCATION	3 YR AVG TOTAL EXPENDITURES <sup>+</sup>
APACHE	\$ 7,920	\$ 56,240	\$ 64,160	1.65%	\$ 63,800
COCHISE	11,400	63,106	74,506	1.91%	42,244
COCONINO	12,540	118,846	131,386	3.37%	164,665
GILA	5,900	61,519	67,419	1.73%	65,997
GRAHAM	4,600	42,663	47,263	1.21%	36,045
GREENLEE	2,600	29,310	31,910	0.82%	9,466
LA PAZ	3,850	43,697	47,547	1.22%	37,278
MARICOPA	281,380	1,715,438	1,996,818	51.28%	2,080,469
MOHAVE	16,500	144,422	160,922	4.13%	197,958
NAVAJO	10,780	79,626	90,406	2.32%	93,524
PIMA	76,010	570,278	646,288	16.60%	703,845
PINAL	19,580	170,926	190,506	4.89%	183,364
SANTA CRUZ	5,610	42,443	48,053	1.23%	28,788
YAVAPAI	17,820	120,683	138,503	3.56%	153,145
YUMA	16,610	141,303	157,913	4.06%	197,234
TOTAL	\$ 493,100	\$ 3,400,500	\$ 3,893,600	100.00%	\$ 4,057,822
		RECOMMENDED FUNDING	LESS ACJC VOCA ADMIN*	LESS STATE RESERVE**	PROGRM ALLOCATION
STATE COMPEN	NSATION FUNDS	\$ 2,543,600	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,493,600
FEDERAL COMPE	ENSATION FUNDS	1,444,800	44,800	-	1,400,000
*ACJC admin equals 5%	*ACJC admin equals 5% of FFY2014 VOCA award			TOTAL	\$ 3,893,600

\*\*\$50,000 held in reserve as required by Program Rule R10-4-102.D

+Source for County Expenditure Activity: ACJC Quarterly Compensation Activity Reports (1-1-2012 to 12-31-2014)

<sup>18</sup> 

V

#### ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

#### **Request for Commission Action**

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2015	<ul><li>☐ Formal Action/Motion</li><li>☐ Information Only</li><li>☐ Other</li></ul>	FY16 Crime Victim Assistance Grant Awards

**TO:** Chairperson and Commission Members

FROM: Larry Grubbs, Program Manager

Crime Victims Services

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission approve the awarding of FY16 Crime Victim Assistance grant funds as indicated in Table VS-4 of the agenda; with \$656,294 awarded to Commission membership eligible applicants, and \$787,906 awarded to all other applicants.

#### DISCUSSION:

A.R.S. § 41-2407 (B) states that no more than 50% of Crime Victim Assistance Grant Funds can be allocated to criminal justice government agencies eligible to serve as a member of the Commission. These agencies are specified in A.R.S. § 41-2404 (A) and (B). The maximum amount available for distribution to the eighteen applicants in this category is \$722,100 for FY16.

The funding proposal in Table VS-4 reflects the evaluation criteria and priorities approved by the Commission. A narrative is provided following this agenda item detailing the victim assistance grant program, the evaluation process, and proposed funding for FY16.

The Crime Victims Committee will meet and make a recommendation to the Commission.

#### FISCAL IMPACT:

Significant – Distribution of up to \$1,444,200 in Crime Victim Assistance grant funds to approved agencies for FY16.

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

# Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program FY 2016 Funding Recommendation

The Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program is established to provide grant awards to support direct services to crime victims in the State of Arizona. At the January 2015 meeting, the Commission approved a program size up to \$1,570,000 in victim assistance grant awards for FY16.

This program size was contingent upon Legislative approval of a budget issue submitted for FY16 requesting an increase of \$320,000 to the total annual appropriation for the Crime Victim Compensation and Assistance Fund. The Legislative budget request was not approved, resulting in the reduced victim assistance funding recommendation presented in table VS-4. However, the total recommended funding level of \$1,444,200 for FY16 represents a \$194,200 total increase over the FY15 program size.

#### **Applications Received**

On February 2, 2015, the FY16 Crime Victim Assistance Program grant application period opened. The deadline for submission of applications was Friday, March 13, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. Fifty-three applications were submitted by the deadline, requesting a total of \$2,233,737. The total amount of funds requested exceeding the program size approved by the Commission.

#### **Evaluation and Scoring**

Grant applications were evaluated pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-2702. All applications received were reviewed and scored by three individuals including ACJC staff and outside evaluators. Scoring was based on the Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program rules, criteria, and priorities approved by the Commission. Financial audit documentation submitted by applicants was reviewed by ACJC financial compliance staff to help determine an applicant agency's capacity to administer an award.

#### **Funding Priorities**

In November 2011 the Commission approved the following as funding priorities for the Crime Victim Assistance Grant Program:

	Crime Victim Assistance Funding Priorities
1	Continue funding from one grant period to the next for programs with a strong performance history, who meet the application requirements.
2	Funding programs that demonstrate a strong collaborative effort with law enforcement, prosecution, service providers, community organizations, and other social service agencies.
3	Funding programs that provide multiple service types to a diverse range of victimization types.
4	Funding programs that demonstrate strong support of established goals and objectives and clearly identify how the success of the program will be measured.
5	Funding at least one program in each county in the State provided that the program meets eligibility requirements and the minimum required application score.
6	Funding programs operating in counties with the highest crime per capita rate based on the latest Uniform Crime Report.

- 7 Funding programs that demonstrate a strong component of assisting crime victims in filing victim compensation claims.
- 8 Annually providing \$25,000 directly to the Arizona Victim Assistance Academy.
- 9 Funding programs providing services to address an emerging victim issue, or to an underserved victim population, as designated annually by the ACJC.\*

#### FY 2016 Funding Recommendation

Forty-seven victim service projects are currently funded for FY15. The FY16 funding allocation recommends continued funding for all forty-seven current grantees. Twenty-two of the forty-seven current grantees are recommended for FY16 awards greater than their FY15 grant amount. Additionally, the recommendation includes funding for four agencies providing victim service projects not funded during the current grant period. Those agencies include the following: City of Surprise (Prosecutor), City of El Mirage (Police), Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation, and Tohdenasshai Committee Against Family Abuse. Total recommended funding for all projects during FY16 is \$1,444,200.

