



REVIEW OF THE AWARD PROCESS FOR THE OFFICE FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME RECOVERY ACT FORMULA AND DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAMS

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of the Inspector General

Report 10-19
March 2010

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Results in Brief | 2 |
| Recovery Act Program Solicitations | 4 |
| Review of the OVC Recovery Act Applications | 5 |
| Formula Program Applications | 6 |
| Discretionary Program Applications | 6 |
| Recipients with Incomplete Applications..... | 7 |
| Review of the OVC Recovery Act Award Process | 7 |
| Verification of the OVC's Recovery Act Formula Allocations | 8 |
| Discretionary Grant Program Award Process | 10 |
| Conclusion | 13 |
| Appendix I: OVC Recovery Act Formula Allocations for the VOCA Victim Compensation Program | 14 |
| Appendix II: OVC Recovery Act Formula Allocations for the VOCA Victim Assistance Program | 15 |
| Appendix III: OVC Recovery Act Awards for the NFG Grant Program | 16 |

Introduction

The Recovery Act appropriated \$100 million to the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP) Office for Victims of Crime (OVC). This funding is required to be administered in accordance with the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (VOCA).¹ Most of the funding (95 percent) was allocated for formula grant programs; however, 5 percent was reserved for discretionary programs.² The specific VOCA grant programs funded by the Recovery Act are described below.

- Recovery Act funding totaling \$47.5 million was distributed among eligible state agencies that administer VOCA-funded crime victim compensation programs to support the provision of crucial financial assistance to victims of crime under the Recovery Act VOCA Victim Compensation Formula Grant Program (VOCA Victim Compensation Program).
- Recovery Act funding totaling \$47.5 million was distributed among state agencies that administer VOCA-funded crime victim assistance programs to support the provision of services to victims of crime under the Recovery Act VOCA Victim Assistance Formula Grant Program (VOCA Victim Assistance Program).
- An additional \$5 million was used to make awards under the Recovery Act National Field-Generated Training, Technical Assistance, and Demonstration Projects Discretionary Grant Program (NFG Grant Program). The purpose of this discretionary grant program is to develop training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects that improve the capacity of victim service providers and allied practitioners in advancing rights and services for crime victims.

¹ 42 U.S.C. § 10601 (d)(4) (2006).

² Formula grants are awarded according to the method dictated by statute, which is usually a formula that specifies how the funds will be allocated among the eligible recipients. Other grants, known as discretionary grants, are awarded on a competitive basis or by the discretion of the bureau or program office, depending on applicable statute or the discretion of the bureau or program office.

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted a review of the award process of the OVC's Recovery Act VOCA funds.³ The objectives of this review were to:

- evaluate the solicitations published by OJP related to the OVC's Recovery Act efforts and determine if they include all required elements from the Recovery Act,
- determine the allocation and application methods for the OVC Recovery Act formula awards, and
- determine if grants awarded under the NFG Grant Program were awarded in a fair and competitive manner.⁴

Results in Brief

We reviewed the OVC's solicitations and issued a Management Advisory Memorandum (MAM) dated April 15, 2009, due to concerns we had regarding the OVC's guidance to applicants on the collection of data for Recovery Act reporting requirements. Specifically, to determine jobs retained through the funding, the VOCA Victim Compensation Program solicitation instructed award recipients to report the number of claimants who received Recovery Act funds to help offset economic loss due to victimization. However, the funding compensates victims for lost wages or other financial support such as medical expenses, mental health counseling, or funeral expenses, but in our opinion, does not result in jobs being retained. Rather, it results in what the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has subsequently defined as "induced" jobs associated with Recovery Act funding.⁵

³ This report is one of a series of reports that we will issue during our ongoing review of the Department's management and oversight of Recovery Act funds allocated to the VOCA Victim Assistance, VOCA Victim Compensation, and NFG Grant Programs. Our future work will include a review of the use of VOCA Victim Compensation, VOCA Victim Assistance, and NFG Grant Program funds by a selected sample of recipients and their sub-recipients, as applicable.

⁴ This report is a non-audit service as defined by generally accepted government auditing standard 3.26. The report contains technical advice that is not intended to be used as the primary basis for management decisions. As a result, this report is not intended to comply with generally accepted government auditing standards.

⁵ According to OMB Memorandum M-09-21 (June 2009), an "induced" job is that which is created in the local community as a result of Recovery Act spending. A job retained is an existing position that would not have been continued to be filled were it not for Recovery Act funding.

