

Legislative Federal Economic Stimulus Program Oversight Commission  
Department/Agency Questionnaire  
December 22, 2009

ARRA program: STOP (Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Act Formula Grant Program  
Office on Violence Against Women  
U.S. Department of Justice

Project title: OVW RECOVERY ACT STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program 2009-X2081-HI-EF

Award number: 2009-EF-S6-0021

1. **For each group/category or program/project for which ARRA funds have been obtained, please provide the following information:**

(a) **A brief summary of the program/project, including goals;**

This Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant program is intended to increase safety for women victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The goals are to improve law enforcement, prosecution, and court responses to victims of these crimes, and to improve services to the victims.

(b) **Whether funds were appropriated for expenditure by a federal agency, were awarded as a formula/block grant to a State or county agency, or were awarded on a competitive grant basis;**

Formula grant.

(c) **Whether matching funds are required, and, if so:**

- (i) **Are they available;**
- (ii) **Have they been secured;**
- (iii) **If they have not been secured, why not; and**
- (iv) **Will the State be required to continue that match or provide increased/full funding in the future;**

The State has obtained a waiver of the match requirement.

(d) **If there are additional requirements to receive funds, what are they;**

By federal statute, VAWA grant funds must be distributed as follows: 25% to law enforcement agencies, 25% to prosecuting agencies, 30% to nonprofit victim service providers, 5% to the courts, and 15% at the discretion of the State. (The

discretionary funds are usually allocated to nonprofit service providers.) VAWA grant funds cannot be used for prevention activities or services to children, unless the victimization of the child is intrinsically linked to the victimization of the woman (for example, a woman and her child in a domestic violence shelter). Standard federal grant requirements also apply – for example, no supplanting, no discrimination, no lobbying, drug free workplace, equal employment opportunity.

- (e) **The amount of funds involved and the state/federal fiscal year within which the funds must be expended (e.g. SFY 2009-2010 or FFY 2009-2010);**

Amount of fund involved: \$1,047,877

The funds must be expended by April 30, 2011.

- (f) **What criteria were used to identify the program/project as a priority and how does the program/project meet them;**

Hawaii receives a VAWA grant every year. The Department solicits projects based on the priorities established by the VAWA Statewide Planning Committee and the Implementation Plan approved by the Committee. The current priorities are:

*Victim Services:* Core Services for Adult and Teenage Female Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking, which include but are not limited to Advocacy; Case Management; Counseling; Crisis Response; Increased accessibility by special populations including the disabled, immigrants, and victims with substance abuse or mental health issues; Legal Assistance; Shelter; and Transitional Services.

*Law Enforcement:* Training; Specialized Equipment to Assist in Investigations; Crisis Response; Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistants (victim assistants in police departments)

*Prosecution:* Vertical Prosecution; Training

*Multi-disciplinary Training and Staff Support Efforts:* Support and promote multi-disciplinary training, encourage coordination of multi-disciplinary efforts, and provide incentives for valuing and retaining staff.

*Outreach to Underserved:* Increase and fund outreach programs that are culturally and linguistically appropriate and competent to underserved communities.

*Coordination of systems response:* Support and promote a coordinated, managed systems (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, victim services) response, including coordinated system advocacy and services for victims

of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The Committee members are the Attorney General (chair), the Prosecuting Attorney of the City and County of Honolulu, the Prosecuting Attorney of the County of Hawaii, the Chief of the Maui Police Department, the Chief of the Kauai Police Department, a Judge of the Family Court of the First Circuit, the Executive Director of the Hawaii State Commission on the Status of Women, the Executive Director of the Hawaii Immigrant Justice Center, the Coordinator of the Hawaii Coalition Against Sexual Assault, the Executive Director of the Hawaii State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the Executive Director of the Domestic Violence Action Center, the Executive Director of the Sex Abuse Treatment Center, and the United States Attorney for the District of Hawaii (non-voting). In general, the Committee includes two Police Chiefs and two Prosecuting Attorneys, on a rotating basis. Program staff of the member agencies also attend Committee meetings.

