

BOARD MEETINGS

JULY 1, 2015

Austin, Texas



TEXAS
JUVENILE ★ JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



TEXAS
JUVENILE JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT

Board Meeting

11209 Metric Boulevard, Building H, Ste. A – Lone Star Conference Room

Austin, TX 78758

Wednesday, July 1, 2015 – 9:00 a.m.

1. Call to order

Chairman Fisher

2. Prayer

Clayton Heald

3. Pledge

Chairman Fisher

4. Discussion, consideration, and possible approval regarding excused absences (Action)

Chairman Fisher

5. Public comments

Chairman Fisher

6. State financial assistance contract and funding allocation recommendation (Action)

Mike Meyer | Page 5

7. Adjourn

- The Texas Juvenile Justice Department Board reserves the right to limit the time and scope of public comments as deemed appropriate by the Board.
- The Board of the Texas Juvenile Justice Department reserves the right to take formal board action on any posted agenda item if necessary.
- Items may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.
- The Board of the Texas Juvenile Justice Department may go into closed session as authorized by the Texas Open Meetings Act as codified in Texas Government Code Section 551.071 with respect to any item.
- If ADA accommodations are needed, please contact Jeannette Cantu at 512.490.7004 or Jeannette.Cantu@tjjd.texas.gov

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



TEXAS
JUVENILE JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT

Memorandum

To: Members of the TJJD Board

From: David Reilly, Executive Director

Michael Meyer, Chief Financial Officer

Subject: FY 2016 State Aid Grant Structure and Funding Allocation Methodology

Date: July 1, 2015

Each year, the TJJD Board approves probation department funding allocations for the agency's primary state financial assistance grants. For the 2014-2015 biennium, these included Grants A (State Aid), C (Commitment Diversion), and N (Mental Health Services). In prior years, the Board also approved commitment targets by department in conjunction with funding allocations under Grant C.

TJJD received several directives from the 84th Legislature requiring changes to the current structure of probation grants and reporting beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2016. The attachments describe the TJJD staff's recommended implementation of those legislative directives, provide answers to frequently asked questions, and provide recommended allocations by department under the new structure, totaling \$134.7 million.¹

The proposal was distributed across the state for consideration by field practitioners and was discussed with the TJJD Advisory Council. Their feedback has been integrated, and the Advisory Council expressed its support. Pending Board approval of the proposal, the *State Financial Assistance Contract for the 2016-2017 Biennium* will be updated to match, and a draft will be distributed for field comments on or around the 10th of July.

¹ Information on other funded programs, including the Border Justice Project, Harris County Leadership Academy, Special Needs Diversionary Program, Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Programs, and any others will be provided at the Board's August meeting.



TEXAS
JUVENILE ★ JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT

Memorandum

TJJD staff intend to gather and respond to field feedback on two additional areas during that process: whether administrative expenses should appear as a separate expenditure reporting category or remain embedded in the existing categories, and how to distribute the statewide commitment target. No other substantive considerations are expected. The final contract will be distributed to departments at the Budget Workshop at the end of July.

The resolution before the Board:

- Approves the proposed State Aid grant structure and funding allocation methodology, including individual departmental funding allocations;
- Authorizes TJJD's Executive Director to craft and execute the *State Financial Assistance Contract for the 2016-2017 Biennium* in alignment with the proposed grant structure and funding allocations; and
- Empowers Mr. Reilly to establish a methodology for distributing the statewide commitment target, and to resolve any considerations related to the State Aid grant structure that may arise before execution of the contract, provided the resolution is within the spirit of the proposal approved by the Board.



TEXAS
JUVENILE JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT

Memorandum

To: TJJJ Board Members
TJJJ Advisory Council
Juvenile Probation Department Chiefs
From: David Reilly, Executive Director
Subject: FY 2016 Probation Grant Structure and Allocation Methodology
Date: June 29, 2015

This memo describes actions taken by the 84th Legislature affecting grants to local probation departments and a proposed fiscal year (FY) 2016 grant structure and funding allocation methodology to implement legislative direction. Feedback was requested from the TJJJ Advisory Council and other field practitioners to ensure the optimal blend of achieving legislative requirements and maintaining local flexibility. That feedback has been integrated into the proposal.

Legislative Actions and Mandates

The Texas Juvenile Justice Department's (TJJJ) FY16 appropriations reflect a population-based funding reduction and a reorganization of funding in areas supporting general and targeted state financial assistance to local juvenile probation departments. In addition, a new policy rider directs TJJJ to create a grant and reporting structure that adheres to TJJJ's appropriations pattern while providing flexibility in the use of funds.

Separately, Senate Bill 1630 included directives to establish a regionalization plan; to clearly define "Basic Probation" and the formula used to calculate related funding allocations; and to develop "discretionary grant funding protocols" with recidivism reduction goals that link funding to documented, data-driven, and research-based practices.

These legislative requirements necessitate several changes to both TJJJ's probation grant structure and funding allocation methods. Most initiatives under SB 1630 will be developed over the course of FY16 and become effective at a later time.

Probation Grant Structure

Grants to local probation departments provided under the State Financial Assistance Contract will be divided into two groups: State Aid (subsuming old Grants A, C and N) and Targeted Grants.

State Aid

State Aid includes grants available to all departments. Component areas differ by eligible/target population and programmatic focus, but are grouped together to allow maximum flexibility in application of funds between grants. This group includes: Basic Probation Supervision, Community Programs, Pre & Post Adjudication, Commitment Diversion, and Mental Health Services.

A minimum budget/expenditure amount for each of the five areas will be provided to each department. A maximum for Basic Probation Supervision will also be provided. Departments must budget and expend in conformance with these limits unless approved by TJJJ (see below). Departments will receive an additional allocation referred to as “Flexible Funds” that may be budgeted and expended under any of the State Aid grants, as determined by each department, except that the designated maximum for Basic Probation Supervision may not be exceeded without approval.

Requests to expend less than the allocated minimum for a particular State Aid grant, to reallocate minimum funding to another grant, and/or to exceed the allocated maximum for Basic Probation Supervision may be submitted to TJJJ for review and possible approval, subject to the following:

1. A department’s initial budget submission must conform to the designated minimum/maximum by grant, and the total for all State Aid must equal the total department allocation for this group (including Flexible Funds).
2. Budget reallocation requests may not be submitted prior to a department’s initial budget submission, but may be submitted in conjunction with the initial submission or at any point thereafter. Requests will be prioritized on a first-come-first-served basis and approved to the extent possible within *General Appropriations Act (GAA)* requirements. TJJJ will develop protocols for submitting and approving requests.
3. A department that fails to meet the deadline for initial budgetary submission and/or any data reporting deadlines is not eligible to request a transfer.
4. Funds not spent, or not spent in accordance with a department’s approved budget, must be refunded to the State.

The following table provides an example of how funding allocations may be shown in the FY16 State Financial Assistance Contract:

State Aid	Minimum	Maximum
Basic Probation Supervision	\$24,001	\$30,000
Community Programs	\$39,394	
Pre & Post Adjudication	\$19,799	
Commitment Diversion	\$11,385	
Mental Health Services	\$10,765	
<i>Flexible Funds</i>	\$19,656	
Total, State Aid	\$125,000	

In this scenario, the department must budget/expend at the minimum level indicated for each grant, may budget the \$19,656 in Flexible Funds in any of the five State Aid areas, but may not exceed \$30,000 in Basic Probation Supervision without approval.

Targeted Grants

Targeted Grants include those that are not available to all departments, but are offered on a competitive basis, with highly specific eligibility criteria and/or programmatic focus. Grants in this group may fluctuate; examples include: Prevention and Intervention, Border Justice Project, Special Needs Diversionary Program, Harris County Leadership Academy, and Regional Diversion Alternatives (currently under development). The present proposal does not affect these grants in any way except as described below.

Requests to transfer Flexible Funds under State Aid to a Targeted Grant may be submitted to TJJJ for review and possible approval, subject to the following:

1. A department's initial State Aid budget submission may not assume such a transfer.
2. Budget reallocation requests may not be submitted prior to a department's initial State Aid budget submission, but may be submitted in conjunction with the initial submission or at any point thereafter. Requests will be prioritized on a first-come-first-served basis and approved to the extent possible within GAA requirements. TJJJ will develop protocols for submitting and approving requests.
3. A department that fails to meet the deadline for initial State Aid budgetary submission and/or any data reporting deadlines is not eligible to request a transfer.
4. Funds not spent, or not spent in accordance with a department's approved budget, must be refunded to the State.