We relayed this concern to the OVC in our MAM and suggested that it: (1) not rely on payments to victims for lost wages as an indication of jobs retained, (2) provide detailed guidance to grantees on reporting requirements, and (3) require baseline data from grantees to appropriately measure the effect of Recovery Act funding. The OVC agreed that this performance measure would capture induced jobs associated with Recovery Act spending and stated that it would defer to guidance provided by the Office and Management and Budget (OMB), issued June 22, 2009, which states that recipients should report only direct jobs created by Recovery Act funding. Subsequently, OJP released supplemental guidance to grantees, and the OVC published guidance on its website clarifying the reporting requirements in accordance with our comments. OJP also stated to us that OVC staff will work with grantees to ensure that each grantee gathers baseline data so that the program has the basic information needed to measure performance. Therefore, we consider the issues presented to the OVC in our April 2009 MAM to have been adequately addressed.

We also reviewed applications submitted under the OVC's three Recovery Act programs to determine if applications from award recipients were complete. All VOCA Victim Assistance and Compensation Program applications we reviewed were complete. However, we found that one award recipient under the NFG Grant Program had not submitted a critical Recovery Act certification. As a result of this omission, the OVC does not have assurance that this recipient is aware of and will comply with some requirements of the Recovery Act and the program solicitation. We brought this concern to the OVC's attention and it immediately contacted the award recipient and obtained the missing certification. Therefore, we consider this issue to have been adequately addressed.

We reviewed methodology for awarding formula funding under both the VOCA Victim Compensation and VOCA Victim Assistance Programs, and found that OJP had made funding allocations to eligible states in accordance with the appropriate statutory formulas.⁶ First, we independently calculated the allocations used by the OVC to verify the accuracy of these calculations, and we determined that VOCA Victim Compensation and Assistance Program funds had been allocated accurately and in accordance with VOCA. In addition, we confirmed that the awards made under both the VOCA Victim Compensation and VOCA Victim Assistance Programs matched the

⁶ The formulas mandated to be used are codified in 42 U.S.C. § 10602(a) and 42 U.S.C. § 10603(a). According to VOCA, funds are to be allocated based on a combination of Census Bureau population estimates for each state, certified payouts to victims from eligible state funds from the prior year, and available funding.

allocations calculated by OJP, and that all funds appropriated had been awarded. Therefore, we concluded that the OVC awarded the VOCA Victim Compensation and VOCA Victim Assistance Program funds in a fair and reasonable manner.

We also examined the OVC's methodology and criteria for awarding discretionary funds under the NFG Grant Program. We determined that the OVC reviewed applications for their adherence to the national scope of the program, sent valid applications for external peer review, and recommended awards based on an evaluation of peer review scores and an internal subject matter expert evaluation. We then reviewed the OVC's final funding memorandum for the NFG Grant Program awards and found that it contained appropriate justification for the funding decisions. Therefore, we concluded that the OVC awarded the NFG Grant Program funds in a fair and reasonable manner.

The full results of our review of the OVC's solicitation requirements, applications, and award processes are discussed in the sections below.

Recovery Act Program Solicitations

In support of its Recovery Act efforts, the OVC posted solicitations for three Recovery Act programs. We reviewed those solicitations and found that each contained the appropriate requirements as described in the Recovery Act and guidance issued by OMB. However, we identified concerns related to the performance measures discussed in one of the solicitations. We relayed these concerns to the OVC in a Management Advisory Memorandum (MAM) entitled Improving Performance Measures for the Office for Victims of Crime Awards Authorized by the Recovery Act, dated April 15, 2009. These concerns have since been resolved, as explained below.

Our April 2009 MAM discussed the requirements in the VOCA Victim Compensation Grant Program solicitation to measure jobs retained based on Recovery Act funding. Specifically, to measure jobs retained, the solicitation required award recipients to report the number of claimants that received Recovery Act funds to help offset economic loss due to victimization. However, the funding compensates victims for lost wages or other financial support such as medical expenses, mental health counseling, or funeral expenses and does not represent jobs retained. As a result, we provided the following advice to the OVC in our April 2009 MAM:

- We believe VOCA payments are part of the essential services funded by the VOCA Victim Compensation Grant Program and should not be reported as retained jobs under the Recovery Act.
- We believe the OVC should provide detailed and formal guidance regarding data collections and reporting in order to prevent data inaccuracies and to ensure data compatibility for all award recipients receiving Recovery Act funds. At a minimum, this guidance should define terms used in performance measures and explain procedures for collecting and summarizing the data.
- We believe the OVC should require award recipients to provide baseline data to measure the true impact of Recovery Act funding. Such data should encompass the services provided under these programs prior to receiving Recovery Act funding and will serve as a starting point for the verification of results achieved under each award.