**(g) Efforts undertaken to coordinate application for funds and administration of the program/project, including expenditure of funds, with other federal, state, and county agencies;**

On March 19, 2009, the Department facilitated a meeting with the Department of Health, the Department of Human Services, and the Judiciary to review the needs and the distribution of funding by these agencies to domestic violence and sexual assault service providers.

All county Police Chiefs and Prosecuting Attorneys, as well as representatives of the Judiciary, were invited to the VAWA Statewide Planning Committee meeting on March 24, 2009, where the Committee reviewed its priorities and the Department's draft application for the ARRA VAWA funds.

The sub-grant application review panels will include personnel from various state and county government agencies.

**(h) The criteria used to select activities for the program/project;**

Sub-grant applications from government agencies (law enforcement, prosecutors, and the Judiciary) will be scored based on their problem statement, goals and objectives to address the problem, project activities to accomplish objectives, project organization and management, personnel, performance indicators and outcome measures, and probability to improve the criminal justice system.

Sub-grant applications from nonprofit service providers will be scored pursuant to state procurement statutes and rules governing requests for proposals.

In both cases, a multi-agency review panel will be used.

- (i) **Efforts made to provide public notice and seek public comment/input or, if public comment/input was not sought, why;**

The VAWA Statewide Planning Committee meeting on March 24, 2009 was open to the public. At this meeting, the Committee approved the implementation plan proposed by the Department. Later, the Committee members provided support letters for the Department's application. The Department held a Request for Information meeting on May 7, 2009; the meeting notice was posted on the State Procurement Office website on April 24, 2009.

- (j) **Efforts made during the bidding/award process to ensure that it was transparent and that the funds were awarded based on merit and in a prompt, fair, and reasonable manner;**

Please see section 1.(h) above.

- (k) **Measures employed to: (1) reduce duplication of efforts, (2) ensure that funds were used for authorized purposes, and (3) prevent cost overruns, fraud, waste, error, and abuse;**

The Department will review applications to ensure that there is no duplication with other known funding sources, and that the activities and budget items are allowable and reasonable. The Department will conduct desk monitoring (review of program reports and fiscal reports) and site visits, using established grant administration procedures, to verify compliance.

- (l) **Current status of the program/project, including percentage of awarded funds that have been obtained, percentage of awarded funds encumbered and/or expended, and what part(s) of program/project have been completed; and**

As of December 15, 2009, the Department has spent \$366 of administrative funds. The Department has hired a Planning Specialist to administer this grant. In January 2010, the Department will issue solicitations for proposals from criminal justice agencies and a request for proposals from nonprofit service providers. The Department expects that sub-grant awards will be made in March 2010.

- (m) **Actual or anticipated economic impact to the State of the program/project, including the number of jobs saved/created and the long-term public benefits of the program/project.**

Number of jobs saved/created: This number will be determined after the sub-grants are awarded.

Public benefit: Improvements in the ways the criminal justice system addresses violent crimes against women; and provision of services to these crime victims by nonprofit agencies.

2. **For other programs/projects, if ARRA funds, such as competitive grants, were available for a program/project but were not sought or were denied, please briefly describe why the funds were not sought or why they were denied.**

Only coalitions and agencies that operate transition houses were eligible to apply for ARRA VAWA competitive grants.

3. **Please describe:**

- (a) **Any legal/operational barriers/constraints encountered in the award, receipt, encumbrance, or expenditure of funds, including procurement, late/delayed federal guidance, and reporting requirements;**
- (b) **The effect of those barriers/constraints; and**
- (c) **If and how they were mitigated.**

A Special Condition of VAWA grants limits the amount of funds that a state can obligate before the U.S. Office for Violence Against Women (OVW) approves the state's Implementation Plan. The Department received notice of this grant award on May 15, 2009, and submitted the Implementation Plan to OVW for approval on July 6, 2009, but did not receive approval until October 29, 2009. This caused a delay in implementing the award.

The Department also experienced difficulty in recruiting qualified candidates for the three Planning Specialist positions that are necessary to administer the Department's ARRA grants.

