



Office of Missouri State Auditor
Nicole Galloway, CPA

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding



Nicole Galloway, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

CITIZENS SUMMARY

Findings in the Audit of the Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Background	Domestic violence shelters exist throughout the state to provide assistance to victims of domestic violence in Missouri. The <i>Supplemental Domestic Violence Incident Report</i> for 2017 compiled by the Missouri State Highway Patrol indicated 45,253 incidents of domestic violence were reported that year. Currently, there are only two shelters to serve every three counties in the state. Domestic violence shelters may receive funding from statutory fees, various state and federal grant programs, state tax credit programs, interest income, local fund raisers, and contributions or donations. The Department of Social Services (DSS) administers the Domestic Violence Shelter Tax Credit as authorized by Section 135.550, RSMo. Funding is limited to \$2 million annually. The audit evaluated local government compliance with various state statutes.
Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Opportunities	Approximately \$698,000 in revenue for domestic violence shelters are forgone annually due to counties and cities electing not to collect all domestic violence fees allowed by state law.
Burdensome Statutes Hinder Distribution of Fees	State statutes regarding the distribution requirements for domestic violence fees collected are burdensome and unclear, resulting in a lack of compliance with requirements, and some county funds going undistributed. State law requires each county and city designated authority responsible for administering domestic violence funding to individually obtain and review domestic violence shelter funding requests, including determining if the shelter is eligible to receive funding. Only 43 of the 106 counties and the City of St. Louis (40 percent) responded that the requirements of Sections 455.215, 455.220 and 455.230, RSMo, were met. State law does not require the designated authorities to distribute funding and has not established a maximum amount that may be retained. Due to the decentralized manner in which domestic violence fees are currently distributed, funds are not being distributed where there is a demand for services.

Due to the nature of this report no rating is provided.

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Table of Contents

State Auditor's Report	2
------------------------	---

Introduction	
Background	4
Scope and Methodology.....	8

Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings	
1. Domestic Violence Funding Opportunities	11
2. Burdensome Statutes Hinder Distribution of Fees	13

Appendixes	
A Shelter Locations and Domestic Violence Incidents by County	16
B Domestic Violence Fund Financial Activity - Counties.....	17
C Domestic Violence Fund Financial Activity - Selected Cities	20
D Counties Holding Domestic Violence Monies	21
E Summary of Survey Responses	22
F Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence Shelter Statistics.....	25



NICOLE GALLOWAY, CPA

Missouri State Auditor

Honorable Michael L. Parson, Governor
and
Members of the General Assembly
Jefferson City, Missouri

We have audited certain operations of local government funding of domestic violence shelters as authorized by state law, in fulfillment of our duties under Chapter 29, RSMo. The scope of the audit included, but was not necessarily limited to the year ended December 31, 2017. The objectives of our audit were to:


1. Evaluate compliance with certain legal provisions as they relate to funding for domestic violence shelters.
2. Evaluate the economy and efficiency of certain management practices and operations, including certain financial transactions, as they relate to funding for domestic violence shelters.

Except as discussed in the following paragraph, we conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides such a basis.

Government Auditing Standards require us to obtain and report the views of responsible officials of the audited entity concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations included in the audit report. Since there is no central agency charged with oversight of domestic violence shelter funding, we were unable to obtain views of responsible officials for the findings, conclusions, and recommendations outlined in the Management Advisory Report. The views of responsible county or city officials were obtained and included where appropriate.

The accompanying Appendixes are presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the management of these political subdivisions and the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence. The information was not subjected to the procedures applied in our audit of the Domestic Violence Shelter Funding.

For the areas audited, we identified (1) noncompliance with legal provisions and (2) the need for improvement in management practices and operations. The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the Domestic Violence Shelters funding.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Nicole R. Galloway". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end of the last name.

Nicole R. Galloway, CPA
State Auditor

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits:	Robert E. Showers, CPA, CGAP
Audit Manager:	Lori Melton, M.Acct., CPA
In-Charge Auditor:	Alex Bruner, MBA, CFE
Audit Staff:	Philip V. Osadchuk, MAcc

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Introduction

Background

Domestic violence shelters exist throughout the state to provide assistance to victims of domestic violence. The Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (MCADSV) is a non-profit membership organization comprised of community-based domestic violence programs throughout Missouri. These member programs, which provide services to domestic violence victims, represent nearly all of the domestic violence and sexual assault victim services providers in Missouri, as well as law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts and other allied victim service professionals. According to the MCADSV, there were 13 member residential service providers (shelters, safe houses, and motel placement) in 1985, 50 in 2000, and 77 as of March 30, 2018. Most, but not all, shelters receiving domestic violence funding are members of the coalition.