Since our April 2009 MAM, these concerns have been addressed by subsequent guidance issued by OMB, as well as action on the part of the OVC. Specifically, on June 22, 2009, OMB released a guidance memorandum on the reporting requirements included in Section 1512 of the Recovery Act.⁷ The guidance states that recipients should not attempt to report on the employment impact of Recovery Act funds on materials suppliers and central service providers (indirect jobs) or on the local community (induced jobs). OJP also released supplemental guidance to grantees after OMB's guidance was released and the OVC published both the OMB and OJP guidance on its website clarifying the reporting requirements. Additionally, in its response to our MAM, OJP stated that OVC staff will work with grantees to ensure that each grantee gathers baseline data so that the program has the basic information needed to measure performance. Therefore, we consider the issues presented to the OVC in our April 2009 MAM to have been adequately addressed.

Review of the OVC Recovery Act Applications

We reviewed application documentation for each application funded under the two Recovery Act VOCA formula programs entitled the VOCA Victim Assistance Program and the VOCA Victim Compensation Program, as well as the discretionary grant program entitled the NFG Grant Program, to determine if each funded application was complete. The VOCA formula and discretionary programs each had different application requirements. The

⁷ Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-09-21.

VOCA Victim Assistance and VOCA Victim Compensation Program applications we reviewed were all complete, but we found that three NFG Grant Program applications were incomplete. The application requirements and discrepancies are explained in more detail below.

Formula Program Applications

For the 109 applications funded under the two Recovery Act VOCA formula programs – the VOCA Victim Compensation Program and VOCA Victim Assistance Program – we determined whether each state or territory submitted all certifications and assurances required by the solicitation and the Recovery Act. Based on our review, we found that each funded application was complete with the requested information and certifications.⁸

Discretionary Program Applications

For the 13 applications funded under the discretionary NFG Grant Program, we reviewed the program solicitation to determine the Basic Minimum Requirements of the solicitation.⁹ Among other requirements, applicants were required to submit two certifications. One was a certification as to Recovery Act reporting requirements in which recipients certified under 18 U.S.C § 1001 that that they understood all the requirements of Section 1512(c) of the Recovery Act and would comply with them.¹⁰ In addition, applicants were required to submit a general certification as to the

⁸ The solicitation required applicants to submit a completed Standard Form 424, a core government-wide standard data set and form for grant applications; an administrative and training funds usage statement; the state statute covering the victim compensation program; a certification of compliance with “state grantee eligibility requirements”; a description of the applicant’s plan for the collection of the data required for performance measures; a certification as to Recovery Act reporting requirements; and a certification consistent with Section 1511 of the Recovery Act regarding requirements for receipt of Recovery Act funds for infrastructure investments.

⁹ The solicitation required applicants to submit a completed Standard Form 424, a core government-wide standard data set and form for grant applications; an administrative and training funds usage statement; a program narrative; a budget narrative and budget detail worksheet; an indirect cost rate agreement for any proposed indirect costs; resumes of key personnel; a certification as to Recovery Act reporting requirements; and a certification consistent with Section 1511 of the Recovery Act regarding requirements for receipt of Recovery Act funds for infrastructure investments.

¹⁰ Applicants certify that a false statement in the certification may be subject to criminal prosecution, including under 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

requirements for receipt of Recovery Act funds for infrastructure investments under Section 1511 of the Recovery Act.¹¹

Recipients with Incomplete Applications

Based on our review of applications in GMS, we identified one discretionary award recipient with an incomplete application as of December 11, 2009. This grantee that was awarded over \$490,000 under the NFG Grant Program excluded the Recovery Act certification for reporting requirements required by the solicitation.¹² The missing reporting certification provided assurance that: (1) the grantee understands and will comply with the reporting requirements of the Recovery Act, (2) the grantee has been informed that false statements are subject to prosecution and data is subject to OJP review, and (3) the certifying official for the grantee is authorized to make these certifications.