Legislative Federal Economic Stimulus Program Oversight Commission  
Department/Agency Questionnaire  
December 22, 2009

ARRA program: Victims of Crime Act Victim Assistance Formula Grant Program  
Office for Victims of Crime  
U.S. Department of Justice

Project title: Recovery Act – OVC FY 09 VOCA Victim Assistance Formula Grant Program

Award number: 2009-SG-B9-0138

**1. For each group/category or program/project for which ARRA funds have been obtained, please provide the following information:**

**(a) A brief summary of the program/project, including goals;**

The overall goal of the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant program is to provide services to crime victims to reduce the impact of the victimization. These services include crisis response, counseling, assistance through the criminal justice process, and information and referrals to other services.

**(b) Whether funds were appropriated for expenditure by a federal agency, were awarded as a formula/block grant to a State or county agency, or were awarded on a competitive grant basis;**

Formula grant.

**(c) Whether matching funds are required, and, if so:**

- (i) Are they available;**
- (ii) Have they been secured;**
- (iii) If they have not been secured, why not; and**
- (iv) Will the State be required to continue that match or provide increased/full funding in the future;**

No match is required for administrative funds. Sub-recipients must provide a 20% cash or in-kind match.

**(d) If there are additional requirements to receive funds, what are they;**

VOCA program requirements apply – for example, funds must be used for direct services to crime victims or for activities that improve direct services; prevention activities are not allowable; at least 10% of funds must be allocated, respectively, to domestic violence services, sexual assault services, child abuse services, and

services to the state-designated underserved population. (In Hawaii, survivors of homicide, DUI victims, and elder abuse victims have been identified as underserved populations.) Standard federal grant requirements also apply – for example, no supplanting, no discrimination, no lobbying, drug free workplace, equal employment opportunity.

- (e) **The amount of funds involved and the state/federal fiscal year within which the funds must be expended (e.g. SFY 2009-2010 or FFY 2009-2010);**

Amount of funds involved: \$585,000

The funds must be expended by September 30, 2012.

- (f) **What criteria were used to identify the program/project as a priority and how does the program/project meet them;**

The VOCA grant program requirements regarding direct services, described above, are the base criteria.

Hawaii receives a VOCA grant every year. The Department passes the majority of these funds through to the county Prosecuting Attorneys' offices, which assume certain administrative responsibilities. The funds support the prosecutors' victim-witness assistance programs and the prosecutors' contracts for crime victim services, such as domestic violence shelters and sex assault crisis centers. This system reflects the underlying philosophy that victim service needs are better identified at the local level, and that county agencies are better able to ensure coordination of local services. The same system is being used for the ARRA VOCA funds.

In April 2009, the Department's VOCA program staff met with the prosecutors' victim-witness assistance program directors to coordinate the use of these funds. It was determined that the funds would best be used to continue services that otherwise would be terminated because of a decrease in state funding for non-profit victim service providers. The Department asked the victim-witness assistance program directors to assess the needs caused in their respective counties by this funding decrease. After discussing funding needs with victim service agencies in their respective counties, each victim-witness assistance program director provided to the Department a problem statement and description regarding gaps and needs in victim services, and how they intended to use the ARRA VOCA funds to provide the needed services.

- (g) **Efforts undertaken to coordinate application for funds and administration of the program/project, including expenditure of funds, with other federal, state, and county agencies;**

Please see section 1.(f) above.

**(h) The criteria used to select activities for the program/project;**

Please see section 1.(f) above.

**(i) Efforts made to provide public notice and seek public comment/input or, if public comment/input was not sought, why;**

The victim-witness assistance program directors communicated with nonprofit service providers regarding victim service needs. A copy of the Department's formula grant application is posted in the Department website, and inquiries from nonprofit victim service providers are referred to the victim-witness assistance program director of the appropriate county.

**(j) Efforts made during the bidding/award process to ensure that it was transparent and that the funds were awarded based on merit and in a prompt, fair, and reasonable manner;**

The Department complies with State procurement statutes and rules. The county Prosecuting Attorneys' offices comply with county procurement procedures.