For applications recommended for funding, all associated budget requests were analyzed by staff. Funding allocations were made based on the needs of the applicant program, and how funding increased the ability of the ACJC Victim Assistance Grant Program to meet the established priorities. In addition to the funding priorities, the following guidelines were used by staff to develop the funding recommendation:

- Fund personnel services and ERE before considering any other budget category;
- Prioritize funding for positions providing direct services to victims of crime;
- Fund one position and the associated ERE at costs reported by the applicant agency;
- Allocate no more than \$722,100 to applicant agencies eligible to serve as members of the ACJC (A.R.S. § 41-2407.B).

Two additional grant requests submitted for FY16 were not recommended for funding. Those applicant agencies are Sojourner Center (DV and Human Trafficking) and Our Family Services, Inc. Score team members unanimously agreed that both of these agencies submitted applications lacking critical detail regarding project evaluation methods and how services provided could meet the unique needs of victims of human trafficking. Because of this there are no projects submitted under the human trafficking special purpose area recommended for funding during FY16.

Table VS-4 displays the staff recommendation for funding allocations to all applicant agencies. The table summarizes the FY15 grant awards, FY16 grant requests, and proposed FY16 awards for all applicants.

<sup>\*</sup> At the January 2015 meeting, the Commission designated programs providing direct services to victims of human trafficking as a funding priority for FY16.

TABLE VS-4 FY16 CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE GRANT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

	RECOMMENDATION									
Comm.		F١	15 Grant	F	Y16 Grant		16 Proposed			
Eligible	APPLICANT AGENCY		Awards		Request		ant Awards			
	A New Leaf, Inc.	\$	41,600	\$	70,304	\$	41,600			
	Against Abuse, Inc.		21,500		27,075		21,500			
	Ama Doo Alchini Bighan, Inc. (ADABI)		13,253		25,774		18,825			
*	Apache County Attorney's Office		23,339		40,954		23,339			
*	Arizona Attorney General's Office		57,237		115,037		57,237			
	Arizona Coalition for Victim Services		25,000		25,169		25,000			
	Arizona's Children Association		12,898		13,383		13,382			
	AZ Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence		18,742		50,161		26,886			
	Bullhead City Attorney's Office		15,217		16,249		15,217			
	Casa Grande City Attorney's Office		19,785		42,485		25,491			
*	Chandler Police Department		19,524		20,168		20,168			
	Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc.		17,338		22,400		22,400			
	Childhelp		12,308		15,480		15,480			
	Chrysalis Shelter For Victims of Domestic Violence		17,000		18,000		17,999			
*	City of Maricopa (Police Department)		20,000		26,282		26,282			
	City of Surprise (Prosecutor)		-		43,407		28,938			
*	Cochise County Attorney's Office		21,044		41,286		21,044			
	Colorado River Regional Crisis Shelter, Inc.		21,353		32,850		21,353			
*	El Mirage Police Department		-		32,491		32,491			
	Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse		46,100		94,043		46,100			
	EMPACT-Suicide Prevention Center		22,662		23,496		23,496			
*	Gila County Attorney's Office		17,600		25,046		17,600			
*	Graham County Attorney's Office		22,362		47,370		29,677			
*	Greenlee County Attorney's Office		13,894		8,337		8,337			
	Haven Family Resource Center		15,673		30,426		15,673			
	Homicide Survivors, Inc.		28,700		33,841		28,700			
	Jewish Family and Children's Service		15,629		16,410		16,410			
	Kingman Aid To Abused People, Inc.		11,600		16,800		16,800			
*	La Paz County Attorney's Office		24,959		41,946		24,959			
*	Maricopa County Attorney's Office		104,400		143,416		104,400			
	Mesa City Prosecutor's Office		24,500		45,003		24,500			
*	Mohave County Attorney's Office		28,447		46,055		28,447			
	Mt. Graham Safe House, Inc.		15,375		43,564		21,783			
*	Navajo County Attorney's Office		32,295		67,502		32,295			
	Northland Family Help Center		20,000		29,999		20,000			
	Our Family Services, Inc.				27,255					
*	Peoria Police Department		17,913		54,195		29,550			
	Phoenix City Fire Department		17,568		35,134		17,568			
	Phoenix City Prosecutor's Office		32,420		32,420		32,420			
*	Pima County Attorney's Office		106,900		169,289		106,900			
*	Pinal County Attorney's Office		27,445		28,600		28,599			
*	Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office		20,216		49,357		23,750			
	Sojourner Center (DV Shelter)		21,600		32,858		21,600			
	Sojourner Center (DV & Human Trafficking)				41,232					
	Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation		-		44,466		19,934			
	Southern Arizona Center Against Sexual Assault		25,638		38,262		32,632			
	Southern Arizona Children's Advocacy Center		21,158		26,659		24,068			
	Tempe City Social Services - Care 7		27,349		70,425		35,212			
	Time Out, Inc.		16,120		19,760		16,120			
	Tohdenasshai Committee Against Family Abuse		10,120		58,253		18,676			
	Verde Valley Sanctuary		25,831		32,143		32,143			
	Victim/Witness Services For Coconino County		30,000		40,000		30,000			
*	Yuma County Attorney's Office		38,508		41,220		41,219			
	TOTAL	\$	1,250,000	\$	2,233,737	\$	1,444,200			
	IVIAL	Ψ	1,230,000	Ψ	4,233,131	Ψ.	1,444,200			

TABLE VS-5 F	TABLE VS-5 FY16 CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE FUNDING SUMMARY									
Funding Distribution by	Number of	% of	\$ Amount	% of \$						
Victimization Type	Awards	Awards	Awarded	Awarded						
Child Abuse	3	6%	52,930	4%						
Domestic Violence	17	33%	395,868	27%						
Human Trafficking	0	0%	0	0%						
Multiple Victimization Types	27	53%	890,640	62%						
Other Specialized	3	6%	72,130	5%						
Sexual Assault	1	2%	32,632	2%						
TOTAL	51	100%	\$1,444,200	100%						
Funding Distribution by	Number of	% of	\$ Amount	% of \$						
Primary Service Area	Awards	Awards	Awarded	Awarded						
State Wide	3	6%	109,123	8%						
Apache County	2	4%	42,164	3%						
Cochise County	1	2%	21,044	1%						
Coconino County	2	4%	50,000	3%						
Gila County	2	4%	33,720	2%						
Graham County	2	4%	51,460	4%						
Greenlee County	1	2%	8,337	1%						
La Paz County	2	4%	46,312	3%						
Maricopa County	16	31%	487,018	34%						
Mohave County	4	8%	76,137	5%						
Navajo County	2	4%	50,971	4%						
Pima County	9	18%	320,703	22%						
Pinal County	2	4%	50,099	3%						
Santa Cruz County	1	2%	23,750	2%						
Yavapai County	1	2%	32,143	2%						
Yuma County	1	2%	41,219	3%						
TOTAL	51	100%	\$1,444,200	100%						
Funding Distribution by	Number of	% of	\$ Amount	% of \$						
Commission Eligibility	Awards	Awards	Awarded	Awarded						
Commission Fligible	18	35%	\$ 656,294	45%						