As a result of this omission, the OVC does not have assurance that this recipient is aware of and will comply with some requirements of the Recovery Act and the program solicitation. We discussed this concern with OVC officials and they immediately contacted the grantee in question and obtained the missing Recovery act certification. As a result, we consider the issue of the missing Recovery Act certification to have been adequately addressed.

Review of the OVC Recovery Act Award Process

As shown in Table 1, the OVC received 127 applications under the 2 VOCA formula programs (VOCA Victim Compensation and VOCA Victim Assistance Programs); 109 of these proposals were funded. Of the 18 formula applications that were denied, 7 were duplicates, and 11 were not from applicants that were designated as a state or territory VOCA

¹¹ DOJ defines "infrastructure" as projects requiring "bricks & mortar." Specifically, "projects resulting in, or directly and substantially affecting, a tangible physical structure or other similar construction, repair, or major renovation projects."

¹² This grantee and a second grantee that received approximately \$500,000 did not submit another required certification as to requirements for receipt of Recovery Act funds for infrastructure investments pursuant to Section 1511 of the Recovery Act. The other applicants that did submit this certification required by the solicitation indicated on the certification that their respective projects did not contain infrastructure investments. We discussed this concern with OVC officials and they immediately contacted the grantees in question and obtained the missing Recovery Act infrastructure investment certifications.

administering agency, as is required by the solicitations.¹³ The OVC also received 174 applications under the VOCA discretionary grant program (the NFG Grant Program) and funded 13. Of the 161 denied applications, 7 were duplicate applications, and the remaining 154 were rejected as a result of the competitive process described later in this report.¹⁴

TABLE 1. OVC GRANT APPLICATIONS AND AWARDS

| PROGRAM | APPLICATIONS RECEIVED | APPLICATIONS FUNDED | APPLICATIONS DENIED |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| VOCA Victim Compensation Program | 61 | 53 | 8 |
| VOCA Victim Assistance Program | 66 | 56 | 10 |
| NFG Grant Program | 174 | 13 | 161 |
| TOTAL | 301 | 122 | 179 |

Source: OJP's Grants Management System (GMS)

To ensure that awards were made appropriately, we verified that the formula allocations used for the VOCA Victim Assistance and VOCA Victim Compensation Programs were calculated accurately. In addition, we reviewed the discretionary award process for the NFG Grant Program to ensure those awards were awarded in a fair and appropriate manner. These portions of our review are described in more detail below.

Verification of the OVC's Recovery Act Formula Allocations

To ensure that allocations were made appropriately, we reviewed the distribution of funds for the VOCA Victim Compensation Program and the VOCA Victim Assistance Program and ensured they were made in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. We found no discrepancies with these portions of our review, which are described in more detail below.

VOCA Victim Compensation Program

Allocations of funds under each formula grant program were posted on the OVC's website. Under the VOCA Victim Compensation Program, the formula mandated in VOCA requires that the amount of compensation

¹³ Each state and territory has one agency that the Governor has designated as the VOCA administering agency. Only these designated agencies, as defined in the statutes for VOCA Compensation (42 U.S.C. § 10602 (2007)) and VOCA Assistance programs (42 U.S.C. § 10603 (2007)), are eligible for VOCA formula grants.

¹⁴ Appendices I and II list the awards to each state under the VOCA Victim Compensation Program and VOCA Victim Assistance Program, respectively, and Appendix III lists the awards under the NFG Grant Program.

program funding allocated to eligible programs be 60 percent of the amount awarded during the “preceding fiscal year,” excluding funds awarded for property damage.¹⁵ However, if available funding is insufficient to fund the VOCA program at a minimum of 60 percent of the amount awarded in the preceding fiscal year, the Director of the OVC may distribute funds using an alternative method. This alternative method provides each eligible state crime victim compensation program with the same percentage of total VOCA program funds that it received the preceding fiscal year.

Because the \$47.5 million in Recovery Act funding designated under the VOCA Victim Compensation Program was insufficient to provide 60 percent of the amount awarded in the preceding fiscal year, the OVC allocated funds based on the percentage of the total FY 2009 non-Recovery Act VOCA Formula Grant funds awarded to each state in accordance with VOCA.¹⁶ Appendix I details the breakdown of the Recovery Act funding allocated to each state or territory under the VOCA Victim Compensation Program.