Budget/Expenditure Matrix

In addition to the flexibility and discretion offered by the "Flexible Funds" category within State Aid, departments have options in budgeting/expending funds for programs and services in cases where there is cross-over eligibility.

For example:

1. Certain programs and services provided to a youth that is both at risk of commitment to TJJJ and has a demonstrated mental health need could be budgeted/expended through either Commitment Diversion or Mental Health Services.
2. A mental health residential placement could be budgeted/expended via either Pre & Post Adjudication or Mental Health Services.
3. A mental health assessment could be funded through any State Aid grant.

The attached State Aid Budget/Expenditure Matrix illustrates these options. The updated *State Financial Assistance Contract for the FY16-17 Biennium* will include more detailed definitions and eligibility information. TJJJ plans to submit a draft contract for field feedback in July.

FY16 Funding Allocation Methodology

The information below describes TJJJ's recommended methodology for determining FY16 departmental funding and allocating that funding under the structure described above. Examples and explanations are also provided.

Calculation of Available Funds and System-wide Funding Reduction

1. Total General Revenue appropriated in strategies¹ supporting State Aid: \$138,053,162
2. Set-asides: \$3,374,034
 - a. Border Justice Project: \$100,000
 - b. Harris Co. Leadership Academy: \$1,000,000
 - c. Special Needs Diversionary Program: \$1,974,034
 - d. Small/Medium Department Commitment Diversion Pool: \$300,000
3. Remaining funds for allocation: \$134,679,128
4. Total initial 2015 Grants A/C/N Allocations: \$139,057,044
5. Total system-wide funding reduction: \$4,377,916

Calculation of Total FY16 Departmental State Aid Allocation

1. The total system-wide funding reduction is applied proportionally across departments based on each department's share of initial FY15 Grant A allocations, except that any remaining non-formula supplements grandfathered for the FY14-15 biennium were phased out by 50 percent.
2. For most departments, this is equivalent to a reduction of about 3.9 percent calculated from its initial FY15 Grant A amount. For departments still receiving a non-formula, grandfathered supplement in FY14-15, this is equivalent to a greater reduction, ranging from 4.2 percent to 13.4 percent. Beginning in 2017 there will be no grandfathered supplements imbedded in formula funding allocations; however, the Supplemental and Emergent Needs program will continue as an avenue for TJJJ to provide targeted assistance to any department faced with significant financial challenges.
3. Therefore, a department's total FY16 State Aid allocation is the sum of:
 - a. A percentage of its initial 2015 Grant A allocation, ranging from 86.6 to 96.1 percent;
 - b. Its initial 2015 Grant C allocation; and
 - c. Its initial 2015 Grant N allocation.

Attribution of a Department's Total State Aid Allocation to Individual Grants

Under the new State Aid grant structure, several component grants are new, and for these there is no historical allocation information to guide the distribution of a department's FY16 total across the new grants. However, historical expenditure information is available to inform that process. As a result, each probation department's total State Aid allocation is distributed across the five State Aid grants using a mixture of FY14 spending patterns² and FY15 allocations.

1. Basic Probation Supervision: equal to each department's proportionate share of FY14 "Court Intake" and "Basic Supervision" expenditures multiplied by the minimum (maximum) system total for FY16.
2. Community Programs: equal to the amount of funds remaining within each department's total FY16 allocation after all other areas are calculated.

¹ These include A.1.2 (Basic Probation Supervision), A.1.3 (Community Programs), A.1.4 (Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities), A.1.5 (Commitment Diversion), and A.1.7 (Mental Health Services Grants).

² For the purposes of these calculations, FY14 Grant A funds expended for mental health purposes are combined with FY14 funds expended under Grant N (Mental Health Services). The FY14 analysis also considered dollars awarded under the Supplemental and Emergent Needs program, but only for the purpose of understanding expenditure patterns.

3. Pre & Post Adjudication: equal to each department’s proportionate share of FY14 expenditures multiplied by the minimum system total for FY16.³
4. Commitment Diversion and Mental Health Services: equal to a blend of actual FY14 expenditures and FY15 allocations. For each area:
 - a. The average between the FY15 allocation and FY14 expenditures is calculated.
 - b. Using average figures across all departments, each department’s proportional share of the total is calculated.
 - c. Each department’s proportional share is multiplied by the minimum system total for FY16.
 - d. For Commitment Diversion, the resulting allocation for each county is 1.9 percent below the average of FY14 expenditures and FY15 allocation; for Mental Health Services, that figure is 4.0 percent.
5. Flexible Funds: equal to approximately 15.7 percent of a department’s total FY16 State Aid allocation.

Under these methods FY16 allocations in each of the five State Aid areas generally decrease relative to former expenditures and allocations, because of system-wide reductions and because dollars are being shifted into the “Flexible Funds” category. In the context of an overall compression of allocations, the flexible dollars are available for departments to restore areas of greater priority.

Funding Allocation Examples

The following examples illustrate the application and results of the methods described above based on different starting conditions. Explanatory notes are also included. In each table, the first two numeric columns show comparisons with breakout by State Aid area. These two columns make it easy to compare FY16 allocations with FY14 expenditures. The last three columns group some areas together to facilitate comparisons to FY15 allocations, which did not distinguish between the first three categories. One example is provided for each of small, medium, large, and urban sized departments.

SMALL DEPARTMENT	FY14 Expended	FY16 Allocated	FY14 Expended	FY15 Allocated	FY16 Allocated
Basic Probation Sprvsn	\$113,542	\$57,807	\$113,542	\$110,546	\$90,463
Community Programs	\$ -	\$32,656			
Pre & Post Adjud.	\$ -	\$ -			
Commitment Diversion	\$12,795	\$12,549	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,549
Mental Health Svcs	\$2,338	\$6,441	\$2,338	\$11,084	\$6,441
Flexible Funds		\$20,422			\$20,422
TOTAL	\$128,674	\$129,875	\$128,674	\$134,425	\$129,875

In the small department example, the county weighted its expenditures heavily in Basic Supervision and Court Intake in FY14 (captured above in “Basic Probation Sprvsn”). However, these areas were strongly affected by the population-based funding reduction as well as the legislative reallocation of funds into Community Programs. This is why there is both a decline in overall allocations and a shift of funding from Basic Supervision into Community Programs. Note, flexibility inherent in the State Aid

³ Funds for nine counties were shifted between other areas to avoid a negative balance in their Community Programs allocation. This had a relatively small impact on other departments’ distribution between areas, but not on total allocation.

Budget/Expenditure Matrix will help this department mitigate the impact of the shift. With regard to Commitment Diversion, this county has been spending exactly its allocation, so we see the FY16 allocation falling below FY14 expenditures as funding is shifted to the “Flexible Funds” category. This county spent below its Mental Health Services allocation, so the FY16 allocation is between FY14 expenditures and FY15 allocation. Flexible Funds for FY16 are equal to 15.7 percent of the total, and may be used in any State Aid area, except that for this county the maximum for Basic Probation Supervision would be \$72,259.

MEDIUM DEPARTMENT	FY14 Expended	FY16 Allocated	FY14 Expended	FY15 Allocated	FY16 Allocated
Basic Probation Sprvsn	\$139,183	\$70,861	\$642,857	\$633,214	\$494,897
Community Programs	\$207,184	\$137,668			
Pre & Post Adjud.	\$296,490	\$286,367			
Commitment Diversion	\$37,231	\$36,518	\$37,231	\$37,231	\$36,518
Mental Health Svcs	\$99,434	\$95,436	\$99,434	\$99,434	\$95,436
Flexible Funds		\$116,963			\$116,963
TOTAL	\$779,522	\$743,814	\$779,522	\$769,879	\$743,814

In this medium department, allocations in the first three grants drop, as expected, as funding is shifted to the flexible category. Unlike the small department example, we do not see as significant a shift of funds into Community Programs because the department was already spending strongly in that area. The department was spending right at allocations in Commitment Diversion and Mental Health Services, so FY16 allocations drop slightly. As before, Flexible Funds may be applied in area based on department priorities. This department’s Basic Probation Supervision maximum would be \$88,577.