Funding Distribution by Commission Eligibility	Number of Awards	% of Awards	\$ Amount Awarded	% of \$ Awarded
Commission Eligible	18	35%	\$ 656,294	45%
Non-Profit / Other Gov't	33	65%	\$ 787,906	55%
TOTAL	51	100%	\$ 1,444,200	100%

VI

#### ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

#### **Request for Commission Action**

Action Requested:	Type of Action Requested:	Subject:
May 21, 2015	Formal Action/Motion Information Only Other	Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program Cycle 29 Grant Awards

**TO:** Chairperson and Commission Members

FROM: Tony Vidale, Program Manager

Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission approve the award of the Arizona Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Cycle 29 grant funds to eligible criminal justice agencies for the period beginning July 1, 2015 and ending June 30, 2016, except the Attorney General's Office Medicaid Fraud project, which will be funded from October 1, 2015 and end September 30, 2016.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

See attached

The Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Committee will meet and make a recommendation to the Commission.

#### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Significant to recipient agencies

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

#### **Program Background**

The Drug, Gang, and Violent Crime Control Program (DC) allows state, county, local and tribal governments to support activities that combat drugs, gangs, and violent crime. The DC program provides funding to support the components of a statewide, system-wide enhanced drug, gang, and violent crime control program as stated in the *2012-2015 Arizona Drug, Gang, and Violent Crime Control Strategy*. The strategy includes the following two goals for the foundation and direction of the program:

- Curtail the flow of illicit drugs, drug proceeds and instruments used to perpetuate violence across Arizona.
- Reduce violent crime and illicit drug use and deter repeat offenders in Arizona.

The strategy also outlines purpose areas as a guide to funding projects meant to address the drug, gang, and violent crime problem in the state. These purpose areas are as follows:

- Apprehension
- Prosecution
- Forensic Support Services
- Adjudication & Sentencing
- Corrections & Community Corrections
- Substance Abuse Treatment for Corrections-Involved Individuals
- Prevention and Education

In FY 2015, grant awards were made in the amount of \$10.3 million. These funds were awarded to projects addressing apprehension of drug offenders, prosecution of drug offenses, statewide forfeiture activities, forensic support of task forces, and drug adjudication projects. Table *DC 1* on page 28 shows a summary of the FY 2015 grant awards, the FY 2016 grant requests made by applicants, and the FY 2016 proposed projects.

#### Funding

The program is supported by several funding streams to successfully carry out the statewide strategy. The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne/JAG) funds awarded to Arizona by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (DOJ/BJA) continue to support program activities along with state Drug and Gang Enforcement Account (DEA) funds established under A.R.S. §41-2402, and matching funds when approved by the Commission. At its January 2014 meeting, the Commission approved implementing a match requirement of 25 percent in response to reductions in overall program revenue.

In FY 2015, \$10.3 million was allocated to grant projects. This amount was comprised of \$3.4 million in Byrne/JAG funds, \$4.3 million in DEA funds, and \$2.6 million in matching funds.

For FY 2016, staff is proposing a program size of \$10,305,097. Of this amount, \$3,528,837 is from the federal Byrne/JAG grant, \$4,224,663 is from the state DEA fund, and \$2,551,597 is from matching funds. The FY 2016 program size represents a decrease of \$2,100 from the FY 2015 program size. The decrease is due to one grantee requesting less funds for FY 2016 than were approved the previous year. Table *DC 2* summarizes the change in program size, by fund source, for FY 2015 and FY 2016 recommended.

DC 2	<i>DC 2</i> Program Size FY 2015 – FY 2016									
	FY 2015	FY 2016 (Recommended)	Change							
Program Size	\$ 10,307,197	\$ 10,305,097	\$ (2,100)							
Fund Source:										
Byrne/JAG	\$ 3,421,339	\$ 3,528,837	\$ 107,498							
DEA Fund	\$ 4,334,261	\$ 4,224,663	\$ (109,598)							
Match Funds	\$ 2,551,597	\$ 2,551,597	\$ 0							
Total	\$ 10,307,197	\$ 10,305,097	\$ (2,100)							

#### **Applications Received**

The solicitation for the Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control Program opened February 23, 2015 and closed March 20, 2015. Thirty-six applications were received requesting a total of \$14,580,542. Of the 36 applications, 14 were apprehension projects (Tier 1), 17 were prosecution projects (Tier 1), one was a statewide forfeiture project (Tier 1), two were forensic support projects (Tier 2), one was a drug adjudication project (Tier 2) and one was a corrections project (Tier 2). Table *DC 3* on page 29 displays the grant request for each eligible applicant broken out by priority area and expenditure type.

#### **Evaluation and Scoring**

Eligible applications were reviewed by an evaluation team consisting of ACJC staff. The projects were scored based on the criteria published in the solicitation with an emphasis on the goals of the statewide strategy. In addition, the solicitation emphasized that personnel expenditures would be prioritized in the budget recommendation allocation.

#### Recommendation

Staff recommends the funding allocation according to Table *DC 4* on page 30. Under the proposal, \$3,439,148 would be allocated to tier one apprehension projects, \$3,817,760 for tier one prosecution projects, \$869,400 for a tier one statewide forfeiture project, \$503,343 for tier two forensic support projects and \$1,677,546 for tier two drug adjudication projects. The total grant project amount is comprised of \$7,755,600 in grant funds and \$2,551,597 in match funds. All of the funding would support personnel costs for grant projects, allocating \$6,970,882 in personal services, \$2,959,614 in employee related expenditures, and \$376,701 in overtime expenditures.

For applicants scored as eligible, all expenditure types were analyzed by staff and allocated based on the needs and best interests of the grant program in meeting the statewide strategy. The following guidelines were used by staff to build the recommendation:

- Prioritize previously funded projects that demonstrate effectiveness.
- Maintain as much balance funding as possible between tier one apprehension and prosecution projects.
- Fund at least one tier one apprehension project and prosecution project in each county.
- Provide some level of funding to tier two projects impacted by apprehension and prosecution activities.
- Prioritize funding core operations positions. Core operations positions are those considered most critical in meeting the purposes of the strategy (i.e. task force officers, attorneys, criminalists).