During our review, we verified that the amount of allocations made by the OVC under the VOCA Victim Compensation Program were accurate and in accordance with the requirements of VOCA. We independently calculated the VOCA Victim Compensation Program allocations based on VOCA compensation program certified payouts reported by the state for the preceding fiscal year, as defined by the OVC, and then compared the results to the OVC’s VOCA Victim Compensation Program formula allocations. In addition, we confirmed that the amounts the OVC actually awarded to each state’s VOCA Victim Compensation Program matched the results of the formula allocation. Based on our analysis, we found that the OVC correctly calculated and awarded Recovery Act funding under the VOCA Victim Compensation Program.

VOCA Victim Assistance Program

Under the VOCA Victim Assistance Program, the formula mandated in VOCA requires that each state receives a base amount of \$500,000, and the eligible territories receive a base amount of \$200,000, with any remaining

¹⁵ 42 U.S.C. § 10602 (2007). OVC defines “preceding fiscal year” as the fiscal year preceding the year of deposits in the Crime Victims’ Fund (2 years prior to the grant year).

¹⁶ Since the Recovery Act was a special funding source authorized in FY 2009, the OVC used percentages of the most recent VOCA fund authorization (the FY 2009 non-Recovery Act appropriation) instead of the preceding fiscal year’s allocations.

funds allocated to the eligible states and territories based on population.¹⁷ Appendix II details the breakdown of the \$47.5 million in Recovery Act funding allocated to each state or territory under the VOCA Victim Assistance Program.

During our review, we independently calculated the VOCA Victim Assistance Program allocations based on population estimates obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, as of July 1, 2008, and compared the results to the OVC's VOCA Victim Assistance Program formula allocations. Additionally, we confirmed that the amounts the OVC actually awarded to each state's VOCA Victim Assistance Program matched the results of the formula allocation shown in Appendix II. Based on our analysis, we found that the OVC correctly calculated and awarded Recovery Act funding under the VOCA Victim Assistance Program.

Discretionary Grant Program Award Process

To ensure that the discretionary awards were made appropriately, we reviewed the OVC's process for making the awards. Specifically, we reviewed the peer review process to ensure it was conducted fairly and in an appropriate manner. In addition, we reviewed the final award decisions to ensure that they were not inappropriately influenced by OVC officials. We found no discrepancies with these portions of our review, which are described in more detail below.

Discretionary Grant Program Peer Review Process

As discussed previously, the OVC received 174 applications under the VOCA discretionary grant program, the NFG Grant Program. These applications were internally reviewed by the OVC to determine if the proposed programs were national in scope and if any applicants submitted duplicate applications. As a result of the internal review, the OVC rejected seven duplicate applications. The remaining 167 applications were sent for an external peer review.

Applications sent for peer review under the NFG Grant Program were divided among several panels of peer reviewers. Each peer review panel consisted of 3 reviewers, and each panel reviewed between 10 and 20 applications. Peer reviewers were selected from a pool of potential reviewers maintained by the peer review contractor, Lockheed Martin, based on their qualifications and experience in each of the nine different purpose

¹⁷ 42 U.S.C. § 10603 (a)(5) (2007).

areas listed on the solicitation.¹⁸ Each peer reviewer performed an initial assessment and rated each criterion listed below in Table 2 on a scale of 0 (unacceptable) to 10 (excellent). Each criterion was assigned a weight (percentage) by the OVC, also identified in Table 2.

TABLE 2. CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW OF NFG GRANT PROGRAM APPLICATIONS

| CRITERIA | WEIGHTED POINT VALUE | DISCUSS IF VARIANCE IN WEIGHTED SCORE IS |
|---|----------------------|--|
| Project Abstract | 5% | 1 point or more |
| Statement of the Problem | 10% | 2 points or more |
| Project Goals and Objectives | 10% | 2 points or more |
| Project Design and Implementation | 25% | 5 points or more |
| Organizational Capability and Project Management | 20% | 4 points or more |
| Budget | 15% | 3 points or more |
| Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation/Performance Measure Data Collection Plan | 15% | 3 points or more |

Source: OJP

After the initial scores were analyzed, the contractor held a consensus call to discuss any applications that had score variances between peer reviewers, as defined in Table 2. According to the OVC, the contractor’s role in the consensus call is to facilitate the discussion between the peer reviewers. The solicitation manager, an OVC staff member responsible for overseeing the award process for a solicitation, will also participate to provide clarification to reviewers without influencing the outcome of the application review.