LARGE DEPARTMENT	FY14 Expended	FY16 Allocated	FY14 Expended	FY15 Allocated	FY16 Allocated
Basic Probation Sprvsn	\$1,053,254	\$536,239	\$2,537,691	\$2,465,220	\$1,918,609
Community Programs	\$752,841	\$675,754			
Pre & Post Adjud.	\$731,596	\$706,616			
Commitment Diversion	\$263,714	\$260,348	\$263,714	\$267,149	\$260,348
Mental Health Svcs	\$297,581	\$281,110	\$297,581	\$288,189	\$281,110
Flexible Funds		\$459,016			\$459,016
TOTAL	\$3,098,986	\$2,919,083	\$3,098,986	\$3,020,558	\$2,919,083

Among the first three areas, this large department’s allocation drops, as expected. The department has a proportionately higher share of funds in Community Programs due to the legislative reallocation. This department spent very close to its Commitment Diversion allocation, and the FY16 allocation falls slightly below FY14 expenditures. The department spent very slightly more on Mental Health Services than allocated, and the FY16 allocation falls below FY14 expenditures. This department’s Basic Supervision maximum would be \$670,299.

URBAN DEPARTMENT	FY14 Expended	FY16 Allocated	FY14 Expended	FY15 Allocated	FY16 Allocated
Basic Probation Sprvsn	\$3,229,317	\$1,644,130	\$3,420,708	\$4,121,495	\$2,792,110
Community Programs	\$ -	\$963,124			
Pre & Post Adjud.	\$191,391	\$184,856			
Commitment Diversion	\$893,782	\$876,661	\$893,782	\$893,782	\$876,661
Mental Health Svcs	\$1,182,244	\$768,993	\$1,182,244	\$420,167	\$768,993
Flexible Funds		\$828,029			\$828,029
TOTAL	\$5,496,733	\$5,265,792	\$5,496,733	\$5,435,444	\$5,265,792

This urban department shows both a drop in total funds in the first three areas, and a shift of funds from Basic Probation Supervision into Community Programs. This is the same impact seen in the small department example. As with other examples, the Commitment Diversion allocation drops slightly. In this example, the department spent considerably more on Mental Health Services than allocated. Its FY16 allocation falls between the current allocation and the prior expenditure level. As always, Flexible Funds equal 15.7 percent of the total and may be applied in any State Aid area. This department's Basic Supervision maximum would be \$2,055,163.

Summary

The proposal above is designed to comply with GAA requirements while maximizing flexibility for local probation departments. To accomplish legislative direction, State Aid areas correspond to items of appropriation, and minimum budget/expenditure amounts are provided. Flexibility is accomplished through the combination of a new "Flexible Funds" allocation, which may be budgeted/expended under any State Aid area, and via cross-over eligibility between grants.

Total FY16 departmental State Aid allocations are calculated as a percentage of initial FY15 Grant A allocations, combined with initial FY15 Grant C and Grant N allocations. A department's total allocation for FY16 is distributed across the five State Aid areas on the basis of FY14 expenditure patterns and FY15 initial allocations.

Feedback on this proposal was solicited from the Advisory Council and other field practitioners. That feedback has been integrated to the extent possible. TJD staff will continue to work with probation department chiefs to facilitate the implementation of these legislatively directed changes.

State Aid Budget/Expenditure Matrix

The matrix below links the components of State Aid (columns) to budget/expenditure categories that will appear in Grant Manager (rows). The matrix serves as a planning and reporting guide, and illustrates the flexibility inherent in the FY16 grant structure in cases where there is cross-over eligibility.

		State Aid Grants / Eligible Population				
		Basic Probation Supervision	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services
Budget/Expenditure Categories	Court Intake	X	X			
	Direct Supervision	X				
	Non-Resid. Services	X	X		X	
	Mntl. Hlth. Assessments	X	X	X	X	X
	Comm.-Based Prog. (General)		X		X	
	Comm.-Based Prog. (Mntl. Hlth.)		X		X	X
	Resid. Prog. & Services			X	X	X
	Post-Adj. (Non-Secure)			X	X	
	Post-Adj. (Secure)			X	X	
	Detention/ Pre-Adj.			X		
Resid. Mntl. Hlth. Placement			X	X	X	

TJJD FY 2016 State Aid Structure Redesign FAQ

The following constitute the primary questions TJJD received with regard to the 2016 proposed State Aid structure and funding allocation methodology, appearing in no particular order.

QUESTION	TJJD RESPONSE
1. Why are these changes necessary?	<i>Changes to TJJD’s grant structure are driven by a new rider in the agency’s appropriation bill pattern, which states that TJJD must design a grant structure that corresponds more closely to its items of appropriations while providing flexibility to the extent possible. The funding allocation methodology described in the proposal was developed to allow prior expenditures and allocations to guide the distribution of each county’s funding award across these new components of State Aid.</i>
2. Will the TJJD Board review this proposal and hear public comment?	<i>Feedback from probation departments is currently being gathered, and the proposal will be discussed with the TJJD Advisory Council on June 26th. Field feedback will be integrated into the proposal so that a final, collaborative version will be presented to the TJJD Board and probation departments by close of business on Monday, June 29th. The TJJD Board will meet on July 1 to review, discuss, and possibly approve the probation grant structure and funding allocation methodology, likely including individual allocations by county. Additional public comments may be provided at that meeting either in written or oral form. It is the staff’s intent to provide final allocations and the updated State Financial Assistance Contract to departments no later than the Budget Workshop in late July.</i>
3. Does this proposal impact other grants like JJAEP funding, Title IV-E, Prevention and Intervention, SNDP, etc.?	<i>No. This proposal is specific to the areas described, subsuming current Grants A, C, and N. Questions regarding other grants should be directed to the appropriate staff person.</i>
4. When will departments receive their allocations?	<i>Final allocations will be distributed no later than the Budget Workshop, along with the updated State Financial Assistance Contract.</i>
5. Are all General Revenue Funds allocated to the Agency under Strategies A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.1.5 and A.1.7 being dispersed under this proposal? Has the Agency withheld any funding from these strategies for other purposes?	<p><i>All General Revenue in those strategies has been allocated to State Aid except for \$3,374,034: \$100,000 for the Border Justice Project and \$1,974,034 for the Special Needs Diversionary Program (both of which are multi-year ongoing programs); \$1,000,000 for the Harris County Leadership Academy (mandated by rider); and \$300,000 for a small/medium department commitment diversion pool (an approved exceptional item). No other General Revenue has been reserved in those strategies for any purpose.</i></p> <p><i>Other appropriations in those strategies include federal funds through the Title IV-E program and probation refunds. Refunds must be collected before they can be distributed, and will be awarded through the Supplemental and Emergent Needs program.</i></p>

<p>6. How was the Maximum calculated for Basic Supervision? Why is there a maximum applied in this area?</p>	<p><i>The maximum across all probation departments is equal to the total appropriation in Strategy A.1.2, Basic Probation Supervision. A department’s individual maximum is equal to its proportional share of the statewide total based on 2014 expenditures under “Court Intake” and “Basic Supervision.”</i></p> <p><i>TJJD received direction during the legislative session to limit expenditures under Basic Probation Supervision to the appropriated amount. Expenditures in 2014 were considerably higher; however, the Legislature relocated about \$20.1 million from Basic Supervision into Community Programs. In order to mitigate the impact of the funding shift, a new expenditure category, “non-residential services,” will be available under both Basic Probation Supervision and Community Programs, so that certain supervision-related services previously paid for under Basic Supervision may also be paid under Community Programs. Based on field feedback, the current “Court Intake” category will be reinstated for the amended funding matrix, allowable under Basic Probation Supervision.</i></p>
<p>7. MH Funding - The formula is partially based on FY 2014, this was a start-up year and many did not spend their entire allocation. Those that spent the majority appear to be getting a greater benefit. However, on page 4 under Calculation of Total FY 2016 Departmental State Aid Allocation item 2.c. indicates a departments allocation is the sum of its initial 2015 Grant N and C funds.</p>	<p><i>There was no positive or negative impact on a department’s total allocation as a result of expenditure patterns under Grant N in 2014. Based on the original proposal each department’s total allocation would include its entire Grant N amount along with its entire Grant C amount and 95.884 percent* of its 2015 initial Grant A amount, regardless of what was spent in each area in 2014. However, expenditure patterns from 2014 were used only as a guide for how to distribute each department’s total allocation across State Aid components since several of these are new. For example, a department that spent all of its Grant N allocation and some of its Grant A allocation on mental health will see a greater portion of its 2016 total allocation devoted to Mental Health Services. A department that spent less than its allocation in Grant N will see some of those dollars shift into other categories, such as flexible funds.</i></p> <p><i>*See Question 6 regarding changes planned for the amended proposal based on field feedback.</i></p>
<p>8. The footnote 1 on page 4 states FY14 expenditure figures also include dollars awarded under the Supplemental and Emergent Needs program. Does this mean that these funds remain allocated to the counties that received these funds in FY 2014? Since all counties have received a reduction across the board it seems more equitable to redistributing these funds through the formula to assist all counties.</p>	<p><i>All funds expended in 2014—including dollars awarded under the Supplemental and Emergent Needs program—were analyzed to inform the distribution of each department’s total allocation across the five State Aid categories, but not to determine departments’ total 2016 award amounts. In the original proposal, initial 2015 allocations—including only supplements that were grandfathered under the prior administration, and no others—were used to determine departments’ total 2016 allocation. <u>In response to field feedback the amended proposal will remove 50 percent of grandfathered supplements and redistribute those dollars proportionally across counties with no grandfathered supplement.</u> As a result, the percentage reduction departments experience in 2016 will no longer be across-the-board, but will be higher for certain counties and lower for others. Based on language in SB 1630, it is the intent of TJJD staff to work with probation departments to establish a new funding formula to be effective 2017. For that year and going forward, there will be no grandfathered supplements imbedded in initial allocations.</i></p>