- Fund a position and the associated ERE at the current costs as reported by the agency in the application.
- As a priority, fund personal services, ERE, and overtime before considering any other budget category.
- Avoid funding multiple support-type positions for any project until core position needs are met.

The recommendation for the Attorney General's Office Medicaid Fraud project would require the grant period to run from October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016. This project would provide matching funds for a federal grant and the grant period needs to run concurrent to the federal fiscal year. All other projects would have a grant period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

The recommendation would comply with the provision in A.R.S. § 41-2402 that limits distribution of monies in the Drug and Gang Enforcement Accounts up to 50 percent for law enforcement agencies, up to 50 percent for prosecution programs/agencies, up to 30 percent for court programs/agencies, up to 30 percent for corrections agencies, and up to 30 percent for criminal justice records integration.

Table *DC 5* on page 31 shows the FY 2015 awards and the FY 2016 recommended awards, broken out by county.

DC 1 Summary of FY		5 Grant		FY16 Grant		/16 Proposed	Distribution %
APPLICANT AGENCY	A	wards		Request		Frant Awards	(A.R.S. § 41-2402)
	Tie	r 1 Appre	hen	•			
Apache County SO	\$	236,316	\$	318,363	\$	236,316	
Cochise County SO		131,197		195,010		131,197	
Flagstaff PD		291,660		364,247		291,660	
Gila County SO		336,917		547,411		336,917	
Graham County SO		28,429		35,012		28,429	
Greenlee County SO		32,000		72,000		32,000	
Kingman PD		345,254		423,811		345,254	
La Paz County SO		67,914		340,598		67,914	
Navajo County SO		241,425		418,126		241,425	
Pinal County SO		147,520		178,813		147,520	
Prescott Valley PD		408,756		513,910		408,756	
Santa Cruz County SO		169,526		169,540		169,526	
Tucson PD		756,637		1,167,473		756,637	
Yuma SO		245,597		334,326		245,597	
Sub-Total	\$ 3,	439,148	\$	5,078,640	\$	3,439,148	33.4%
	_	r 1 Prose	•				
AG's Office - Medicaid Fraud	\$	100,816	\$	134,530	\$	100,816	
Apache County Attorney		90,469		113,106		90,469	
Cochise County Attorney		157,305		241,543		157,305	
Coconino County Attorney		135,988		290,929		135,988	
Gila County Attorney		63,656		77,388		63,656	
Graham County Attorney		51,188		102,376		51,188	
Greenlee County Attorney		36,600		34,500		34,500	
La Paz County Attorney		71,499		125,492		71,499	
Maricopa County Attorney		1,377,099		1,458,656		1,377,099	
Mohave County Attorney		154,171		392,771		154,171	
Navajo County Attorney		112,450		290,866		112,450	
Pima County Attorney		515,145		1,232,943		515,145	
Pinal County Attorney		189,749		230,581		189,749	
Santa Cruz County Attorney		49,014		97,913		49,014	
Tucson City Prosecutor		315,018		333,141		315,018	
Yavapai County Attorney		127,004		318,117		127,004	
Yuma County Attorney		270,589		315,132		270,589	
Sub-Total	\$ 3,	817,760	\$	5,789,984	\$	3,815,660	37.0%
	ecution	- Statewi	de l	Forfeiture Ac			
Attorney General's Office	\$	869,400	\$	1,126,515	\$	869,400	
Sub-Total		869,400	\$	1,126,515	\$	869,400	8.4%
		2 Forensi				,	
Arizona Department of Public Safety	\$	445,265	\$	560,989	\$	445,265	
Tucson PD - Forensics		58,078		58,078		58,078	
Sub-Total	\$	503,343	\$	619,067	\$	503,343	4.9%
			n a	nd Correctio		<u> </u>	
Administrative Office of the Courts		1,677,546	\$	1,836,328	\$	1,677,546	
Department of Corrections	\$	- ,- ,	\$	130,008	\$	-	
Sub-Total		677,546	\$	1,966,336	\$	1,677,546	16.3%
TOTAL		307,197	_	14,580,542	_	10,305,097	100%

DC 3	FY 2016 I	Drug, Gang, &	Violent Crime	Control Grant	t Requests			
		g,g, .						Total
				P&O	In-State	Operating		FY16
Applicant Agency	Salary	Overtime	ERE	Services	Travel	Expense	Equipment	Requested
			Tier 1 Apprehe	ension				
Apache County SO	\$ 186,126	\$ -	\$ 132,237	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<b>.</b> -	\$ 318,363
Cochise County SO	-	195,010	<del>ψ</del> 132/237	-	-	-	-	195,010
Flagstaff PD	134,641	41,099	80,267	93,480	_	14,760	_	364,247
Gila County SO	311,904	-	235,507	-	_		_	547,411
Graham County SO	-	35,012	-	_	_	_	_	35,012
Greenlee County SO	-	72,000	-	_	-	_	_	72,000
Kingman PD	85,375	-	47,111	291,325	_	_	_	423,811
La Paz County SO	219,304	_	121,294	-	_	_	_	340,598
Navajo County SO	269,581	_	148,545	_	_	_	_	418,126
Pinal County SO	51,000	93,643	34,170	_	_	_	-	178,813
Prescott Valley PD	308,401	JJ,013 -	205,509	-	-	_	-	513,910
Santa Cruz County SO	34,611	122,739	12,190	_	_	_	-	169,540
Tucson PD	734,324	122,739	433,149	_	_	_	-	1,167,473
Yuma SO	196,802	47,462	90,062	-	-	-	-	334,326
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2,532,069	\$ 606,965	\$ 1,540,041	\$ 384,805	\$ -	\$ 14,760	\$ -	\$ 5,078,640
30B-TOTAL	\$ 2,532,069	\$ 606,965			<b>D</b> -	3 14,760	<b>-</b>	\$ 5,076,640
		T -	Tier 1 Prosec	1	Г.	1 .	Г.	
AG's Office - Medicaid Fraud	\$ 90,208	\$ -	\$ 44,322	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 134,530
Apache County Attorney	85,310	-	27,796	-	-	-	-	113,106
Cochise County Attorney	185,670	-	55,873	-	-	-	-	241,543
Coconino County Attorney	225,080	-	65,849	-	-	-	-	290,929
Gila County Attorney	58,402	-	18,986	-	-	-	-	77,388
Graham County Attorney	76,646	-	25,730	-	-	-	-	102,376
Greenlee County Attorney	27,600	-	6,900	-	-	-	-	34,500
La Paz County Attorney	91,400	-	34,092	-	-	-	-	125,492
Maricopa County Attorney	1,099,987	-	358,669	-	-	-	-	1,458,656
Mohave County Attorney	274,665	-	118,106	-	-	-	-	392,771
Navajo County Attorney	213,234	-	75,239	-	2,393	-	-	290,866
Pima County Attorney	916,369	-	316,574	-	-	-	-	1,232,943
Pinal County Attorney	180,283	-	50,298	-	-	-	-	230,581
Santa Cruz County Attorney	77,709	-	20,204	-	-	-	-	97,913
Tucson City Prosecutor	216,262	-	116,879	-	-	-	-	333,141
Yavapai County Attorney	239,322	-	78,795	-	-	-	-	318,117
Yuma County Attorney	220,885	-	94,247	-	-	-	-	315,132
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 4,279,032	\$ -	\$ 1,508,559	\$ -	\$ 2,393	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,789,984
	Т	ier 1 Prosecu	tion - Statewid	e Forfeiture A	ctivities			
Attorney General's Office	\$ 717,928	\$ -	\$ 375,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,850	\$ -	\$ 1,126,515
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 717,928	\$ -	\$ 375,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,850	\$ -	\$ 1,126,515
		, .	Tier 2 Forensic			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Arizona Department of Public Safety	\$ 428,537	\$ -	\$ 132,452	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 560,989
Tucson PD - Forensics	40,900	- Ψ	17,178	-	Ψ -	<del>-</del>	- Ψ	58,078
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 469,437	\$ -	\$ 149,630	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 619,067
SSD-TOTAL	¥ <del>1</del> 07,437		g Adjudication					\$ 517,007
A doministrative Office of the County	\$ 1,322,613	\$ -			s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,836,328
Administrative Office of the Courts	,-,-			\$ -	_		\$ 130,008	, , , , , , , , ,
Department of Corrections	\$ -	Ψ	\$ -	Ψ	т	Ψ	<del>  ' ' '   '                            </del>	
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,322,613	\$ -	\$ 513,715	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ 1,966,336
TOTAL	\$ 9,321,079	\$ 606,965	\$ 4,087,682	\$ 384,805	\$ 2,393	\$ 47,610	\$ -	\$14,580,542