After the consensus call, reviewers updated their assessments and scores based on discussions during the consensus review. Next, the peer review contractor ensured that reviewers had made agreed-upon changes and followed up on any discrepancies. Once the reviewers finalized their scores, the contractor normalized the scores by applying a mathematical process to reviewers’ raw scores in order to minimize their individual biases. After normalizing the scores, the contractor incorporated them into a final scoring report for the OVC, which reported final scores on a scale of

¹⁸ The nine purpose areas were: (1) elder abuse, (2) sexual assault, (3) victim restitution, (4) child abuse, (5) youth victimization (including cybercrime victimization), (6) victim services in corrections settings, (7) stalking, (8) the implications of forensic technologies for victims, and (9) training and technical assistance on crime victims’ rights.

0 (unacceptable) to 100 (excellent). The top 5 applications in each of the 9 NFG Grant Program purpose areas scoring above 85 were considered for funding.¹⁹

Throughout the peer review process, the OVC solicitation managers and subject matter experts are involved to provide clarification to reviewers. However, OJP's grant application peer review procedures prohibit the OVC from influencing the outcome of the application peer review process. To ensure that the OVC's involvement was appropriate, we compared the initial scores reported by the peer reviewers for each application to the final score. Specifically, we attempted to identify variances in the scores that would indicate that an OVC solicitation manager or subject matter expert may have attempted to influence the score. For example, scores that had been changed to meet the minimum criteria for funding consideration following the consensus call could be an indication of influence by participants in the consensus call. Based on our review, we did not identify any applications that were raised above, or lowered below, the threshold of 85 following the consensus call. As a result, we did not identify any indications that OVC officials attempted to significantly influence the external peer review process.

Discretionary Grant Program Award Decisions

As part of the normal awarding process, OVC subject matter experts reviewed the top 5 applications in their assigned purpose area with normalized scores above 85 and submitted to the OVC Director a list of applicants that the subject matter experts believed should be funded. In making the final funding recommendation, the OVC considered factors such as the peer review score, geographic distribution, the number of jobs created or retained, and purpose area. Subject matter experts met with each other and program staff to discuss strengths and weaknesses of each application and developed the list of funding recommendations for the Director of the OVC. Once the Director of the OVC approved them, the funding recommendations were sent to the OJP Assistant Attorney General's Office for final concurrence or non-concurrence. The ultimate decision of funding for the NFG Grant Program lies with the OJP Assistant Attorney General's Office, but justification for funding lower ranked applications over

¹⁹ In some instances there were not 5 applications in a purpose area that scored above 85. In those cases, the OVC considered additional applications in other purpose areas.

those ranked higher is required to be included in the funding decision memorandum.²⁰

The OJP Assistant Attorney General's Office approved the OVC's funding recommendations on June 26, 2009. We reviewed the final funding recommendation list and found that it contained appropriate justification for the funding decisions under the NFG Grant Program. The successful applicants under the NFG Grant Program are shown in Appendix III.

Conclusion

Based on our review, we concluded that the OVC had included all Recovery Act requirements in its three Recovery Act program solicitations, allocated and awarded funds in accordance with the applicable provisions of VOCA for the VOCA Victim Compensation Program and the VOCA Victim Assistance Program, and that the NFG Grant Program award process was open and competitive. However, we had concerns with guidance provided by the OVC to applicants with regard to Recovery Act reporting requirements. These concerns have since been addressed by providing updated guidance from OMB on Recovery Act reporting to grantees. Finally, we identified one incomplete application from an NFG Grant Program award recipient that was missing a critical Recovery Act certification required by the solicitation. OVC has since obtained the missing Recovery Act certification, thereby addressing this concern.

²⁰ The requirement to provide justification for funding lower ranked applications over those ranked higher is required by a March 10, 2009, memorandum issued by the OJP Acting Assistant Attorney General. This memorandum was provided in OJP's response to OIG Audit Report 09-24 *Procedures Used by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to Award Discretionary Grants In Fiscal Year 2007*.