**(k) Measures employed to: (1) reduce duplication of efforts, (2) ensure that funds were used for authorized purposes, and (3) prevent cost overruns, fraud, waste, error, and abuse;**

The Department reviewed applications to ensure that there was no duplication with other known funding sources, and that the activities and budget items were allowable and reasonable. The Department conducts desk monitoring (review of program reports and fiscal reports) and site visits, using established grant administration procedures, to verify compliance. The county Prosecuting Attorneys' offices conduct program and fiscal monitoring of their nonprofit subgrantees.

**(l) Current status of the program/project, including percentage of awarded funds that have been obtained, percentage of awarded funds encumbered and/or expended, and what part(s) of program/project have been completed; and**

No funds have been expended. The Department is in the process of obtaining signatures for two of the four contracts. For the other two contracts, the Department is working with the respective county Prosecuting Attorneys' offices to revise certain goals, objectives, and budget items. The Department expects that the four contracts will be executed in January 2010.

- (m) **Actual or anticipated economic impact to the State of the program/project, including the number of jobs saved/created and the long-term public benefits of the program/project.**

Number of jobs created/saved: This number will be determined after the county Prosecuting Attorneys' offices complete their sub-grants to nonprofit service providers.

Public benefit: Provision of services to crime victims that otherwise would not be available because of a lack of funding for personnel.

2. **For other programs/projects, if ARRA funds, such as competitive grants, were available for a program/project but were not sought or were denied, please briefly describe why the funds were not sought or why they were denied.**

Not applicable. No other ARRA funds were available for the VOCA program.

3. **Please describe:**

- (a) **Any legal/operational barriers/constraints encountered in the award, receipt, encumbrance, or expenditure of funds, including procurement, late/delayed federal guidance, and reporting requirements;**  
(b) **The effect of those barriers/constraints; and**  
(c) **If and how they were mitigated.**

None.

Legislative Federal Economic Stimulus Program Oversight Commission  
Department/Agency Questionnaire  
December 22, 2009

ARRA program: Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Grant Program  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention  
U.S. Department of Justice

Project title: ICAC Task Force - HI

Award number: 2009-SN-B9-K004

**1. For each group/category or program/project for which ARRA funds have been obtained, please provide the following information:**

**(a) A brief summary of the program/project, including goals;**

In 2001, the Department of the Attorney General received a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to establish an Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force to investigate and prosecute technology facilitated crimes against children, conduct forensic examinations, and provide community awareness programs concerning these crimes. Under the ARRA Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, existing task forces received specific sums of recovery funds. The Hawaii ICAC Task Force is using these funds to increase the Task Force's performance in (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of investigations and prosecutions of ICAC offenses; and (2) public awareness and prevention of ICAC offenses.

**(b) Whether funds were appropriated for expenditure by a federal agency, were awarded as a formula/block grant to a State or county agency, or were awarded on a competitive grant basis;**

Formula/block grant.

**(c) Whether matching funds are required, and, if so:**

- (i) Are they available;**
- (ii) Have they been secured;**
- (iii) If they have not been secured, why not; and**
- (iv) Will the State be required to continue that match or provide increased/full funding in the future;**

Matching funds are not required.

**(d) If there are additional requirements to receive funds, what are they;**

None.

- (e) **The amount of funds involved and the state/federal fiscal year within which the funds must be expended (e.g. SFY 2009-2010 or FFY 2009-2010);**

Amount of funds involved: \$463,917

The funds must be expended between April 1, 2009 and March 31, 2013.

- (f) **What criteria were used to identify the program/project as a priority and how does the program/project meet them;**

Only agencies that currently receive funds under the U.S. Department of Justice ICAC Task Force Program were eligible to receive funds under this ARRA program. The ICAC Task Force helps prevent Internet crimes against children and bring perpetrators to justice by increasing public awareness and increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of investigations and prosecutions.

- (g) **Efforts undertaken to coordinate application for funds and administration of the program/project, including expenditure of funds, with other federal, state, and county agencies;**

None. The ICAC Task Force was established in 2001, and written agreements among the members are already in effect.