DC 4 FY 2016	Drug, Gang,				I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	1
	Personal			Total Proposed	Federal &	
Applicant Agency	Services	Overtime	ERE	Proposed Project	State Funds	Match Funds
Applicant Agency	Sei vices	Overtime	LKL	Fioject	State Fullus	iviatori Furiu
		Tier 1 Ap	prehension			
Apache County SO	\$ 143,164	\$ -	\$ 93,152	\$ 236,316	\$ 177,237	\$ 59,079
Cochise County SO	-	131,197	-	131,197	98,398	32,799
Flagstaff PD	187,574	-	104,086	291,660	218,745	72,915
Gila County SO	188,546	-	148,371	336,917	252,688	84,229
Graham County SO	-	28,429	-	28,429	21,322	7,107
Greenlee County SO	210.262	32,000	126 002	32,000	24,000	8,000
Kingman PD	218,362	-	126,892	345,254	258,940	86,314
a Paz County SO	43,804	-	24,110	67,914	50,935	16,979
Navajo County SO Pinal County SO	157,719	62.250	83,706	241,425	181,069	60,356
Prescott Valley PD	51,000 244,285	62,350	34,170 164,471	147,520 408,756	110,640 306,567	36,880 102,189
Santa Cruz County SO	34,611	122,725	12,190	169,526	127,144	42,382
Tucson PD	468,379	122,723	288,258	756,637	567,478	189,159
Yuma SO	165,076	-	80,521	245,597	184,198	61,399
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,902,520	\$ 376,701	\$ 1,159,927	\$ 3,439,148	\$ 2,579,361	\$ 859,787
332	, <del>+ .//0</del> 2/020	+ 0.0/.0.	<b>+</b> 1/10///2	+ 0/10//110	ψ <u>=</u>  σ.	+ 007/101
		Tier 1 P	rosecution			
AG's Office - Medicaid Fraud	\$ 70,102	\$ -	\$ 30,714	\$ 100,816	\$ 100,816	\$ -
Apache County Attorney	68,665	ı	21,804	90,469	67,852	22,617
Cochise County Attorney	123,159	-	34,146	157,305	117,979	39,326
Coconino County Attorney	104,530	-	31,458	135,988	101,991	33,997
Gila County Attorney	48,013	-	15,643	63,656	47,742	15,914
Graham County Attorney	38,323	-	12,865	51,188	38,391	12,797
Greenlee County Attorney	27,600	-	6,900	34,500	25,875	8,625
a Paz County Attorney	52,133	-	19,366	71,499	53,624	17,875
Maricopa County Attorney	1,041,430	-	335,669	1,377,099	1,032,824	344,275
Mohave County Attorney	107,848	-	46,323	154,171	115,628	38,543
Navajo County Attorney Pima County Attorney	82,690 407,990	-	29,760 107,155	112,450 515,145	84,337 386,359	28,113 128,786
Pinal County Attorney	148,425	-	41,324	189,749	142,312	47,437
Santa Cruz County Attorney	38,855	_	10,159	49,014	36,760	12,254
Fucson City Prosecutor	205,843	-	109,175	315,018	236,263	78,755
Yavapai County Attorney	98,489	-	28,515	127,004	95,253	31,751
Yuma County Attorney	194,574	_	76,015	270,589	202,942	67,647
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2,858,669	\$ -	\$ 956,991	\$ 3,815,660	\$ 2,886,948	\$ 928,712
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			,,,	. , , ,	
	Tier 1 Prose	ecution - State	ewide Forfeitur	e Activities		
Attorney General's Office	\$ 616,674	\$ -	\$ 252,726	\$ 869,400	\$ 652,050	\$ 217,350
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 616,674	\$ -	\$ 252,726	\$ 869,400	\$ 652,050	\$ 217,350
Arizona Department of Public Safety	A 340 300		nsic Support	A 445 075	A 200 045	
"Eona Department of Table barety	φ 5.0/200	\$ -	\$ 104,985	+ 110/200	+	\$ 111,316
Fucson PD - Forensics	40,900	- e	17,178	58,078 \$ 502,242	43,558 \$ 277.507	14,520
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 381,180	\$ -	\$ 122,163	\$ 503,343	\$ 377,507	\$ 125,836
	Tier 2	Drug Adjudic	ation and Corre	ections		
Administrative Office of the Courts	\$ 1,210,155	\$ -	\$ 467,391	\$ 1,677,546	\$ 1,258,159	\$ 419,387
Department of Corrections	\$ 1,210,133	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,077,540	\$ 1,230,137	\$ 417,387
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,210,155	\$ -	\$ 467,391	\$ 1,677,546	\$ 1,258,159	\$ 419,387
	,=,	•	,	,,	,= ,	,