APPENDIX I

**OVC RECOVERY ACT FORMULA ALLOCATIONS
FOR THE VOCA VICTIM COMPENSATION PROGRAM²¹**

| STATE/TERRITORY | PERCENT OF TOTAL ²² | AMOUNT | STATE/TERRITORY | PERCENT OF TOTAL | AMOUNT |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|
| Alabama | 1.78 | \$847,343 | Nevada | 1.15 | \$544,273 |
| Alaska | 0.31 | 149,316 | New Hampshire | 0.13 | 60,301 |
| Arizona | 0.62 | 293,150 | New Jersey | 2.97 | 1,410,671 |
| Arkansas | 0.58 | 276,705 | New Mexico | 0.42 | 201,524 |
| California | 17.07 | 8,110,055 | New York | 5.96 | 2,829,174 |
| Colorado | 1.96 | 929,310 | North Carolina | 1.36 | 647,906 |
| Connecticut | 0.60 | 285,841 | North Dakota | 0.16 | 78,313 |
| Delaware | 0.27 | 130,521 | Ohio | 4.21 | 2,000,627 |
| District of Columbia | 1.62 | 770,857 | Oklahoma | 0.76 | 360,499 |
| Florida | 6.42 | 3,050,799 | Oregon | 0.75 | 356,583 |
| Georgia | 2.14 | 1,015,976 | Pennsylvania | 3.23 | 1,536,233 |
| Hawaii | 0.24 | 115,642 | Rhode Island | 0.39 | 185,862 |
| Idaho | 0.72 | 343,009 | South Carolina | 2.43 | 1,153,023 |
| Illinois | 6.38 | 3,029,132 | South Dakota | 0.08 | 37,329 |
| Indiana | 1.25 | 592,566 | Tennessee | 3.10 | 1,472,799 |
| Iowa | 1.05 | 498,329 | Texas | 16.36 | 7,771,484 |
| Kansas | 0.73 | 346,403 | Utah | 1.41 | 671,400 |
| Kentucky | 0.19 | 89,537 | Vermont | 0.12 | 57,951 |
| Louisiana | 0.49 | 233,894 | Virginia | 0.71 | 335,439 |
| Maine | 0.09 | 42,289 | Washington | 1.98 | 938,446 |
| Maryland | 1.20 | 570,638 | West Virginia | 0.73 | 348,230 |
| Massachusetts | 0.57 | 271,484 | Wisconsin | 0.56 | 264,175 |
| Michigan | 0.75 | 355,800 | Wyoming | 0.36 | 168,894 |
| Minnesota | 0.78 | 369,897 | American Samoa | 0.00 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 0.26 | 122,690 | Guam | 0.00 | 0 |
| Missouri | 2.00 | 951,498 | North Mariana Islands | 0.00 | 0 |
| Montana | 0.19 | 90,582 | Puerto Rico | 0.31 | 145,139 |
| Nebraska | 0.03 | 15,663 | Virgin Islands | 0.05 | 24,799 |

Source: OVC website, <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/fund/recoverycvfa2009.html>

²¹ Differences in totals are due to rounding (the sum of individual numbers prior to rounding may differ from the sum of the individual numbers rounded).

²² Percent of total column was calculated by dividing each individual state's award amount by the total amount awarded of \$47.5 million.

