

**Special Alcohol Fund Advisory Committee
City of Manhattan
Harmon Room, City Hall, 1101 Poyntz Avenue
September 23, 2005**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Meredith, Mark White, Brian London, Joan Smith, Julie Govert-Walter, and Matthew Schindler-Mary DeLuccie arrived at 3:30 p.m.

STAFF PRESENT: Allie Lousch, Administrative Program Coordinator

PUBLIC PRESENT: Camilla Owens of Sunflower CASA

Joan Smith called the meeting to order at 2:50 p.m.

Below is a general account of the Committee's discussion and members' comments per item:

The Committee reviewed new information provided to them by agency representatives.

Joan explained the City Commission's request to reconsider the allocations in light of "new" or "clarifying" information presented at the June 28, 2005, and August 16, 2005, City Commission meetings. This information was offered on behalf of Sunflower CASA and KSU- Alcohol and Other Drug Education Service (KSU-AODES). The City Commission has approved the overall \$325,042 Special Alcohol Fund allocation.

The Committee had questions regarding CASA and the percentage of children served whose involvement includes drug and alcohol issues and how many of those children are Manhattan residents. Kimberly Corum, CASA board member, submitted a memo summarizing the agency's position and stating that the CASA Special Alcohol Fund application reflected only the children whose cases involved alcohol/substance abuse and were Manhattan residents.

Teen Court: Audrey Lee submitted a letter (August 29, 2005) saying that Teen Court was closing, which she followed up with an August 30, 2005 email stating the same. County Attorney Barry Wilkinson, submitted a letter August 30, 2005*, stating that Audrey Lee had resigned and asking to withdraw Teen Court's request for 2006 Special Alcohol Funds. City received a "final grant report" from Audrey Lee dated September 2, 2005. The September 19, 2005, Kansas State Collegian ran an article stating that the Riley County Board of Commissioners has "voted unanimously to make Teen Court a permanent County program." Mercury also addressed Teen Court's "comeback" in a September 13, 2005, article (this sentence is confusing). City received a fax (today) dated September 22, 2005, requesting that the Committee re-allocate the funds previously allocated to Teen Court and later withdrawn*. The letter stated that the County would fund the Teen Court Coordinator position and requested funding for supplies, travel, etc.

Committee expressed concerned about the "instability" and unknowns of the Teen Court program. Members expressed concern that it would be "irresponsible to allocate funds to an entity that –as of this discussion-is not secure nor set under Riley County Community Corrections (RCCC) or County Attorney's umbrella." RCCC's September 22 letter discussed plans for the requested Teen Court allocation-plans that were not aligned with the original application. Committee discussed the two "applications" for funding and deliberated whether RCCC was presenting a new-and therefore late-application.

Committee expressed interest in how much Riley County planned to "put forth" to re-initiate Teen Court. In reviewing the RCCC's September 22 letter, Committee learned that Riley County only funded the Teen Court Coordinator position and no additional line items such as training, supplies, etc. This is in contrast to the original application that requested Special Alcohol funds for the position and minimal travel expenses.

Committee furthered discussed the original Teen Court funding recommendation to fund 50% of the salary. If the County is funding the position, City Special Alcohol Funds are being asked to fund something different and new. If the Committee were to consider Teen Court's new proposal as presented by RCCC-this may indicate a

new proposal-not received at the time of the other proposals and may require-if considered-that all applications be renewed via a new Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Committee members expressed that the original allocations were made in good faith after much investigation, review, and discussion.

NOTE: Committee agreed that there was significant value in the Teen Court program and it's "goodness of fit" within the Special Alcohol Fund parameters of prevention, intervention, and/or direct services. Committee expressed confidence in the program's effectiveness and illustrated outcomes.

Matthew Schindler made a motion that the Committee decline RCCC's request on behalf of Teen Court for Special Alcohol funds because of the contradicting correspondence of first returning the allocation and later re-requesting funds. Brian London seconds.

Further Discussion:

Suggestion to fund Teen Court for \$1,500 towards travel conferences, and meetings, because the remainder has already been funded by Riley County per the September 22, 2005, RCCC correspondence. \$1,500 is all that was originally requested that was not been covered by Riley County per the most recent RCCC correspondence.