Domestic violence incidents

The *Supplemental Domestic Violence Incident Report* for 2017 compiled by the Missouri State Highway Patrol indicated 45,253 incidents of domestic violence were reported that year. Approximately 12 percent (5,654) of the incidents occurred in a county without a domestic violence shelter. These victims may have received shelter services in neighboring counties or even other states; however, this result cannot be determined. Appendix A lists the number of shelters and the domestic violence incidents per county.

An unmet need exists at local shelters

Currently, there are only two shelters to serve every three counties in the state. The MCADSV reported 28,182 unmet requests for shelter and other services in 2017. MCADSV officials indicated there would be some duplication within the number of individuals turned away since individuals in need of shelter services are referred from one shelter to another until available space is located. However, this duplication in counts emphasizes the problem of providing shelter when needed.

The state does not compile any statewide statistics on the number of people served by domestic violence shelters. However, the MCADSV collects and compiles service statistics on a contractual basis with the state. Service providers who receive funding through the Department of Social Services (DSS) or Victims of Crime Act are required to submit their Monthly Services Report (MSR) data online through MCADSV's web-based system. The MSRs are reviewed by MCADSV for any anomalies and are available to the DSS. According to MCADSV records, 6,303 women, 5,048 children and 83 men were provided shelter from domestic violence in 2017. The total number of bed nights provided was 323,102. The MCADSV also reported 28,182 unmet requests for shelter and other services due to a shelter lacking the resources to provide services. Appendix F provides a breakdown of services provided by region of the state.

When comparing domestic violence statistics in Missouri to five neighboring states, we determined Missouri ranks highest in the number of victims turned away from shelters per domestic violence incident. In addition, Missouri



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Introduction

ranked second highest in number of services used per domestic violence incident. Table 1 shows the state comparisons for 2016.

Table 1: Domestic Violence State Comparison for 2016

	Domestic Violence Incidents	Services Used	Incidents per 10,000 people	Services Used per Incident	People Turned Away	People Turned Away per Incident
Missouri ¹	44,501	34,051	73	0.765	10,433	0.234
Arkansas ²	9,764	12,566	33	1.287	1,084	0.111
Illinois ²	118,160	50,040	92	0.423	7,800	0.066
Kentucky ²	41,435	22,299	93	0.538	1,164	0.028
Oklahoma ¹	23,936	15,778	61	0.659	1,430	0.060
Tennessee ¹	78,032	22,460	117	0.288	1,239	0.016

¹ State indicated counts of victims were unduplicated.

² State did not indicate whether counts of victims was duplicated.

Source: State domestic violence coalitions

Available funding

Domestic violence shelters may receive funding from statutory fees, various state and federal grant programs, state tax credit programs, interest income, local fund raisers, and contributions or donations. We estimated¹ 2017 statewide domestic violence shelter revenues of approximately \$74 million.

Approximately \$49 million (66 percent) in state and federal funding² in state fiscal year 2017 was awarded to domestic violence shelters. The domestic violence funding provided by the mandatory and optional domestic violence fees made up approximately 3 percent of funding. Figure 1 illustrates domestic violence shelter funding for 2017.


¹ We obtained financial data from 15 of the state's domestic violence shelters and estimated this data for the 77 shelters in the state.

² State and federal funding includes \$37 million of Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant monies, which include domestic violence services.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Introduction

Figure 1: 2017 Shelter
Funding by Source



Source: Survey responses submitted by counties, the MCADSV, and the Department of Social Services, Department of Public Safety and Department of Health and Senior Services.

Some domestic violence shelters also offer mental health, transitional housing, or job training programs. We excluded, when possible, these programs from total estimated shelter funding.

Tax credits

The DSS administers the Domestic Violence Shelter Tax Credit as authorized by Section 135.550, RSMo. Funding is limited to \$2 million annually. The tax credit program works as follows:

- Shelters wishing to participate in the tax credit program must apply to DSS annually. Each approved shelter receives an equal share of the tax credits available.
- Businesses or citizens donate money to an approved shelter and receive a tax credit. The contributor receives a 50 percent state tax credit for the contributions.
- Contributions must be at least \$100 and each contributor is limited to receiving \$50,000 in tax credits annually. The credits may be redeemed over the next 4 succeeding tax years until the full amount is claimed.
- If a shelter issues all available credits in a particular year, the shelter may contact the DSS to obtain additional credits. The DSS will contact shelters that do not appear to be in need of all assigned credits to receive authorization to transfer the unneeded credits.