<p>9. How is probation supervision – Youth on supervision defined? What will be allowable: Intake officers, administration, support staff?</p>	<p><i>The first column in the funding matrix corresponds to Strategy A.1.2, Basic Probation Supervision. Basic Supervision expenditures previously reported under Grant A fall under this new component of State Aid. The expenditure categories shown (Supervision, Non-Residential Services, and Mental Health Assessments) are intended to capture the activities currently reported under Basic Supervision, and two of these are also allowable under Community Programs. The current “Court Intake” category will be reinstated in the amended funding matrix, based on field feedback, allowable under Basic Probation Supervision. I.e., taken together these categories are intended to capture the current “Basic Supervision” category, and currently allowable expenditures will remain allowable (see also Question 2).</i></p> <p><i>It is not TJJ’s intent to change definitions for 2016, but to work with stakeholders during 2016 to adjust definitions where required by SB 1630, for implementation in 2017. The terminology in the funding matrix will be adjusted as necessary to make this clear. The intent of the matrix is to link reporting categories that are nearly identical to current reporting categories to the new State Aid component grants, not to establish new definitions. The only reporting category that is distinctly different than current categories is “Non-Residential Services,” which is being added to allow Community Programs expenditures for services while on supervision that were previously reported exclusively under Basic Supervision. The addition of this category will facilitate the implementation of the legislative shift of funding from Basic Supervision into Community Programs.</i></p>
<p>10. Community Programs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Can this include staff who administer programs? b. How does one account for a staff who handles a caseloads but also provides programming? Will salaries have to be split between grants? 	<p><i>It is not TJJ’s intent to change definitions for 2016, but to work with stakeholders during 2016 to adjust definitions where required by SB 1630, for implementation in 2017. Probation department employees who administer programs may be paid under Community Programs. With regard to time allocation, staff that work over 80 percent in one area may be paid exclusively from the dominant area. Staff that work between 60 and 80 percent in one area and the remainder in another area should be split accordingly. Staff working 50 to 60 percent in one area and the remainder in another may be split equally. We encourage departments with specific circumstances to speak to a TJJ staff person for further guidance. See also Question 5.</i></p>
<p>11. Grant N – One of the original intents of grant N was to provide for Mental Health staff in pre & post facilities either as an employees of a department or contracted these positions provide assessment and psychological services, counseling, group counseling. The Matrix on page 8 seems to disallow the use of the funds for this purpose.</p>	<p><i>That is not the intent (see also Questions 5 and 6). The final version of the funding matrix and the State Financial Assistance Contract language will clarify this as necessary. All expenditures previously allowable under Grant N remain allowable under Mental Health Services. In addition, other funding sources may be used for mental health programs and services as indicated by the funding matrix. The most appropriate expenditure category under Mental Health Services for mental health staff in pre & post facilities is currently called “Resid. Prog.,” though that label may change in the final version of the funding matrix.</i></p>

<p>12. Commitment Diversion – Will there be any change to how departments currently utilized this funding? If so, what will those changes be?</p>	<p><i>There will be no changes applicable to 2016. As mentioned above, during 2016 TJJ staff will work with stakeholders to ensure all definitions and limitations of TJJ grants are appropriate and up-to-date, including in Commitment Diversion.</i></p>
<p>13. Commitment Diversion - The Matrix appears to disallow these funds from being used for supervision or non-residential services. Counties currently use these funds for JPO salaries for a variety of purposes (including ISP, programs provision, other surveillance programs, and early intervention programs, etc.) . Are these things being disallowed?</p>	<p><i>It is not TJJ's intent to make changes for 2016 that would disallow any expenditure that is currently allowable under Commitment Diversion or any other State Aid area. The final version of the funding matrix and the language of the State Financial Assistance Contract will clarify this as necessary. Please note the following from the current Grant C program description: "Services not associated with a community-based program or post-adjudication placement [are unallowable]."</i></p>
<p>14. Pre & Post Adjudication – Can these funds be utilized for community based detention or electronic monitoring?</p>	<p><i>Pre & Post Adjudication is intended to capture the costs associated with placements. Community based programs and services should be budgeted and expended in another State Aid area. For example, electronic monitoring would be allowable as a non-residential service under Community Programs.</i></p>
<p>15. Are there any definitional changes on how funding may be utilized and if so what are they?</p>	<p><i>It is not TJJ's intent to make changes for 2016 that would disallow any expenditure that is currently allowable under any State Aid area. The intent of the matrix is to link reporting categories that are nearly identical to current reporting categories to the new State Aid component grants, not to establish new definitions. The primary change in this area is the addition of "Non-residential Services" as an allowable category under both Basic Probation Supervision and Community Programs, to facilitate the implementation of the legislatively directed funding shift. Other changes in expenditure categories are intended only to consolidate or clarify existing expenditure categories, or make existing categories allowable under more State Aid component grants, not to make substantive definitional changes.</i></p>
<p>16. Are there any implications to budgeting and expending funds for training and associated travel?</p>	<p><i>The objects of expense currently appearing in Grant Manager (salaries & fringe, travel & training, operating expenditures, etc.) will continue to appear under each of the components of State Aid. As a result, training and associated travel may be budgeted under whichever component of State Aid is most appropriate: if the training and travel are related to Basic Supervision, they should be expended in that area; if related to Community Programs, it would appear there; etc.</i></p>

<p>17. Do maximum amounts apply to any area other than Basic Supervision? Will departments be able to move funds between State Aid components over the course of the year?</p>	<p><i>No other area aside from Basic Supervision is subject to a maximum. Each department's initial budget submission must within the designated limitations and distribute their flexible dollars across the five State Aid component grants. No payments will be distributed to a department until it has an approved budget. Funds may be subsequently reallocated subject to TJJJ approval. If the request is to reallocate a department's original flexible dollars only a simple verification by TJJJ staff will be necessary. Requests to reallocate funds above and beyond the department's original flexible allocation will be evaluated in the context of the system-wide capacity to approve such requests, and will be prioritized on a first-come-first-served basis.</i></p>
<p>18. Can a county that currently does not use state dollars for pre & post move their minimum funding into another category? Can a county request a transfer below the minimum in an area to elsewhere as long as they do not exceed their Basic Supervision maximum?</p>	<p><i>Each county's distribution of funds across the five State Aid areas is guided by historical spending patterns. A county that did not spend any state funds on pre & post in 2014 will have a \$0 minimum for 2016. Such a department may add funds to pre & post from their flexible funds if so desired.</i></p> <p><i>A department may request to reallocate any amount of funds outside of the minimum or maximum for a State Aid area, to any other State Aid area. However, requests to reallocate funds above and beyond the department's original flexible allocation will be evaluated in the context of the system-wide capacity to approve such requests, and will be prioritized on a first-come-first-served basis.</i></p>
<p>19. What is the significance of the "Non-Residential Services" category?</p>	<p><i>During the 2014-2015 biennium, probation departments spent state dollars on Basic Supervision at a level that was much higher than appropriations, and the range of activities included in this area by departments was very broad. TJJJ received direction during the legislative session to limit expenditures under Basic Probation Supervision to the appropriated amount, and a considerable amount of funding was shifted over to Community Programs. The probation grant structure proposal uses the "Non-Residential Services" category to build a bridge from Basic Supervision to Community Programs, where certain supervision-related services previously paid for under Basic Supervision may also be paid under Community Programs. Based on field feedback, the current "Court Intake" category will be reinstated for the amended funding matrix, allowable under Basic Probation Supervision. Both of these steps will also ensure that departments have options for state funding sources to support salaries of staff that work in multiple areas.</i></p>
<p>20. Is there any carryover ability between FY16 and FY17 that will be extended to departments?</p>	<p><i>This remains to be determined and will be affected by decisions regarding the new probation funding formula for 2017. The General Appropriations Act does allow TJJJ to carry forward some funds to hold harmless those departments impacted by population-based funding reductions. This option may be available to the agency if de-obligated 2016 funds become available, and would help to mitigate the impact of a new formula on selected counties.</i></p>
<p>21. How is the amount of flexible funding calculated?</p>	<p><i>The amount of flexible funding available system-wide is based on transfer limitations in the General Appropriations Act. A county's individual flexible funding is equal approximately 15.7 percent of its total State Aid allocation.</i></p>