- (h) **The criteria used to select activities for the program/project;**

Under this program, activities must further the goals of maintaining or expanding the ICAC Task Force and improving its effectiveness to prevent, interdict, investigate, and prosecute technology-facilitated child exploitation and Internet crimes against children.

- (i) **Efforts made to provide public notice and seek public comment/input or, if public comment/input was not sought, why;**

None. Participation in the ICAC Task Force is limited to law enforcement agencies.

- (j) **Efforts made during the bidding/award process to ensure that it was transparent and that the funds were awarded based on merit and in a prompt, fair, and reasonable manner;**

There was no bidding/award process because there are no sub-recipients.

- (k) Measures employed to: (1) reduce duplication of efforts, (2) ensure that funds were used for authorized purposes, and (3) prevent cost overruns, fraud, waste, error, and abuse;**

(1) The ICAC Task Force includes federal, state, and local agencies that investigate and prosecute Internet crimes against children in Hawaii. The members regularly meet and share information. There is no other ICAC Task Force in Hawaii.

(2) All of the Department's federal grant funds are coded to separate accounts. Charges to these accounts must go through several levels of approval, including the program manager, division supervisor, Administrative Services Officer, the Department's fiscal office, and the Department of Accounting and General Services Pre-Audit Branch. At each level, each charge is reviewed to ensure that it is appropriate for the specific account.

(3) Costs are monitored at the program level by the program manager and the Auditor assigned to the ICAC Task Force program. Further review is conducted by the Department's fiscal office and the Department of Accounting and General Services Pre-Audit Branch. Charges to the account must comply with any standards associated with the grant and with applicable State Procurement Office rules.

- (l) Current status of the program/project, including percentage of awarded funds that have been obtained, percentage of awarded funds encumbered and/or expended, and what part(s) of program/project have been completed; and**

The Department has hired a Deputy Attorney General to prosecute ICAC cases, and a Technical Support Assistant to assist unit personnel and Task Force members in technical areas.

- (m) Actual or anticipated economic impact to the State of the program/project, including the number of jobs saved/created and the long-term public benefits of the program/project.**

Number of jobs created: 2

Long-term public benefits: Investigation, prosecution, and prevention of Internet crimes against children.

- 2. For other programs/projects, if ARRA funds, such as competitive grants, were available for a program/project but were not sought or were denied, please briefly describe why the funds were not sought or why they were denied.**

No other ARRA funds were available to support ICAC Task Force operations. Other ARRA grants related to Internet crimes against children were available (for example, the University of Hawaii received a grant to research and assess certain technology concerns), but these were not appropriate for the Department of the Attorney General. The Department brought the other ARRA grant opportunities to the attention of other agencies.

**3. Please describe:**

- (a) Any legal/operational barriers/constraints encountered in the award, receipt, encumbrance, or expenditure of funds, including procurement, late/delayed federal guidance, and reporting requirements;**
- (b) The effect of those barriers/constraints; and**
- (c) If and how they were mitigated.**

None.

Legislative Federal Economic Stimulus Program Oversight Commission  
Department/Agency Questionnaire  
December 22, 2009

ARRA program: Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
U.S. Department of Justice

Award number: 2009-SU-B9-0044

Project title: State of Hawaii 2009 Recovery Act Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program

**1. For each group/category or program/project for which ARRA funds have been obtained, please provide the following information:**

**(a) A brief summary of the program/project, including goals;**

The overall goal of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program is to assist state and local criminal justice efforts in preventing or reducing crime and violence. The funds are sub-granted for projects such as drug task forces, specialized prosecution units, forensic evidence units, criminal justice database improvements, school emergency response plans, family justice centers, and offender assessment and reentry projects.

**(b) Whether funds were appropriated for expenditure by a federal agency, were awarded as a formula/block grant to a State or county agency, or were awarded on a competitive grant basis;**

Formula grant.

**(c) Whether matching funds are required, and, if so:**

- (i) Are they available;**
- (ii) Have they been secured;**
- (iii) If they have not been secured, why not; and**
- (iv) Will the State be required to continue that match or provide increased/full funding in the future;**

Matching funds are not required.