The tax credit program is designed to generate up to \$4 million in donations to shelters annually. However, our analysis determined this source of funding is not used fully. The amount of tax credits granted in the last 3 fiscal years is shown in Table 2.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Introduction

Table 2: Tax Credits
Granted by Year

Fiscal Year	Tax Credits Granted	Percentage of Cap	Contributions to Shelters
2015	\$ 1,433,909	72%	\$ 2,867,818
2016	1,893,349	95%	3,786,698
2017	1,611,058	81%	3,222,116
Total	\$ 4,938,316	82%	\$ 9,876,632

Source: Department of Social Services data

Statutes

The audit evaluated local government compliance with various state statutes.

Section 451.151, RSMo, requires a fee be charged for the issuance of a marriage license, to include \$5 to provide financial assistance to shelters for victims of domestic violence. Section 488.607, RSMo, allows counties and cities to implement an optional surcharge of up to \$4 for each criminal case filed, including violations of any county or municipal ordinance. Section 488.445, RSMo, provides that the governing body of any county, or of any city not within a county, may impose a \$5 fee upon the issuance of a marriage license and may impose a \$2 surcharge upon any civil case filed in the circuit court.

Section 455.210, RSMo, provides that the governing body of the city or county shall designate an authority to administer the allocation and distribution of the funds to shelters for victims of domestic violence.

Section 455.215, RSMo, provides that a shelter for victims of domestic violence may apply to the designated authority for funds. All applications shall include the following:

- Evidence that the shelter is incorporated in Missouri as a nonprofit corporation.
- A list of the directors of the corporation, and a list of the trustees of the shelter if different.
- The proposed budget of the shelter for the following calendar year.
- A summary of the services proposed to be offered in the following calendar year.
- An estimate of the number of persons to be served during the following calendar year.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Introduction

Section 455.220, RSMo, provided that to qualify for the funds, a shelter shall meet the all of the following requirements:

- (1) Be incorporated in the state as a nonprofit corporation.
- (2) Have trustees who represent the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the community to be served, at least one of whom must possess personal experience in confronting or mitigating the problems of domestic violence.
- (3) Receive at least 25 percent of its funds from sources other than funds distributed pursuant to Section 455.215, RSMo. These other sources may be public or private and may include contributions of goods or services, including materials, commodities, transportation, office space or other types of facilities or personal services.
- (4) Provide residential service or facilities for children when accompanied by a parent, guardian, or custodian who is a victim of domestic violence and who is receiving temporary residential service at the shelter.
- (5) Require persons employed by or volunteering services to the shelter to maintain the confidentiality of any information that would identify individuals served by the shelter and any information or records that are directly related to the advocacy services provided to such individuals.
- (6) Prior to providing any advocacy services, inform individuals served by the shelter of the nature and scope of the confidentiality requirement in subdivision (5) of this subsection.

Section 455.225, RSMo, provides guidance for allocation of funds if applications received exceed the amount of funds available.

Section 455.230, RSMo, requires shelters to file an annual report with the designated authority to include statistics on the number of persons served by the shelter, the relationship of the victim of domestic violence to the abuser, the number of referrals made for medical, psychological, financial, educational, vocational, child care, or legal services, and the results of an independent audit.

Scope and Methodology

The analysis focused on the funding available from counties and cities for domestic violence shelters. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, funding for domestic violence for the year ended December 31, 2017.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Introduction

Our methodology included interviewing various MCADSV and DSS personnel. We obtained an understanding of legal provisions that are significant within the context of the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violation of contract or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance significant to those provisions.

To gain an understanding of what fees counties collected to fund domestic violence shelters and how these funds were disbursed to shelters, we surveyed the state's 114 counties and the City of St. Louis. The questionnaire asked these entities to:

- Identify which of the mandatory and optional fees were implemented. If an optional fee had not been authorized, an explanation was requested.
- Provide financial data for the fund(s) where these fees were placed.
- Provide information on compliance with various domestic violence funding statutory requirements.
- Report which domestic violence shelters received funding in 2017.

We received or obtained a response providing at least some of the requested information from most counties and the City of St. Louis. The counties of Camden, Clay, Crawford, Morgan, Ripley, and St. Charles did not reply to the survey. Responses received are summarized in Appendixes B and E.