"If we fund the \$1,500, we are setting a precedent opening the (RFP) process to late-coming requests for funding."

Committee unanimously voted to decline RCCC's request on behalf of Teen Court based on the irreconcilable contrasts between the original Teen Court proposal and the September 22 RCCC letter. No abstentions.

Agency Use of Allocated Funds: While attending a recent Manhattan Area Prevention Coalition (MAPRC) meeting, an agency director asked a Committee member whether agencies could spend their allocation at will or were obligated to spend the allocations per the committee recommended which are based on the original application.

A Committee member then asked, "Why have them (agencies) submit proposals if they aren't going to follow them?"

The liaison mentioned that the allocation contract has been recently reviewed by the City Attorney and now includes language that specifies the portion of the agencies' proposals the Committee wishes to fund.

Mary DeLuccie arrived at 3:30 pm.

Mark White made a **motion** to capture the original Teen Court allocation (\$24,036) and return it to the City's Special Alcohol Fund (estimated at \$225,000 for next year's allocation process) in confidence of the Committee's original review process and as a way to minimize the impact of significant decrease in 2007 available monies. Bill Meredith seconds.

Member observed that the Committee may have a unique opportunity to use some of the funds to educate agencies regarding effective practices in prevention, intervention, direct services, and substantive program measurement success. Liaison cautioned that such an action would then cause the Committee to become a recipient of Special Alcohol Funds.

Committee would like to find a way to offer training to local social service agencies re: adding substantive measures to agency program and application. RFP needs to include a request for ongoing substantive measures of program success. Discussed whether to require/ask all grantees to attend training hosted by Committee or add that all recipient agencies agree to include evaluative measures into their current contract year- include evidence based approaches regarding current and proposed programming. Committee

evaluates proposals-evaluations are based upon stated objectives, etc. in applications-and recognized that many of applications objectives were poor and qualified substantive program measurements were lacking.

Member mentioned that a few years ago, the City's Social Service Advisory Board (SSAB) provided a free workshop to all area social service agencies in an effort to improve agency boards and board relations. The same could be done for improving program measurement.

Members expressed concern that voting to return monies originally allocated to Teen Court to the City's Special Alcohol Fund-before Committee discuss the new information provided at the City Commission meetings-would be premature.

Julie Govert-Walter requested that the Committee table the motion. Joan seconds.

Vote: Two members voted in favor of tabling the motion to return monies originally allocated to Teen Court to the City's Special Alcohol Fund; four voted against the motion, and one member abstained.

Committee Chair, Joan Smith, wanted the minutes to reflect that the Committee appreciates the concern of those organizations that provided further information or objections in regards to the original Special Alcohol Fund allocation recommendations. Committee appreciates their civic involvement.

Vote: *Committee revisited the motion to restore Teen Court's returned allocation to the City's Special Alcohol Fund. Four members voted in favor, two voted against, and one member abstained.*

Member stated, "I want to be able to tell the commission, agency, and the press that we did examine all of the information and that they can be confident that we did not make decisions lightly or in error."

"If Teen Court had not gone away and the agency concerns were made post deliberations-as they were- and then discovered to be valid, the Committee would have had to take funds away from another organization.

USD 383: New funding streams have emerged since the original application was made and the Committee recommended allocations. New funding streams include revenue as a result of the revised State of Kansas funding formula and revenues realized from Fort Riley's troop buildup.

Member stated that the Manhattan Mercury reported a recent overall student loss of 60 students in USD 383. USD 383 has been advised that they can only anticipate roughly 100 students from the upcoming troop build up. This does not indicate a significant increase in student-generated revenue or revenue realized from a local purchasing/taxable population increase.

No action taken in regards to USD 383 allocation.

Chair restated that the City Commission asked the Committee to revisit allocation recommendations re: KSU-Alcohol and Other Drug Education Service (KSU-AODES) and Sunflower Casa. Liaison referred Committee to summary information found in the original City Commission memo re: Special Alcohol Fund recommendations.