**(d) If there are additional requirements to receive funds, what are they;**

Standard federal grant requirements apply – for example, no supplanting, no discrimination, no lobbying, drug free workplace, equal employment opportunity.

- (e) **The amount of funds involved and the state/federal fiscal year within which the funds must be expended (e.g. SFY 2009-2010 or FFY 2009-2010);**

Amount of funds involved: \$6,424,438

The funds must be expended by April 30, 2013.

- (f) **What criteria were used to identify the program/project as a priority and how does the program/project meet them;**

Hawaii receives a JAG formula grant every year. The Governor's Committee on Crime selects the priorities for these funds from among the purpose areas authorized by the U.S. Department of Justice. On March 24, 2009, the Committee selected the following priorities: law enforcement programs; prosecution and court programs; corrections and community corrections programs; drug treatment and enforcement programs; and planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs.

The current Committee members are the Attorney General (chair), the First Circuit Criminal Administrative Judge, the Administrative Director of the Courts, the Superintendent of the Department of Education, the Director of the Department of Health, the Director of the Department of Public Safety, the Chair of the Hawaii Paroling Authority, the Chief of the Hawaii Police Department, the Chief of the Honolulu Police Department, the Prosecuting Attorney of the County of Kauai, the Prosecuting Attorney of the County of Maui; and the U.S. Attorney for the District of Hawaii (non-voting).

In general, the Committee includes two Police Chiefs and two Prosecuting Attorneys, on a rotating basis. The Police Chiefs and Prosecuting Attorneys who are not current members are invited to Committee meetings. Program staff of the member agencies also attend Committee meetings.

- (g) **Efforts undertaken to coordinate application for funds and administration of the program/project, including expenditure of funds, with other federal, state, and county agencies;**

The panels that conducted the first review of the sub-grant applications included employees of various criminal justice agencies. The Governor's Committee on Crime, which comprises the agencies listed in section 1.(f) above, also reviewed and approved the sub-grant applications. At Committee meetings, county police and prosecutors reported on their plans for using the ARRA JAG funds that counties received directly from the U.S. Department of Justice.

Coordination among agencies also occurs at the operational level, where appropriate. For example, police departments that receive funding for drug task

forces coordinate missions with appropriate federal agencies, such as the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration.

**(h) The criteria used to select activities for the program/project;**

The sub-grant application scores were based on the following categories: problem statement, goals and objectives to address the problem, project activities to accomplish objectives, project organization and management, personnel, performance indicators and outcome measures, and probability to improve the criminal justice system.

**(i) Efforts made to provide public notice and seek public comment/input or, if public comment/input was not sought, why;**

The Department posted a draft of its formula grant application on the Department's website for public comment before submitting it to the U.S. Department of Justice. The Department held informational meetings with Oahu criminal justice agencies on March 20, 2009, and with neighbor island criminal justice agencies by videoconference on March 23, 2009. Governor's Committee on Crime meetings, including the meetings where ARRA grants were discussed, are open to the public.

**(j) Efforts made during the bidding/award process to ensure that it was transparent and that the funds were awarded based on merit and in a prompt, fair, and reasonable manner;**

A three tier review process was used. First, three panels comprising the Department's JAG program staff and employees of various criminal justice agencies conducted an initial review. Second, the Department's JAG program staff reviewed the panels' findings and made funding recommendations to the Governor's Committee on Crime. Third, the Committee reviewed the sub-grant application materials, voted on which projects to fund, and made recommendations to the Attorney General. The Attorney General accepted the Committee's recommendations. The Department received 46 sub-grant applications and awarded 23 sub-grants.

**(k) Measures employed to: (1) reduce duplication of efforts, (2) ensure that funds were used for authorized purposes, and (3) prevent cost overruns, fraud, waste, error, and abuse;**

The Department reviewed the sub-grant applications to ensure that there was no duplication with other known funding sources, and that the activities and budget items were allowable and reasonable. The Department will conduct desk monitoring (review of program reports and fiscal reports) and site visits, using established grant administration procedures, to verify compliance.