		D/ 45	64	wards by County FY 16			
County		FY 15 approved	% Allocation	Recommended		% Allocation	
Apache County	-	rppi oved	Allocation			Allocation	
Apache County Attorney	\$	90,469		\$	90,469		
Apache County Sheriff	\$	236,316		\$	236,316		
Total	\$	326,785	3.17%	\$	326,785	3.17	
	7	0_0,00	0.2	7	0_0,.00	J	
Cochise County							
Cochise County Attorney	\$	157,305		\$	157,305		
Cochise County Sheriff	\$	131,197		\$	131,197		
Total	\$	288,502	2.80%	\$	288,502	2.80	
Coconino County							
Coconino County Attorney	\$	135,988		\$	135,988		
Flagstaff Police Department	\$	291,660		\$	291,660		
Total	\$	427,648	4.15%	\$	427,648	4.15	
Gila County							
Gila County Attorney	\$	63,656		\$	63,656		
Gila County Sheriff	\$	336,917		\$	336,917		
Total Total	\$	400,573	3.89%	<i>\$</i>	400,573	3.89	
Graham County_							
Graham County Attorney	\$	51,188		\$	51,188		
Graham County Sheriff	\$	28,429		\$	28,429		
Total	\$	79,617	0.77%	\$	79,617	0.77	
Greenlee County							
Greenlee County Attorney	\$	36,600		\$	34,500		
Greenlee County Sheriff	\$	32,000		\$	32,000		
Total	\$	68,600	0.67%	\$	66,500	0.65	
La Paz County							
La Paz County Attorney	\$	71,499		\$	71,499		
La Paz County Sheriff	\$	67,914		\$	67,914		
Total	\$	139,413	1.35%	\$	139,413	1.35	
Maricopa County							
Maricopa County Attorney	\$	1,377,099		\$	1,377,099		
Total .	\$	1,377,099	13.36%		1,377,099	13.36	
Mohave County							
Mohave County Attorney	\$	154,171		\$	154,171		
Kingman Police Department	\$	345,254		\$	345,254		
Total	\$	499,425	4.85%	\$	499,425	4.85	
		,		,	,		
Navajo County							
Navajo County Attorney	\$	112,450		\$	112,450		
Navajo County Sheriff	\$	241,425		\$	241,425		
Total	\$	353,875	3.43%	\$	353,875	3.43	
		,.		,	,		
Pima County							
Pima County Attorney	\$	515,145		\$	515,145		
Tucson City Prosecutor	\$	315,018		\$	315,018		
Tucson Police Department - Task Force	\$	756,637		\$	756,637		
Tucson Police Department - Crime Lab	\$	58,078		\$	58,078		
Total	\$	1,644,878	15.96%	\$	1,644,878	15.96	
	7	2/01//010	25,50,0	7	2/07//070	13,50	
Pinal County							
Pinal County Attorney	\$	189,749		\$	189,749		
Pinal County Sheriff	\$	147,520		\$	147,520		
Total	\$	337,269	3.27%	\$	337,269	3.27	
	7	23,,233	3.2.70	7	23.,203	3.27	
Santa Cruz County							
Santa Cruz County Attorney	\$	49,014		\$	49,014		
Santa Cruz County Sheriff	\$	169,526		\$	169,526		
Total	\$	218,540	2.12%		218,540	2.12	
	7						
Yavapai County							
Yavapai County Attorney	\$	127,004		\$	127,004		
Prescott Valley Police Deparment	\$	408,756		\$	408,756		
Total	\$	535,760	5.20%		535,760	5.20	
	7	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
Yuma County							
Yuma County Attorney	\$	270,589		\$	270,589		
Yuma County Sheriff	\$	245,597		\$	245,597		
Total	\$	516,186	5.01%		516,186	5.01	
	4	220,200	3.0170	7	520,100	3.01	
Statewide Statewide							
Administrative Office of the Courts	¢	1,677,546		¢	1,677,546		
	\$			\$			
Attorney General - Forefeiture	\$	869,400 100,816		\$	869,400 100,816		
Attorney General - Medicaid Fraud Department of Public Safety - Crime Lab					445,265		
Department of Public Safety - Crime Lab  Total	\$ \$	445,265 3,003,027	30.010/	\$		20.01	
I Old I	*	3,093,027	30.01%	\$	3,093,027	30.01	
			1				

VII

# ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Action Requested:		Type of Action Requested:	Subject:					
May 21, 2	2015	☐ Formal Action/Motion ☐ Information Only ☐ Other	Update on the FY 2015 Substance Abuse Prevention and Education Grant Awards					
TO:	Chairperson and C	ommission Members						
FROM:	Tony Vidale, Progr Drug, Gang and Vi	am Manager olent Crime Control						
RECOM	MENDATION:							
Informa	tion Only							
DISCUS	SSION:							
	s and non-profit age	mission on funding awards made to coencies for the FY 2015 Substance Abuse						
FISCAL	IMPACT:							
N/A								
ALTER	NATIVES:							
N/A								

#### **Background**

The Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) and the Arizona Department of Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health Services (ADHS/DBHS) collaborated to implement a substance abuse prevention program with a focus on criminal justice agencies. This program was designed to assist state, county, local, tribal, and non-profit agencies in implementing effective substance prevention and education efforts encompassing evidence-based interventions and environmental prevention strategies involving multiple sectors of the community focusing on reducing access and opportunity, enforcing consequences, and decreasing the likelihood of substance abuse by addressing risk and protective factors. Non-profit agencies were required to have a strong collaboration with a criminal justice agency.

Goals of the effort included projects that are designed to prevent and/or reduce substance abuse that are cost-effective and result in increased public safety, proactively address substance abuse before its inception to thwart negative consequences related to safety, health, and academic achievement, and build collaborative relationships between public health, community, and criminal justice organizations to better address substance abuse. In addition, meeting these goals must be done using evidence-based interventions.

#### **Funding**

The total funding amount available was \$604,339. The source of the funding is the Strategic Prevention Framework, Partnerships for Success Grant administered by the Arizona Department of Health Services (DHS) through the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). The funds from this SAMHSA grant are set to expire on September 30, 2015.