Proposed FY2016 Allocations: State Aid

DEPARTMENT	Basic Probation Supervision (minimum)	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services	Flexible Funds	Total, FY16 State Aid	Basic Probation Supervision (maximum)
ANDERSON	\$ 137,615	\$ 89,481	\$ 17,717	\$ 18,302	\$ 44,807	\$ 57,454	\$ 365,376	\$ 172,019
ANDREWS	\$ 31,200	\$ 15,890	\$ 30,784	\$ 12,261	\$ 48,982	\$ 25,957	\$ 165,074	\$ 39,000
ANGELINA	\$ 142,473	\$ -	\$ 267,646	\$ 88,448	\$ 83,529	\$ 108,611	\$ 690,707	\$ 178,091
ATASCOSA	\$ 185,132	\$ 97,854	\$ 37,247	\$ 29,114	\$ 78,005	\$ 79,738	\$ 507,090	\$ 231,415
AUSTIN	\$ 73,564	\$ 49,409	\$ 14,894	\$ 13,780	\$ 16,507	\$ 31,375	\$ 199,529	\$ 91,955
BAILEY	\$ 49,824	\$ 61,194	\$ -	\$ 6,516	\$ 5,076	\$ 22,877	\$ 145,487	\$ 62,280
BANDERA	\$ 42,613	\$ 70,854	\$ -	\$ 12,483	\$ 7,160	\$ 24,837	\$ 157,947	\$ 53,267
BASTROP	\$ 325,801	\$ 155,536	\$ 96,239	\$ 134,027	\$ 79,710	\$ 147,649	\$ 938,962	\$ 407,251
BAYLOR	\$ 36,765	\$ 26,800	\$ -	\$ 6,130	\$ 1,696	\$ 13,321	\$ 84,712	\$ 45,956
BELL	\$ 433,561	\$ 145,074	\$ 193,407	\$ 237,443	\$ 187,195	\$ 223,285	\$ 1,419,965	\$ 541,951
BEXAR	\$ 2,589,181	\$ 1,527,101	\$ 292,313	\$ 1,380,568	\$ 1,211,013	\$ 1,306,141	\$ 8,306,317	\$ 3,236,476
BOWIE	\$ 61,845	\$ 271,954	\$ 76,370	\$ 85,512	\$ 49,746	\$ 101,769	\$ 647,196	\$ 77,307
BRAZORIA	\$ 367,066	\$ 318,142	\$ 261,778	\$ -	\$ 227,273	\$ 219,101	\$ 1,393,360	\$ 458,833
BRAZOS	\$ 206,269	\$ 319,267	\$ 86,813	\$ 133,647	\$ 133,825	\$ 164,163	\$ 1,043,984	\$ 257,837
BREWSTER	\$ 56,507	\$ 32,114	\$ -	\$ 12,267	\$ 6,296	\$ 19,999	\$ 127,183	\$ 70,634
BROOKS	\$ 39,217	\$ 19,692	\$ 19,481	\$ 12,261	\$ 14,006	\$ 19,528	\$ 124,185	\$ 49,021
BROWN	\$ 135,121	\$ 78,270	\$ 17,849	\$ 19,448	\$ 33,479	\$ 53,022	\$ 337,189	\$ 168,901
BURNET	\$ 112,162	\$ 235,958	\$ 78,120	\$ 13,839	\$ 48,768	\$ 91,212	\$ 580,059	\$ 140,203
CALDWELL	\$ 127,889	\$ 64,772	\$ 54,803	\$ 26,092	\$ 50,953	\$ 60,549	\$ 385,058	\$ 159,862
CALHOUN	\$ 69,655	\$ 40,754	\$ 20,092	\$ 21,845	\$ 29,280	\$ 33,889	\$ 215,515	\$ 87,069
CALLAHAN	\$ 11,192	\$ 27,770	\$ -	\$ 6,130	\$ 3,338	\$ 9,036	\$ 57,466	\$ 13,990
CAMERON	\$ 507,322	\$ 640,712	\$ 671,270	\$ 246,308	\$ 265,951	\$ 435,039	\$ 2,766,602	\$ 634,152
CASS	\$ 119,620	\$ 72,149	\$ 10,085	\$ 15,947	\$ 13,274	\$ 43,115	\$ 274,190	\$ 149,525
CHAMBERS	\$ 84,319	\$ 52,534	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,270	\$ 26,705	\$ 169,828	\$ 105,399
CHEROKEE	\$ 172,212	\$ 167,768	\$ -	\$ 71,851	\$ 40,267	\$ 84,356	\$ 536,454	\$ 215,265
CHILDRESS	\$ 69,218	\$ 42,087	\$ 45,216	\$ 11,578	\$ 13,206	\$ 33,829	\$ 215,134	\$ 86,522
COCHRAN	\$ 17,257	\$ 9,187	\$ -	\$ 12,261	\$ 4,473	\$ 8,056	\$ 51,234	\$ 21,571
COKE	\$ 86,398	\$ 46,306	\$ 9,132	\$ 11,944	\$ 18,807	\$ 32,203	\$ 204,790	\$ 107,998
COLEMAN	\$ 10,002	\$ 34,248	\$ -	\$ 6,130	\$ 3,490	\$ 10,051	\$ 63,921	\$ 12,502
COLLIN	\$ 884,552	\$ 479,219	\$ 52,113	\$ -	\$ 188,562	\$ 299,369	\$ 1,903,815	\$ 1,105,691
COMAL	\$ 188,583	\$ 92,473	\$ 117,227	\$ 37,846	\$ 47,736	\$ 90,283	\$ 574,148	\$ 235,729
COMANCHE	\$ 143,890	\$ 88,572	\$ -	\$ 16,266	\$ 11,716	\$ 48,596	\$ 309,040	\$ 179,863