- (l) **Current status of the program/project, including percentage of awarded funds that have been obtained, percentage of awarded funds encumbered and/or expended, and what part(s) of program/project have been completed; and**

The JAG grant program requires the State to draw down the funds in one lump sum at the start of the grant period. All of the ARRA JAG grant funds have been encumbered. As of September 30, 2009 (the end of the first sub-recipient reporting period), four of the twenty-three projects were operational; the other contracts were in process. As of November 30, 2009, the Department and its sub-recipients had spent a total of \$40,463.

- (m) **Actual or anticipated economic impact to the State of the program/project, including the number of jobs saved/created and the long-term public benefits of the program/project.**

Number of jobs saved/created: Approximately 30. The actual number will be determined after the sub-grant projects have been implemented, positions have been filled, and contracts with vendors have been executed.

Public benefits: Prevention and reduction of crime and violence.

2. **For other programs/projects, if ARRA funds, such as competitive grants, were available for a program/project but were not sought or were denied, please briefly describe why the funds were not sought or why they were denied.**

The other ARRA criminal justice grant programs were not appropriate for the Department of the Attorney General. The Department distributed a list of ARRA criminal justice grant opportunities to other state and county criminal justice agencies and the Judiciary.

3. **Please describe:**

- (a) **Any legal/operational barriers/constraints encountered in the award, receipt, encumbrance, or expenditure of funds, including procurement, late/delayed federal guidance, and reporting requirements;**  
(b) **The effect of those barriers/constraints; and**  
(c) **If and how they were mitigated.**

None.

Legislative Federal Economic Stimulus Program Oversight Commission  
Department/Agency Questionnaire  
December 22, 2009

ARRA Program: Office of Child Support Enforcement  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Project: Hawaii Child Support Enforcement Agency

**1. For each group/category or program/project for which ARRA funds have been obtained, please provide the following information:**

**(a) A brief summary of the program/project, including goals;**

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) provides incentive funds to state child support enforcement agencies that perform well in certain categories established by DHHS. In the past, DHHS additionally provided two dollars of matching funds for every dollar of incentive funds that a state earned and spent, but at the end of federal fiscal year 2006-2007, Congress eliminated the additional matching funds. The present ARRA program temporarily restores the matching funds. These ARRA matching funds can be used for any legitimate expenditure to support the state child support enforcement program.

**(b) Whether funds were appropriated for expenditure by a federal agency, were awarded as a formula/block grant to a State or county agency, or were awarded on a competitive grant basis;**

Formula grant.

**(c) Whether matching funds are required, and, if so:**

- (i) Are they available;**
- (ii) Have they been secured;**
- (iii) If they have not been secured, why not; and**
- (iv) Will the State be required to continue that match or provide increased/full funding in the future;**

These ARRA funds *are* matching funds for federal incentive funds earned and spent as described in section 1.(a) of this questionnaire. State matching funds are not required.

**(d) If there are additional requirements to receive funds, what are they;**

Not applicable. There are no additional requirements.

- (e) **The amount of funds involved and the state/federal fiscal year within which the funds must be expended (e.g. SFY 2009-2010 or FFY 2009-2010);**

DHHS awarded to the Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA) \$1.4 million in federal incentive funds before September 30, 2009. By spending these federal incentive funds between July 1, 2009 and September 30, 2010, CSEA expects to generate \$2.8 million in ARRA matching funds. The ARRA matching funds must be expended by September 30, 2010.

- (f) **What criteria were used to identify the program/project as a priority and how does the program/project meet them;**

(1) The project will enhance the existing child support enforcement system, or (2) the project will improve the operational infrastructure of CSEA. For example, the employer data clean-up project will greatly reduce unnecessary use of system resources and facilitate posting of child support payments from employers, which in turn will result in better service for custodial parents; and creating new positions in various areas will strengthen operations in those areas.

- (g) **Efforts undertaken to coordinate application for funds and administration of the program/project, including expenditure of funds, with other federal, state, and county agencies;**

These Child Support Enforcement ARRA funds were made available to CSEA as part of the entitlement program that provides all other federal funds to the child support program. Thus, there was no application process per se.