#### **Funding Requests**

Staff established two waves of applicants: criminal justice/government agencies and non-profit agencies. The grant opened on February 2, 2015 for all applicants. Criminal justice/government agency applications were due February 27, 2015 and non-profit agency applications were due March 13, 2015. A summary of the funding requests and recommended projects appears in Table *DC 6* on page 34. In total, 19 agencies submitted applications (nine criminal justice/government agencies and 10 non-profit agencies), requesting a total of \$1,669,209. Table *DC 7* on page 34 provides detail on agency requests for funding. Staff conducted internal evaluations of all the applications and presented the Executive Director with a recommended funding plan.

#### Funding Awards

Thirteen agencies received awards totaling \$604,339. Nine criminal justice/government agencies were awarded a total of \$401,159 and four non-profit agencies were awarded a total of \$203,180. Table *DC 8* on page 35 provides a breakout of each project funded by line item. In addition, summary information on each award is located on page 35 showing the project focus and the types of expenditures funded.

Summary of FY 2015 Grant Requests & Approved Awards										
DC 6 for Substance Abuse Prevention Program										
	FY15 Grant	FY15 Approved								
APPLICANT AGENCY	Request	Grant Awards								
Criminal Justice	/Government Agencie	S								
Apache County SO	\$ 11,600	\$ 11,600								
Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts	443,380	100,000								
Arizona Attorney General's Office	70,402	54,778								
Arizona Department of Corrections	23,025	23,025								
Coconino County Superior Court	22,200	22,200								
Kingman PD	87,915	65,915								
Maricopa County Adult Probation Department	158,090	79,045								
Maricopa County Attorney	14,976	14,976								
Tempe City Social Services - Care 7	33,220	29,620								
Sub-Total	\$ 864,808	\$ 401,159								
Non-pr	ofit Agencies									
Citizens Against Substance Abuse	\$ 33,870	\$ -								
Friends of Navajo Co. Anti-Drug Coalition										
Thenas of Navajo Co. And Drug Coaldon	36,550	-								
HOPE	36,550 29,736	26,798								
		26,798 98,975								
HOPE	29,736	i								
HOPE MATFORCE	29,736 401,675 45,716 47,009	98,975								
HOPE MATFORCE Pasadera Behavioral Health Network	29,736 401,675 45,716	98,975 41,289								
HOPE MATFORCE Pasadera Behavioral Health Network Pima Prevention Partnership	29,736 401,675 45,716 47,009	98,975 41,289								
HOPE MATFORCE Pasadera Behavioral Health Network Pima Prevention Partnership Sojourner Center	29,736 401,675 45,716 47,009 54,524	98,975 41,289								
HOPE MATFORCE Pasadera Behavioral Health Network Pima Prevention Partnership Sojourner Center Technical Assistance Partnership of Arizona	29,736 401,675 45,716 47,009 54,524 87,797	98,975 41,289								
HOPE MATFORCE Pasadera Behavioral Health Network Pima Prevention Partnership Sojourner Center Technical Assistance Partnership of Arizona Northland Family Help Center	29,736 401,675 45,716 47,009 54,524 87,797 12,424	98,975 41,289								

DC 7 FY 2015 Substance Abuse Prevention and Education Grant Requests												
Applicant Agency		Salary	ERE		P & O Services	In-State Travel	Out-of-State Travel	Operating Expense	Equipment	Total FY15 Requested		
Criminal Justice/Government Agencies												
Apache County SO	\$	-	\$	-	\$	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$ 10,000	\$	11,600	
Arizona Administrative Office of the O		-		-	146,620	90,160	22,500	184,100	-		443,380	
Arizona Attorney General's Office		31,526		11,034	6,817	4,128	-	16,897	-		70,402	
Arizona Department of Corrections		-		-	-	12,900	-	10,125	-		23,025	
Coconino County Superior Court		-		-	22,200	-	-	-	-		22,200	
Kingman PD		-		-	61,800	-	-	26,115	-		87,915	
Maricopa County Adult Probation Dep		-		-	140,400	-	-	17,690	-		158,090	
Maricopa County Attorney		-		-	10,076	600	-	1,400	2,900		14,976	
Tempe City Social Services - Care 7		25,020		1,600	-	-	-	6,600	-		33,220	
SUB-TOTAL	\$	56,546	\$	12,634	\$ 387,913	\$107,788	\$ 22,500	\$264,527	\$12,900	\$	864,808	
				ľ	lon-profit Ag	encies						
Citizens Against Substance Abuse	\$	20,826	\$	1,514	\$ 7,750	\$ -	\$ 1,106	\$ 2,674	\$ -	\$	33,870	
Friends of Navajo Co. Anti-Drug Coal		=		-	24,000	2,206	1,455	8,889	-		36,550	
HOPE		16,938		3,613	1	-	-	8,820	365		29,736	
MATFORCE		25,250		4,545	51,000	3,280	-	317,600	-		401,675	
Pasadera Behavioral Health Network		11,267		1,774	14,793	522	-	17,360	-		45,716	
Pima Prevention Partnership		15,764		5,246	5,200	427	-	20,372	1		47,009	
Sojourner Center		10,750		2,150	ı	-	-	41,624	-		54,524	
Technical Assistance Partnership of A		41,600		4,992	21,600	1	-	19,605	-		87,797	
Northland Family Help Center		8,112		1,947	-	-	1,060	1,305	-		12,424	
The Haven		35,000		9,580	ı	1,980	-	6,640	1,900		55,100	
SUB-TOTAL	\$	185,507	\$	35,361	\$ 124,343	\$ 8,415	\$ 3,621	\$444,889	\$ 2,265	\$	804,401	
TOTAL	\$	242,053	\$	47,995	\$ 512,256	\$116,203	\$ 26,121	\$709,416	\$15,165	\$	1,669,209	