To gain an understanding of what fees cities collected to fund domestic violence shelters, we surveyed the state's 10 largest cities that are within a county, by population. The survey asked the cities to identify if the optional fee was implemented. If the fee was implemented, the survey asked the fund balance at December 31, 2017. Responses are summarized in Appendix C.

We made additional inquiries to many county and city officials and sought additional clarification to the survey responses as deemed appropriate. We did not generally visit the political subdivisions or review supporting documentation of the revenues, expenditures, or balances of the special revenue fund used to manage this funding. We obtained financial information for some domestic violence shelters from counties that had provided funding to the shelters. These shelters appeared to be representative of the shelters in the state. We used this financial information to estimate the funding available to all shelters in the state. We did not visit any shelters for victims of domestic violence or perform any detailed review of shelter financial documentation or documentation supporting service statistics.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Introduction

We obtained a summary of statistical data from MCADSV, an advocacy organization having the majority of domestic violence shelters in Missouri as members. We also obtained statistics on court activity from the 2017 Annual Report prepared by the Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) and the number of domestic violence incidents from the *Supplemental Domestic Violence Incident Report* for 2017 prepared by the Missouri State Highway Patrol. We obtained statistics on the number of marriages from the 2016 Annual Report issued by the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services. The 2017 Annual Report was not available as of May 2018, so we projected data available at that time.

We obtained information on federal and state grant funding provided to domestic violence shelters through the DSS, the Department of Health and Senior Services, and the Department of Public Safety as well as tax credit programs managed by the DSS. We evaluated if the state was participating in applicable federal grant programs that could provide funding to domestic violence shelters. No concerns were noted regarding this issue.

To compare Missouri's funding for domestic violence shelters and domestic violence statistics to other states, we contacted officials in the eight surrounding states. We received responses from five states. We did not receive responses from Iowa, Kansas, or Nebraska.

We also obtained an understanding of the legal provisions that are significant within the context of our audit objectives. This work included, but were not limited to, reviews of Sections 455.200 to 455.230, 451.151, 488.445, 488.607, and 135.550, RSMo.

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Management Advisory Report State Auditor's Findings

1. Domestic Violence Funding Opportunities


Approximately \$698,000 in revenue for domestic violence shelters are forgone annually due to counties and cities electing not to collect all domestic violence fees allowed by state law. As depicted in Table 1.1, Missouri statutes allow counties and cities the option to assess fees to fund shelters for victims of domestic violence. These fees are in addition to the mandatory \$5 fee required to be charged by counties for marriage licenses.

Table 1.1: Optional Fees to Fund Domestic Violence

Statute	Fee Description	Allowed Amount	Applies To
488.445	Issuance of a marriage license	\$5	Counties and the City of St. Louis
488.445	Filing of a civil case	\$2	Counties and the City of St. Louis
488.607	Filing of a criminal case	up to \$4	Counties and Cities

Due to these fees being optional, implementation has been sporadic across the state. We determined 17 counties did not impose any of the optional fees to fund shelters for victims of domestic violence, a significant improvement from 60 reported in a prior audit report issued in 2000.³ In the 17 counties that did not impose any of the optional fees, there were 2,007 domestic violence incidents, or 4 percent of the total 45,253 domestic violence incidents reported during 2017. In addition, 3 of the 10 largest cities in the state did not pass ordinances authorizing collection of the optional fee authorized under Section 488.607, RSMo.⁴ In 2017, 69 counties reported domestic violence fee revenue of less than \$1,000. Figure 1.1 illustrates the number of counties collecting the optional domestic violence fees. Appendix B includes the detailed optional fees authorized by each county.

Figure 1.1: Percentage of counties collecting optional fees, by fee type



Source: Survey responses submitted by counties

³ State Auditor's Office, *Audit of Collection and Distribution of Fees for Domestic Violence Shelters*, report number 2000-97.

⁴ The maximum fee allowed by section 488.607, RSMo, was updated in 2014 to allow an amount up to \$4. Prior to 2014, counties and cities could authorize a \$2 fee. Audit survey response indicated 43 counties imposed the maximum allowable fee.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

In response to our survey, officials cited the following reasons for not implementing optional fees:

- There are no domestic violence shelters within the county or city.
- The officials were not aware of the optional fees.
- One county collected all fees except the \$5 optional fee per Section 488.445, RSMo, because the official thought this fee was for homeless shelters only, and there are none within the county.