Proposed FY2016 Allocations: State Aid

DEPARTMENT	Basic Probation Supervision (minimum)	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services	Flexible Funds	Total, FY16 State Aid	Basic Probation Supervision (maximum)
COOKE	\$ 121,700	\$ 42,189	\$ 37,939	\$ 25,423	\$ 26,253	\$ 47,300	\$ 300,804	\$ 152,125
CORYELL	\$ 258,778	\$ 86,520	\$ 80,994	\$ 55,745	\$ 49,391	\$ 99,157	\$ 630,585	\$ 323,472
CRANE	\$ 23,410	\$ 16,485	\$ 7,884	\$ 6,130	\$ 7,324	\$ 11,425	\$ 72,658	\$ 29,262
CROSBY	\$ 29,524	\$ 12,288	\$ 11,506	\$ 12,261	\$ 4,682	\$ 13,110	\$ 83,371	\$ 36,904
CULBERSON	\$ 29,354	\$ 26,918	\$ 675	\$ 6,130	\$ 6,218	\$ 12,929	\$ 82,224	\$ 36,692
DALLAM	\$ 55,193	\$ 40,361	\$ -	\$ 20,025	\$ 10,640	\$ 23,551	\$ 149,770	\$ 68,992
DALLAS	\$ 3,077,650	\$ 2,254,594	\$ 933,792	\$ 2,149,381	\$ 554,521	\$ 1,673,672	\$ 10,643,610	\$ 3,847,062
DAWSON	\$ 61,989	\$ 82,915	\$ 8,593	\$ 9,734	\$ 7,925	\$ 31,935	\$ 203,091	\$ 77,486
DEAF SMITH	\$ 90,542	\$ 44,194	\$ 43,435	\$ 39,465	\$ 28,606	\$ 45,945	\$ 292,187	\$ 113,177
DENTON	\$ 636,225	\$ 466,070	\$ -	\$ 311,896	\$ 439,431	\$ 345,862	\$ 2,199,484	\$ 795,281
DEWITT	\$ 67,145	\$ 50,226	\$ 9,698	\$ 20,168	\$ 28,579	\$ 32,805	\$ 208,621	\$ 83,931
DUVAL	\$ 81,645	\$ -	\$ 44,418	\$ 12,261	\$ 66,631	\$ 38,242	\$ 243,197	\$ 102,056
EASTLAND	\$ 70,736	\$ 44,209	\$ 2,048	\$ 12,261	\$ 12,415	\$ 26,434	\$ 168,103	\$ 88,420
ECTOR	\$ 290,117	\$ 161,342	\$ 65,209	\$ 132,564	\$ 99,383	\$ 139,682	\$ 888,297	\$ 362,647
EL PASO	\$ 932,097	\$ 1,250,299	\$ 123,635	\$ 435,663	\$ 326,569	\$ 572,497	\$ 3,640,760	\$ 1,165,120
ELLIS	\$ 194,445	\$ 132,905	\$ 146,704	\$ -	\$ 54,421	\$ 98,606	\$ 627,081	\$ 243,056
ERATH	\$ 113,907	\$ 62,944	\$ 4,073	\$ 23,588	\$ 15,999	\$ 41,144	\$ 261,655	\$ 142,384
FANNIN	\$ 98,528	\$ 64,051	\$ 14,356	\$ 15,117	\$ 16,848	\$ 38,978	\$ 247,878	\$ 123,160
FAYETTE	\$ 58,892	\$ 39,475	\$ 14,106	\$ 6,379	\$ 9,922	\$ 24,028	\$ 152,802	\$ 73,615
FLOYD	\$ 82,107	\$ 40,794	\$ -	\$ 12,261	\$ 10,712	\$ 27,218	\$ 173,092	\$ 102,634
FORT BEND	\$ 543,022	\$ 329,807	\$ 523,033	\$ 255,103	\$ 202,751	\$ 345,879	\$ 2,199,595	\$ 678,778
FRIO	\$ 75,237	\$ 50,611	\$ -	\$ 12,612	\$ 11,840	\$ 28,044	\$ 178,344	\$ 94,047
GAINES	\$ 54,248	\$ 28,802	\$ 34,408	\$ 11,256	\$ 9,076	\$ 25,710	\$ 163,500	\$ 67,810
GALVESTON	\$ 260,328	\$ 325,470	\$ 226,335	\$ 227,804	\$ 163,591	\$ 224,562	\$ 1,428,090	\$ 325,410
GARZA	\$ 35,718	\$ 20,757	\$ -	\$ 10,548	\$ 5,226	\$ 13,481	\$ 85,730	\$ 44,648
GOLIAD	\$ 30,387	\$ 18,004	\$ 486	\$ 9,470	\$ 7,243	\$ 12,238	\$ 77,828	\$ 37,984
GRAY	\$ 77,562	\$ 78,433	\$ 25,470	\$ -	\$ 12,946	\$ 36,274	\$ 230,685	\$ 96,953
GRAYSON	\$ 115,429	\$ -	\$ 526,011	\$ 91,837	\$ 152,505	\$ 165,275	\$ 1,051,057	\$ 144,286
GREGG	\$ 144,186	\$ 117,230	\$ 318,637	\$ 121,816	\$ 45,430	\$ 139,436	\$ 886,735	\$ 180,233
GRIMES	\$ 93,736	\$ 48,143	\$ -	\$ 21,725	\$ 15,821	\$ 33,478	\$ 212,903	\$ 117,170
GUADALUPE	\$ 197,412	\$ 134,398	\$ 86,100	\$ 93,388	\$ 87,859	\$ 111,795	\$ 710,952	\$ 246,765
HALE	\$ 50,658	\$ -	\$ 178,205	\$ 43,678	\$ 35,872	\$ 57,546	\$ 365,959	\$ 63,323

Proposed FY2016 Allocations: State Aid

DEPARTMENT	Basic Probation Supervision (minimum)	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services	Flexible Funds	Total, FY16 State Aid	Basic Probation Supervision (maximum)
HARDIN	\$ 201,527	\$ 75,951	\$ 24,444	\$ 29,033	\$ 76,649	\$ 76,054	\$ 483,658	\$ 251,908
HARRIS	\$ 32,080	\$ 6,003,822	\$ 3,420,499	\$ 3,677,937	\$ 1,097,342	\$ 2,655,444	\$ 16,887,124	\$ 40,100
HARRISON	\$ 220,500	\$ 123,837	\$ 59,428	\$ -	\$ 61,961	\$ 86,898	\$ 552,624	\$ 275,625
HASKELL	\$ 28,993	\$ 33,381	\$ 9,363	\$ -	\$ 4,626	\$ 14,248	\$ 90,611	\$ 36,241
HAYS	\$ 186,335	\$ 99,379	\$ 161,196	\$ 60,310	\$ 144,054	\$ 121,519	\$ 772,793	\$ 232,919
HENDERSON	\$ 102,797	\$ 70,472	\$ 102,825	\$ 24,016	\$ 36,097	\$ 62,732	\$ 398,939	\$ 128,496
HIDALGO	\$ 923,840	\$ 467,914	\$ 718,781	\$ 388,244	\$ 225,365	\$ 508,290	\$ 3,232,434	\$ 1,154,800
HILL	\$ 107,976	\$ 44,618	\$ 48,229	\$ 72,818	\$ 23,389	\$ 55,422	\$ 352,452	\$ 134,969
HOCKLEY	\$ 58,722	\$ 22,420	\$ 53,960	\$ 19,563	\$ 25,253	\$ 33,570	\$ 213,488	\$ 73,403
HOOD	\$ 145,007	\$ 100,650	\$ -	\$ 25,985	\$ 30,711	\$ 56,415	\$ 358,768	\$ 181,258
HOPKINS	\$ 214,544	\$ 110,066	\$ -	\$ 46,127	\$ 41,342	\$ 76,889	\$ 488,968	\$ 268,180
HOUSTON	\$ 62,802	\$ 44,164	\$ -	\$ 6,243	\$ 12,981	\$ 23,545	\$ 149,735	\$ 78,502
HOWARD	\$ 110,052	\$ 37,109	\$ 56,969	\$ 74,822	\$ 37,901	\$ 59,121	\$ 375,974	\$ 137,565
HUNT	\$ 121,401	\$ 34,162	\$ 217,915	\$ 87,025	\$ 81,354	\$ 101,103	\$ 642,960	\$ 151,751
HUTCHINSON	\$ 92,134	\$ 65,377	\$ -	\$ 13,921	\$ 14,091	\$ 34,616	\$ 220,139	\$ 115,167
JACKSON	\$ 42,228	\$ 17,485	\$ 16,286	\$ 19,816	\$ 8,898	\$ 19,538	\$ 124,251	\$ 52,785
JASPER	\$ 185,634	\$ 88,587	\$ 63,421	\$ 49,461	\$ 38,966	\$ 79,499	\$ 505,568	\$ 232,043
JEFFERSON	\$ 259,256	\$ 413,457	\$ 196,919	\$ 231,932	\$ 109,847	\$ 226,033	\$ 1,437,444	\$ 324,070
JIM WELLS	\$ 245,929	\$ 128,927	\$ -	\$ 18,701	\$ 71,402	\$ 86,755	\$ 551,714	\$ 307,411
JOHNSON	\$ 295,282	\$ 144,319	\$ 69,983	\$ 71,878	\$ 86,161	\$ 124,570	\$ 792,193	\$ 369,102
JONES	\$ 69,261	\$ 51,359	\$ 44,286	\$ 6,344	\$ 10,004	\$ 33,820	\$ 215,074	\$ 86,576
KARNES	\$ 150,083	\$ 181,503	\$ -	\$ 46,533	\$ 53,868	\$ 80,603	\$ 512,590	\$ 187,604
KAUFMAN	\$ 227,423	\$ 119,970	\$ -	\$ 39,032	\$ 50,014	\$ 81,434	\$ 517,873	\$ 284,278
KENDALL	\$ 83,296	\$ 39,734	\$ 17,331	\$ 14,898	\$ 18,904	\$ 32,496	\$ 206,659	\$ 104,120
KERR	\$ 23,706	\$ -	\$ 215,313	\$ 24,990	\$ 72,903	\$ 62,863	\$ 399,775	\$ 29,632
KLEBERG	\$ 81,025	\$ 39,046	\$ 39,836	\$ 22,590	\$ 22,095	\$ 38,174	\$ 242,766	\$ 101,281
LAMAR	\$ 146,099	\$ 95,170	\$ -	\$ 49,753	\$ 40,669	\$ 61,889	\$ 393,580	\$ 182,624
LAMB	\$ 52,531	\$ 21,293	\$ 15,711	\$ 12,261	\$ 18,708	\$ 22,485	\$ 142,989	\$ 65,663
LAMPASAS	\$ 30,701	\$ 15,453	\$ 65,833	\$ 20,700	\$ 20,421	\$ 28,568	\$ 181,676	\$ 38,377
LASALLE	\$ 39,083	\$ 23,731	\$ -	\$ 12,127	\$ 4,194	\$ 14,765	\$ 93,900	\$ 48,853
LAVACA	\$ 196,442	\$ 75,648	\$ 44,738	\$ 46,201	\$ 40,546	\$ 75,302	\$ 478,877	\$ 245,553