The ARRA funds have given CSEA the opportunity to explore how various types of services that were curtailed or restricted through the budget process could be reinstated, at least during the ARRA time frame. CSEA has coordinated mainly with the federal office of Child Support Enforcement to ensure that funds are drawn down properly and to maximize the amount of funds that CSEA can bring into the state.

- (h) **The criteria used to select activities for the program/project;**

(1) The activity is a legitimate child support expenditure; (2) the activity will provide a value to the program in providing services to families, and (3) the money can be spent before September 30, 2010.

- (i) **Efforts made to provide public notice and seek public comment/input or, if public comment/input was not sought, why;**

None. Public comment/input is not required under this program.

- (j) **Efforts made during the bidding/award process to ensure that it was transparent and that the funds were awarded based on merit and in a prompt, fair, and reasonable manner;**

The bidding/award process complies with state procurement statutes and rules.

- (k) **Measures employed to: (1) reduce duplication of efforts, (2) ensure that funds were used for authorized purposes, and (3) prevent cost overruns, fraud, waste, error, and abuse;**

(1) No other agency in Hawaii provides child support enforcement services.

(2) All of the Department's federal grant funds are coded to separate accounts. Charges to these accounts must go through several levels of approval, including the program manager, division supervisor, Administrative Services Officer, the Department's fiscal office, and the Department of Accounting and General Services Pre-Audit Branch. At each level, each charge is reviewed to ensure that it is appropriate for the specific account.

(3) Costs are monitored by the program manager and CSEA's Accountant Supervisor. Further review is conducted by the Department's fiscal office and the Department of Accounting and General Services Pre-Audit Branch. Charges to the account must comply with the DHHS requirements for this program and with applicable State Procurement Office rules.

- (l) **Current status of the program/project, including percentage of awarded funds that have been obtained, percentage of awarded funds encumbered and/or expended, and what part(s) of program/project have been completed; and**

CSEA has spent approximately \$226,000 in federal incentive funds between July 1, 2009 and November 30, 2009. This has generated approximately \$438,000 in ARRA matching funds, which must be spent by September 30, 2010.

CSEA has created twenty positions. Other activities include the Customer Service Training project (completed in October 2009), the Decision Support System Training project (the vendor has been selected); the Employer Data Clean-Up project (the contract has been executed and the work will start in January 2010); the Interactive Voice Response Unit project (the contract is being processed); hiring additional staff for the Deadbeat Parent unit, in order to enforce more cases with high arrearages; acquiring furniture and equipment (a request for proposals for furniture has been issued, and CSEA expects to purchase computer equipment in early 2010); and expanding the personal service of process activities within CSEA.

- (m) **Actual or anticipated economic impact to the State of the program/project, including the number of jobs saved/created and the long-term public benefits of the program/project.**

Number of jobs saved/created: CSEA has established twenty positions (one Administrative Processing Branch Attorney, two Child Support Enforcement Supervisors, one Deputy Attorney General, one Information Technology Specialist, one Investigator, two Legal Clerks, ten Office Assistants, and two Program Specialists). CSEA has filled eight of these positions, is recruiting for eight of these positions, and is processing personnel documents for four individuals who have accepted position offers.

The Department does not monitor the number of jobs saved or created by CSEA ARRA sub-contracts because CSEA ARRA funds are not subject to federal ARRA reporting requirements.

Long-term public benefits: Children receive financial support from absent parents. The State receives reimbursement for public assistance programs.

2. **For other programs/projects, if ARRA funds, such as competitive grants, were available for a program/project but were not sought or were denied, please briefly describe why the funds were not sought or why they were denied.**

Not applicable. No other ARRA grants programs were available for child support enforcement services.

3. **Please describe:**

- (a) **Any legal/operational barriers/constraints encountered in the award, receipt, encumbrance, or expenditure of funds, including procurement, late/delayed federal guidance, and reporting requirements;**  
(b) **The effect of those barriers/constraints; and**  
(c) **If and how they were mitigated.**

The Office of Management and Budget issued its *Updated Implementing Guidance for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* approximately two months after Congress passed the ARRA. Because this guidance contained essential information regarding the requirements of this program, CSEA was unable to spend ARRA funds during this two-month period.