DC 8 FY 2015 Substance Abuse Prevention and Education Grant Approved Awards												
					Prof./							Total
	Per	sonal		ERE	Outside	In-State	Out-of-State	Operating				FY15
Applicant Agency	Ser	vices		Costs	Svs	Travel	Travel	Expense	Eq	uipment		Proposed
Criminal Justice/Government Agencies												
Apache County SO	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$	10,000	\$	11,600
Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts		-		-	51,060	12,740	-	36,200		-		100,000
Arizona Attorney General's Office		24,568		9,228	6,817	4,128	-	10,037		-		54,778
Arizona Department of Corrections		-		-	1	12,900	-	10,125		-		23,025
Coconino County Superior Court		-		-	22,200	-	-	-		-		22,200
Kingman PD		-		-	41,800	-	-	24,115		-		65,915
Maricopa County Adult Probation Department		-		-	70,200	-	-	8,845		-		79,045
Maricopa County Attorney		-		-	10,076	600	-	1,400		2,900		14,976
Tempe City Social Services - Care 7		25,020		-	1,600	-	-	3,000		-		29,620
SUB-TOTAL	\$	49,588	\$	9,228	\$ 203,753	\$ 30,368	\$ -	\$ 95,322	\$	12,900	\$	401,159
				No	n-profit Ager	icies						
Citizens Against Substance Abuse	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-
Friends of Navajo Co. Anti-Drug Coalition		-			ı	-	-	-		-		
HOPE		14,490		3,123	-	-	-	8,820		365		26,798
MATFORCE		-		-	83,975	-	-	15,000		-		98,975
Pasadera Behavioral Health Network		11,267		1,774	14,793	522	-	12,933		-		41,289
Pima Prevention Partnership		15,764		5,246	5,200	427	-	9,481		-		36,118
Sojourner Center					•	-	-	-		-		-
Technical Assistance Partnership of Arizona		-		-	-	-	-	-		-		-
Northland Family Help Center		-		-	-	-	-	-		-		-
The Haven		-		-	-	-	-	-				-
SUB-TOTAL	\$	41,521	\$	10,143	\$ 103,968	\$ 949	\$ -	\$ 46,234	\$	365	\$	203,180
TOTAL	\$	91,109	\$	19,371	\$ 307,721	\$ 31,317	\$ -	\$141,556	\$	13,265	\$	604,339

#### **Drug Prevention and Education Grant Project Summary**

#### Apache County Sheriff's Office \$11,600

Project focus is to educate public and provide safe disposal of unused or unwanted prescription drugs throughout Apache County. Population affected: adults and juveniles.

Proposal would fund a drug incinerator and supplies/materials to promote drug take back events. The incinerator is an equipment purchase item costing \$10,000.

#### Administrative Office of the Courts \$100,000

Project focus is to provide drug prevention training to probation officers to more effectively deal with substance abusers on probation. Drug prevention and reduction are the keys to the project and drug testing of offenders is included in the project activities. Population affected: adults.

Proposal would fund contract expenses and in-state travel expenses related to the training and 7,240 drug testing kits.

#### Attorney General's Office \$54,778

Project focus is to support the Alcohol Adult Literacy Project (AALP). This education project is geared towards children and young adults to convey misconceptions about alcohol use and support an alcohol-free lifestyle. Population affected: juveniles.

Proposal would fund contractual services to train AG personnel on the AALP, which includes a 3-day class delivered locally, AG personnel expenses to deliver the training to various locations in the state, and materials/supplies expenses to support the project.

#### Arizona Department of Corrections \$23,025

Project focus is to receive education and training at the Southwestern School for Behavioral Health Studies Conference in Tucson, August 24-27. The goal of the training is to enhance the clinical skill sets of ADOC substance abuse counseling staff to improve the quality of treatment services and outcomes. Population affected: adults.

Proposal would fund the travel and per diem costs of 25 staff and registration costs to attend the training.

#### Coconino County Superior Court \$22,200

Project focus is to increase success rate of current or potential substance abusers going through DUI/Drug Court or Integrated Family Court using random drug tests to deter substance abuse. This project would also expand existing DUI/drug testing by increasing the number of substances included in the drug tests from 5 substances to 10 substances. Population affected: adults and juveniles.

Proposal would fund materials and supplies for 3,600 drug tests and a small number of substance abuse assessments for those clients that need a more thorough assessment for treatment/prevention referrals.

#### Kingman Police Department \$65,915

Project focus is to support the Mohave Opportunities Rehab Education (MORE) program that proactively addresses substance abuse through education to juveniles and adults. This is a pilot program in Kingman, with anticipation of expanding countywide after an evaluation of the program. Population affected: adults and juveniles.

Proposal would fund substance abuse prevention and education training for school resource officers, field officers, school faculty and staff, contract services for initial assessments and specimen testing of participants, and materials and supplies for drug prevention and education activities.

#### Maricopa County Adult Probation \$79,045

Project focus is to work with Adult Drug Court to increase the frequency of drug testing of program participants to two tests per week, delivered randomly, to ensure accountability and effectiveness in reducing substance abuse. Population affected: adults.

Proposal would fund contract services to cover the costs of 10,400 drug tests over a 6 month period and indirect costs at a rate of 12.6%.

#### Maricopa County Attorney \$14,976

Project focus is to support the Good Choices, Bright Futures program that delivers substance abuse prevention curriculum for youth between 10-14, in out-of-school settings. Population affected: juveniles.

Proposal would fund contract services for training and evaluation of the project, travel costs related to delivering the presentations, materials/supplies related to the training and presentations, and equipment for the presentations.

#### Tempe Social Services – Care 7 \$29,620

Project focus is to support the Celebrating Families Program that is a parenting skills program designed for families where one or both parents are in the early stages of substance addiction recovery and there is a high risk for domestic violence/child abuse. Population affected: adults and juveniles.

Proposal would fund personnel costs to deliver the training, contractual expenses to provide technical assistance to trainers, and materials/supplies for program.

#### HOPE, Inc. \$26,789

Project focus is to support the Community Reintegration Program with substance abuse prevention and education and relapse prevention coping skills. Population affected: adults.

Proposal would fund personnel costs to revise and administer the substance abuse curriculum, materials/supplies to support the curriculum and participants, and equipment costs of the program.

#### *MATFORCE* \$98,975

Project focus is to implement a mass media campaign on the harms of marijuana across the state of Arizona and work with community coalitions to affect change by disseminating information and delivering training. Population affected: juveniles.

Proposal would fund contractual services to develop toolkits, deliver training presentations, and develop curriculum, cover costs to produce toolkits, and operating expense related to a conference.

#### Pasadera Behavioral Health Network \$41,289

Project focus is to support the Rx360 and The Buzz programs to target 525 parents and 110 youth with prevention education related to underage drinking, youth Rx drug use, and the consequences associated with these risk taking behaviors. Population affected: adult and juvenile.

Proposal would fund personnel costs related to project oversight and coordination, contract services to deliver various aspects of the prevention training for facilitators and participants and provide translation services, and materials/supplies related to prevention training.

#### Pima Prevention Partnership \$36,118

Project focus is to support the Pima County Teen Court program deliver substance abuse prevention training to youth that demonstrate higher risk of recidivism due to substance use. Population affected: juvenile.

Proposal would fund personnel costs for program oversight and for workshop facilitators, contract for training services for staff, travel expenses for staff to conduct workshops, and materials/supplies to support delivering the prevention workshops.