Committee noted that KSU-AODES requested funds in support of agency director- a trusted resource. During interviews, director noted that his work with KSU overflows into community during three or four public meetings each year. Also requested funding for graduate assistant who, according to the director's comments during the June interview, works solely on the KSU-AODES newsletter, which is distributed on campus only.

Committee members made the following additional comments in regards to KSU-AODES Special Alcohol Fund original proposal and "additional information": "not much meat to the proposal" and "appears to be pretty much the same proposal as has been given for the last 20 years."

Committee reviewed a KSU-AODES generated PowerPoint presented to the City Commission which attempts to illustrate that KSU-related people and activities contribute to the bulk of the special alcohol fund-via taxes levied per drink in Manhattan. When reviewing the allocation, Committee considered "Did the new information contradict or enhance the information presented in application or interview?" After much discussion, the new information regarding KSU-AODES allocation was determined as "not significant."

Brian London made the following **motion**: The Committee does not change any of the allocations recommended to KSU-AODES based strictly on the strength of the proposal. Bill Meredith seconds.

Vote: Committee voted six in favor of the motion with one abstention.

Sunflower CASA: Again the Committee sought to revisit the allocation by asking "Did any new information or facts contradict or enhance the information originally presented in application or during the interview?"

The original application stated that of Sunflower CASA's 2004 caseload, 80% of the children enter the system due to drug and/or alcohol-related offenses and 60% live in Manhattan. Committee members' comments are below:

"Recall that we asked them about the percentages of children in CASA due to drug and alcohol problems, etc., but did we ask them specifically if their proposal reflects these percentages?"

"Doesn't the RFP indicate that these funds are only to be used for City of Manhattan residents?"

"The CASA application states that 87% of proposal represents 130 Manhattan kids served by CASA and 60% of those cases are alcohol/drug related."

"Their budget in the application does not reflect anything in this (Kimberly Corum's) memo."

"During the interview, we asked the questions as to how many children does CASA serve in Manhattan and how many of them are related to drug and alcohol? They did not indicate that the budget reflected only Manhattan kids in alcohol-related cases."

"The salaried person may be providing training and recruitment services. I think what they did was break their numbers down into what the staff member does."

"How do you piece out the one person who is trained and serves Riley, Clay and part of Pottawatomie county. This committee is concerned with kids in the City only."

"The information is still unclear and the new memo does not clarify their claims nor explain the numbers they provided in the original memo."

"The memo does not provide new clarifying information."

With 78 kids served in Riley County, we assume that to get down to the \$14,000 requested, you need to take out the percentage of Manhattan kids related to alcohol/drug issues, but do not get the numbers to support this change. The 21% figure presented in the application is ambiguous.

Brian London made a **motion** that the Committee does not change the allocation recommendation for Sunflower CASA. Matthew Schindler seconds.

Vote that the Committee does not change the allocation recommendation for Sunflower CASA: six in favor and one abstention.

New Business

Site Visits: Assign board liaisons – six active Committee members and fourteen agencies to visit. Purpose of the visits is to develop a relationship between committee and agencies.

Committee discussed whether site visits should begin in October or should site visits begin once grants are awarded? If site visits begin soon, Committee can ask about any end of cycle challenges and anticipated programming.

Bill Meredith is already assigned to BBBS and /Boys and Girls with SSAB would like to serve as liaison for spec alcohol as well.

Julie Govert-Walter: Regional Prevention Center & MARPC

Brian London: Manhattan Housing Authority & KSU Academic

Mary DeLuccie: Sunflower CASA & Riley County Community Corrections

Matthew Schindler: USD 383 & KSU-Counseling Services

Mark White: DARE & UFM

Joan Smith: Little Apple Task Force & Manhattan Emergency Shelter

Liaison will send SSAB Site Visit info to Committee. Committee will return edits, suggestions, and deletions within the week so that the Special Alcohol Site Visit forms can be finalized.

SITE VISITS Due November 30, 2005.

Meeting closed 5:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Committee will arrange date of next meeting via email. Looking to conduct Quarterly meetings.