APPENDIX II

**OVC RECOVERY ACT FORMULA ALLOCATIONS
FOR THE VOCA VICTIM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM²³**

| LOCATION | POPULATION ²⁴ | PERCENT OF TOTAL | AMOUNT | STATE/ TERRITORY | POPULATION | PERCENT OF TOTAL | AMOUNT |
|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|------------------|-----------|
| Alabama | 4,661,900 | 1.51 | \$808,000 | Nevada | 2,600,167 | 0.84 | \$672,000 |
| Alaska | 686,293 | 0.22 | 545,000 | New Hampshire | 1,315,809 | 0.43 | 587,000 |
| Arizona | 6,500,180 | 2.11 | 930,000 | New Jersey | 8,682,661 | 2.82 | 1,074,000 |
| Arkansas | 2,855,390 | 0.93 | 689,000 | New Mexico | 1,984,356 | 0.64 | 631,000 |
| California | 36,756,666 | 11.92 | 2,931,000 | New York | 19,490,297 | 6.32 | 1,789,000 |
| Colorado | 4,939,456 | 1.60 | 827,000 | North Carolina | 9,222,414 | 2.99 | 1,110,000 |
| Connecticut | 3,501,252 | 1.14 | 732,000 | North Dakota | 641,481 | 0.21 | 542,000 |
| Delaware | 873,092 | 0.28 | 558,000 | Ohio | 11,485,910 | 3.72 | 1,260,000 |
| District of Columbia | 591,833 | 0.19 | 539,000 | Oklahoma | 3,642,361 | 1.18 | 741,000 |
| Florida | 18,328,340 | 5.94 | 1,712,000 | Oregon | 3,790,060 | 1.23 | 751,000 |
| Georgia | 9,685,744 | 3.14 | 1,141,000 | Pennsylvania | 12,448,279 | 4.04 | 1,323,000 |
| Hawaii | 1,288,198 | 0.42 | 585,000 | Rhode Island | 1,050,788 | 0.34 | 569,000 |
| Idaho | 1,523,816 | 0.49 | 601,000 | South Carolina | 4,479,800 | 1.45 | 796,000 |
| Illinois | 12,901,563 | 4.18 | 1,353,000 | South Dakota | 804,194 | 0.26 | 553,000 |
| Indiana | 6,376,792 | 2.07 | 922,000 | Tennessee | 6,214,888 | 2.02 | 911,000 |
| Iowa | 3,002,555 | 0.97 | 699,000 | Texas | 24,326,974 | 7.89 | 2,109,000 |
| Kansas | 2,802,134 | 0.91 | 685,000 | Utah | 2,736,424 | 0.89 | 681,000 |
| Kentucky | 4,269,245 | 1.38 | 782,000 | Vermont | 621,270 | 0.20 | 541,000 |
| Louisiana | 4,410,796 | 1.43 | 792,000 | Virginia | 7,769,089 | 2.52 | 1,014,000 |
| Maine | 1,316,456 | 0.43 | 587,000 | Washington | 6,549,224 | 2.12 | 933,000 |
| Maryland | 5,633,597 | 1.83 | 873,000 | West Virginia | 1,814,468 | 0.59 | 620,000 |
| Massachusetts | 6,497,967 | 2.11 | 930,000 | Wisconsin | 5,627,967 | 1.83 | 872,000 |
| Michigan | 10,003,422 | 3.24 | 1,162,000 | Wyoming | 532,668 | 0.17 | 535,000 |
| Minnesota | 5,220,393 | 1.69 | 845,000 | American Samoa | 64,827 | 0.02 | 204,000 |
| Mississippi | 2,938,618 | 0.95 | \$694,000 | Guam | 175,991 | 0.06 | 212,000 |
| Missouri | 5,911,605 | 1.92 | 891,000 | North Mariana Islands | 86,616 | 0.03 | 206,000 |
| Montana | 967,440 | 0.31 | 564,000 | Puerto Rico | 3,954,037 | 1.28 | 762,000 |
| Nebraska | 1,783,432 | 0.58 | 618,000 | Virgin Islands | 109,840 | 0.04 | 507,000 |

Source: OVC website, <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/fund/recoverycvfa2009.html>

²³ Differences in totals are due to rounding (the sum of individual numbers prior to rounding may differ from the sum of the individual numbers rounded).

²⁴ Population statistics are as of July 1, 2008. As of this date, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates the total population of the United States to be 304,059,724.

APPENDIX III

**OVC RECOVERY ACT AWARDS FOR THE
NFG GRANT PROGRAM**

| AWARD NUMBER | LOCATION | GRANTEE ORGANIZATION | PURPOSE AREA | AMOUNT AWARDED |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2009-SZ-B9-K001 | KY | Council of State Governments | Victim Services in Corrections | \$363,644 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K002 | NC | Research Triangle Institute | Sexual Assault | 493,799 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K003 | WI | FORGE, Inc. | Sexual Assault | 293,209 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K004 | CA | Youth ALIVE! | Youth Victimization | 406,600 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K005 | DC | National Center for Victims of Crime | Stalking | 347,080 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K006 | DC | National Center for Victims of Crime | Victim Restitution | 185,608 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K007 | VA | National Crime Prevention Council | Youth Victimization | 500,000 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K008 | CA | San Diego University Research Foundation | Elder Abuse | 497,922 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K009 | VA | National Sherriff's Association | Forensic Technology and Victims | 288,522 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K010 | DC | National Center for Victims of Crime | Forensic Technology and Victims | 238,189 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K011 | NY | Girls Educational and Mentoring Services, Inc. | Sexual Assault | 385,837 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K012 | CA | Alliant University | Child Abuse | 499,844 |
| 2009-SZ-B9-K013 | TX | University of Texas at Austin | Child Abuse | 499,746 |
| TOTAL | 13 | | | \$5,000,000 |

Source: OJP's GMS