Proposed FY2016 Allocations: State Aid

DEPARTMENT	Basic Probation Supervision (minimum)	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services	Flexible Funds	Total, FY16 State Aid	Basic Probation Supervision (maximum)
LEON	\$ 33,958	\$ 18,448	\$ 5,399	\$ 12,261	\$ 4,827	\$ 13,974	\$ 88,867	\$ 42,447
LIBERTY	\$ 174,603	\$ 114,749	\$ -	\$ 36,777	\$ 21,947	\$ 64,946	\$ 413,022	\$ 218,254
LIMESTONE	\$ 97,061	\$ 56,258	\$ 94,591	\$ 25,347	\$ 52,791	\$ 60,836	\$ 386,884	\$ 121,326
LUBBOCK	\$ 104,293	\$ 27,386	\$ 812,524	\$ 316,700	\$ 193,712	\$ 271,412	\$ 1,726,027	\$ 130,366
LYNN	\$ 31,527	\$ -	\$ 13,645	\$ 12,261	\$ 7,602	\$ 12,135	\$ 77,170	\$ 39,409
MADISON	\$ 20,873	\$ 17,047	\$ -	\$ 7,856	\$ 3,358	\$ 9,168	\$ 58,302	\$ 26,091
MATAGORDA	\$ 108,435	\$ 86,778	\$ 64,162	\$ 39,652	\$ 50,266	\$ 65,174	\$ 414,467	\$ 135,544
MAVERICK	\$ 400,634	\$ 195,372	\$ -	\$ 57,426	\$ 83,488	\$ 137,500	\$ 874,420	\$ 500,792
MCCULLOCH	\$ 51,984	\$ 51,788	\$ 56,486	\$ 15,951	\$ 9,062	\$ 34,569	\$ 219,840	\$ 64,979
MCLENNAN	\$ 273,264	\$ 97,840	\$ 420,914	\$ 284,939	\$ 157,126	\$ 230,264	\$ 1,464,347	\$ 341,580
MEDINA	\$ 132,388	\$ 89,944	\$ 54,112	\$ 18,493	\$ 20,034	\$ 58,770	\$ 373,741	\$ 165,485
MIDLAND	\$ 196,299	\$ 164,758	\$ 173,056	\$ 129,487	\$ 128,124	\$ 147,725	\$ 939,449	\$ 245,374
MILAM	\$ 158,936	\$ 105,052	\$ 119,895	\$ 80,127	\$ 54,084	\$ 96,669	\$ 614,763	\$ 198,670
MONTAGUE	\$ 89,352	\$ 41,894	\$ 48,330	\$ 17,076	\$ 33,967	\$ 43,031	\$ 273,650	\$ 111,690
MONTGOMERY	\$ 482,944	\$ 368,074	\$ 213,802	\$ 268,657	\$ 257,533	\$ 296,862	\$ 1,887,872	\$ 603,681
MOORE	\$ 66,882	\$ 14,992	\$ 37,540	\$ 22,635	\$ 22,375	\$ 30,679	\$ 195,103	\$ 83,603
NACOGDOCHES	\$ 159,916	\$ 19,763	\$ 98,281	\$ 80,391	\$ 44,525	\$ 75,171	\$ 478,047	\$ 199,895
NAVARRO	\$ 104,226	\$ 61,094	\$ 94,966	\$ 28,943	\$ 18,575	\$ 57,432	\$ 365,236	\$ 130,283
NOLAN	\$ 68,989	\$ 59,727	\$ 62,778	\$ 18,317	\$ 18,415	\$ 42,584	\$ 270,810	\$ 86,236
NUECES	\$ 786,691	\$ 634,271	\$ 209,567	\$ 151,684	\$ 269,772	\$ 382,873	\$ 2,434,858	\$ 983,364
OCHILTREE	\$ 43,747	\$ 23,885	\$ 15,162	\$ 12,825	\$ 5,133	\$ 18,799	\$ 119,551	\$ 54,683
ORANGE	\$ 144,156	\$ 159,275	\$ 61,631	\$ 87,496	\$ 35,593	\$ 91,082	\$ 579,233	\$ 180,195
PALO PINTO	\$ 72,332	\$ 52,999	\$ 26,350	\$ 22,978	\$ 16,075	\$ 35,589	\$ 226,323	\$ 90,415
PANOLA	\$ 58,673	\$ 46,782	\$ 40,018	\$ 8,643	\$ 9,622	\$ 30,551	\$ 194,289	\$ 73,342
PARKER	\$ 244,087	\$ 123,265	\$ -	\$ 58,044	\$ 56,680	\$ 89,949	\$ 572,025	\$ 305,109
PECOS	\$ 38,184	\$ 26,252	\$ 42,635	\$ 10,524	\$ 11,504	\$ 24,088	\$ 153,187	\$ 47,731
POLK	\$ 243,110	\$ 93,826	\$ 93,350	\$ 51,339	\$ 50,618	\$ 99,309	\$ 631,552	\$ 303,888
POTTER	\$ 148,693	\$ 2,340	\$ 429,582	\$ 157,829	\$ 115,223	\$ 159,283	\$ 1,012,950	\$ 185,867
RANDALL	\$ 138,145	\$ -	\$ 276,079	\$ 60,426	\$ 248,980	\$ 135,020	\$ 858,650	\$ 172,681
RED RIVER	\$ 43,700	\$ 3,411	\$ 53,669	\$ 12,261	\$ 9,945	\$ 22,947	\$ 145,933	\$ 54,625
REEVES	\$ 24,714	\$ 47,345	\$ 77,890	\$ 12,175	\$ 12,795	\$ 32,637	\$ 207,556	\$ 30,893
REFUGIO	\$ 34,372	\$ 3,314	\$ 16,777	\$ -	\$ 11,524	\$ 12,312	\$ 78,299	\$ 42,965

Proposed FY2016 Allocations: State Aid

DEPARTMENT	Basic Probation Supervision (minimum)	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services	Flexible Funds	Total, FY16 State Aid	Basic Probation Supervision (maximum)
ROCKWALL	\$ 146,515	\$ 81,909	\$ 42,838	\$ 31,475	\$ 38,223	\$ 63,619	\$ 404,579	\$ 183,144
RUSK	\$ 109,343	\$ 143,669	\$ 28,000	\$ 16,759	\$ 28,486	\$ 60,875	\$ 387,132	\$ 136,679
SAN PATRICIO	\$ 462,106	\$ 273,009	\$ 46,074	\$ 132,131	\$ 80,724	\$ 185,475	\$ 1,179,519	\$ 577,633
SCURRY	\$ 30,622	\$ 235	\$ 92,367	\$ -	\$ 16,809	\$ 26,128	\$ 166,161	\$ 38,277
SHELBY	\$ 49,732	\$ 51,562	\$ 4,376	\$ 14,848	\$ 9,642	\$ 24,286	\$ 154,446	\$ 62,165
SMITH	\$ 417,279	\$ 204,610	\$ 16,441	\$ 243,685	\$ 98,262	\$ 182,907	\$ 1,163,184	\$ 521,599
SOMERVELL	\$ 9,431	\$ 4,825	\$ 39,700	\$ 8,073	\$ 4,465	\$ 12,407	\$ 78,901	\$ 11,789
STARR	\$ 331,577	\$ 186,915	\$ 70,518	\$ 41,770	\$ 92,862	\$ 135,022	\$ 858,664	\$ 414,471
SUTTON	\$ 26,995	\$ 15,819	\$ 10,844	\$ 12,261	\$ 7,090	\$ 13,623	\$ 86,632	\$ 33,743
SWISHER	\$ 68,083	\$ 50,340	\$ -	\$ 20,695	\$ 11,425	\$ 28,089	\$ 178,632	\$ 85,104
TARRANT	\$ 1,321,297	\$ 1,143,373	\$ 1,364,310	\$ 989,898	\$ 732,066	\$ 1,035,733	\$ 6,586,677	\$ 1,651,620
TAYLOR	\$ 246,588	\$ 393,856	\$ -	\$ 52,493	\$ 51,658	\$ 138,932	\$ 883,527	\$ 308,235
TERRY	\$ 68,397	\$ -	\$ 37,611	\$ 11,403	\$ 19,270	\$ 25,503	\$ 162,184	\$ 85,496
TITUS	\$ 189,528	\$ 141,820	\$ -	\$ 23,808	\$ 23,238	\$ 70,603	\$ 448,997	\$ 236,910
TOM GREEN	\$ 79,979	\$ 155,323	\$ 324,547	\$ 41,217	\$ 107,716	\$ 132,249	\$ 841,031	\$ 99,974
TRAVIS	\$ 860,852	\$ 768,799	\$ 880,036	\$ 2,187,915	\$ 321,600	\$ 936,517	\$ 5,955,719	\$ 1,076,065
TYLER	\$ 62,925	\$ 44,619	\$ -	\$ 6,445	\$ 8,917	\$ 22,933	\$ 145,839	\$ 78,656
UPSHUR	\$ 111,395	\$ 66,931	\$ 46,561	\$ 25,168	\$ 19,193	\$ 50,238	\$ 319,486	\$ 139,243
UPTON	\$ 34,192	\$ 28,720	\$ -	\$ 6,326	\$ 4,403	\$ 13,740	\$ 87,381	\$ 42,741
UVALDE	\$ 120,526	\$ 86,264	\$ 30,146	\$ 14,237	\$ 28,163	\$ 52,121	\$ 331,457	\$ 150,657
VAL VERDE	\$ 268,221	\$ 166,307	\$ -	\$ 48,039	\$ 51,657	\$ 99,679	\$ 633,903	\$ 335,277
VAN ZANDT	\$ 138,041	\$ -	\$ 178,140	\$ 20,772	\$ 76,833	\$ 77,207	\$ 490,993	\$ 172,552
VICTORIA	\$ 308,478	\$ 206,229	\$ -	\$ 154,508	\$ 70,326	\$ 137,989	\$ 877,530	\$ 385,598
WALKER	\$ 174,350	\$ 94,209	\$ -	\$ 43,907	\$ 33,978	\$ 64,642	\$ 411,086	\$ 217,937
WALLER	\$ 71,982	\$ 64,054	\$ 37,917	\$ 8,340	\$ 10,563	\$ 35,984	\$ 228,840	\$ 89,977
WARD	\$ 43,810	\$ 19,777	\$ 62,688	\$ 12,261	\$ 10,457	\$ 27,800	\$ 176,793	\$ 54,763
WEBB	\$ 682,686	\$ 481,203	\$ 213,240	\$ 242,154	\$ 227,574	\$ 344,599	\$ 2,191,456	\$ 853,357
WHARTON	\$ 138,108	\$ 41,178	\$ 32,504	\$ 76,436	\$ 36,549	\$ 60,599	\$ 385,374	\$ 172,635
WHEELER	\$ 43,488	\$ 19,347	\$ 21,209	\$ 12,261	\$ 6,466	\$ 19,176	\$ 121,947	\$ 54,360
WICHITA	\$ 359,791	\$ 246,896	\$ 14,404	\$ 157,715	\$ 125,950	\$ 168,815	\$ 1,073,571	\$ 449,738
WILBARGER	\$ 80,307	\$ 42,958	\$ -	\$ 12,888	\$ 11,161	\$ 27,487	\$ 174,801	\$ 100,384
WILLACY	\$ 89,238	\$ 47,103	\$ 41,408	\$ 14,103	\$ 26,386	\$ 40,720	\$ 258,958	\$ 111,547

Proposed FY2016 Allocations: State Aid

DEPARTMENT	Basic Probation Supervision (minimum)	Community Programs	Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities	Commitment Diversion	Mental Health Services	Flexible Funds	Total, FY16 State Aid	<i>Basic Probation Supervision (maximum)</i>
WILLIAMSON	\$ 499,525	\$ 147,052	\$ 463,607	\$ 166,549	\$ 185,469	\$ 272,828	\$ 1,735,030	\$ 624,406
WINKLER	\$ 20,663	\$ 29,546	\$ 7,578	\$ 6,130	\$ 4,075	\$ 12,686	\$ 80,678	\$ 25,828
WISE	\$ 111,501	\$ 37,753	\$ 157,261	\$ 32,994	\$ 28,054	\$ 68,582	\$ 436,145	\$ 139,376
WOOD	\$ 105,444	\$ 43,157	\$ 14,884	\$ 23,628	\$ 28,819	\$ 40,290	\$ 256,222	\$ 131,805
YOAKUM	\$ 12,645	\$ 38,990	\$ 6,304	\$ -	\$ 4,008	\$ 11,559	\$ 73,506	\$ 15,806
YOUNG	\$ 119,359	\$ 65,206	\$ -	\$ 20,217	\$ 23,079	\$ 42,516	\$ 270,377	\$ 149,199
ZAPATA	\$ 73,111	\$ 6,069	\$ 51,674	\$ 20,282	\$ 22,122	\$ 32,328	\$ 205,586	\$ 91,389
TOTALS	\$ 33,171,899	\$ 28,680,140	\$ 19,651,990	\$ 19,192,505	\$ 12,804,755	\$ 21,177,839	\$ 134,679,128	\$ 41,464,872



**Texas Juvenile Justice Department
RESOLUTION**

**A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE DISTRIBUTION METHODOLOGY FOR THE STATE AID GRANTS AND
AUTHORIZING THE NEGOTIATION AND EXECUTION OF CONTRACTS FOR THE SAME**

On this the **1st day of July, 2015**, a duly called and lawfully convened meeting of the Texas Juvenile Justice Board was held in the City of Austin, Texas, pursuant to the Texas Open Meetings Act. A quorum of the Members was present, to wit:

BOARD MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Scott W. Fisher					
John Brieden III					
Carol Bush					
Becky Gregory					
Jane A. King					
Scott Matthew					
MaryLou Mendoza					

BOARD MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Rene Olvera					
Laura Parker					
Riley Shaw					
Jimmy Smith					
Calvin Stephens					
Melissa Weiss					
Motion:			Second:		

where, among other matters, came up for consideration and adoption the following Resolution:

WHEREAS, the General Administrative Policy 385.110.d.1 specifies the TJJD Board’s authority and responsibility to approve the distribution methodology of available probation funds; and

WHEREAS, the 84rd Legislature provided appropriations for State Aid to local probation departments (Basic Probation Supervision, Community Programs, Pre & Post Adjudication Facilities, Commitment Diversion, and Mental Health Services), and provided statewide commitment targets; and

WHEREAS, TJJD staff has developed a proposed grant structure and allocation methodology for \$134,679,128 in available funds in consultation with the TJJD Advisory Council and other field practitioners; and

WHEREAS, staff requests approval of the proposed structure and allocation methodology;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board approves the proposed methodology for allocating available State Aid funding; and

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Board authorizes the Executive Director to enter into negotiations and contract with juvenile probation departments for the purpose of operationalizing the proposed grant structure and distributing funding allocations; and

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Board authorizes the Executive Director to establish a methodology for the distribution of the statewide commitment target, and to resolve matters that may arise related to the proposed grant structure in a manner consistent with the Board’s intent.

The foregoing Resolution was lawfully moved, duly seconded and adopted by the Texas Juvenile Justice Board.

Signed this **1st day of July, 2015.**

Texas Juvenile Justice Board

Scott W. Fisher, Chairman