As shown in Table 1.2, an estimated \$698,000 would be available each year for domestic violence shelters if counties and the surveyed cities implemented the optional fees.

Table 1.2: Additional
Fees Available

Fee	Number of Cases ¹	Fee Amount	Total Available
Marriage	4,966	\$5	\$ 24,830
Civil Cases	24,732	\$2	49,464
Criminal Cases	99,850	Up to \$4	399,400
Criminal Fees less than \$4	69,868	Up to \$4	147,951
City Criminal Cases	19,082	Up to \$4	76,328
Total	218,498		\$ 697,973

¹ We based our estimate for marriages upon the number of marriages reported by the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services in the department's 2016 Annual Report in counties that did not collect the fees. For civil and criminal cases, we used statistics reported in the Missouri Judicial Report and information supplied by surveyed cities.

Section 488.445, RSMo, does not restrict the adoption of optional fees to counties having a shelter. Section 488.607, RSMo, specifically allows adoption of the optional fee on criminal cases by "any county or municipality whose residents are victims of domestic violence and are admitted to such shelters...." Implementing all optional fees would allow shelters the maximum funds to provide domestic violence services.

Recommendation

The General Assembly evaluate statutory changes that would expand adoption of the optional fees to support domestic violence shelters.

Auditee's Response

Due to no state or local entity having oversight or management responsibilities over funding for domestic violence shelters on a statewide basis, no management response can be obtained. The views of any applicable county or city officials were obtained as appropriate and considered a part of our audit fieldwork.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

2. Burdensome Statutes Hinder Distribution of Fees

State statutes regarding the distribution requirements for domestic violence fees collected are burdensome and unclear, resulting in a lack of compliance with requirements, and some county funds going undistributed. Survey results indicated many county governments do not require shelters to submit annual funding requests or provide an annual report of services provided as required by law. As a result of the burdensome statutory requirements, domestic violence fees were not distributed and attempts were not made to send idle funds to areas in the most need for the funds. A more centralized approach to distribution of fees could help ensure funds are used more effectively. Victims were turned away at some shelters and may not have received needed services as a result.

Statute requires duplication of effort

State law requires each county and city designated authority responsible for administering the allocation and distribution of domestic violence funds to shelters to individually obtain and review domestic violence shelter funding requests, including determining if the shelter is eligible to receive funding. If a shelter is requesting funding from multiple counties or cities, the shelter must submit the same paperwork and that paperwork must be reviewed and evaluated by multiple local officials.

Section 455.215, RSMo, requires the applications submitted to contain evidence the shelter is incorporated, the directors of the corporation, a proposed budget, a summary of services offered, and an estimate of the number of people to be served. Our survey results indicated 54 counties and the City of St. Louis received funding requests from shelters that properly included the items required under this statute.

Shelters already apply for and receive state and federal grant funding through programs administered by the Department of Social Services and other state agencies. These programs generally involve application processes to determine eligibility as well as post-expenditure reporting requirements. With mechanisms already in place to evaluate shelter eligibility and for shelters to report program results, having hundreds of county and city designated authorities receive funding requests, determine eligibility, and receive program result reports is redundant and inefficient. Having a state agency designate which shelters are eligible to receive local domestic violence funding would simplify this process. Local governments could access this centralized data to determine a shelter's current eligibility status as well as its compliance status. A simplified or consolidated process would reduce the administrative burden at the local level and improve the ease of distribution to the shelters.

Statutory requirements for distribution are not being met

Only 43 of the 106 counties and the City of St. Louis (40 percent) responded that the requirements of Sections 455.215, 455.220 and 455.230, RSMo, were met. In addition, only 37 of the 89 counties providing funding to shelters in 2017 indicated the required financial, statistical, and audit results were provided in compliance with statutory requirements.



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

Section 455.220, RSMo, requires shelters to be incorporated in the state as a nonprofit corporation, have trustees who represent the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the community to be served, receive at least 25 percent of funds from sources other than funds distributed pursuant to Section 455.215, RSMo, and provide residential services or facilities for children when accompanied by a parent or guardian who is a victim of domestic violence. Fifty-three counties and the City of St. Louis indicated the shelters making funding requests met the eligibility requirements of Section 455.220, RSMo. One county (Callaway) indicated the only funding request received did not meet the requirements but funding was provided anyway. Six counties (Adair, Clark, Daviess, Dunklin, Reynolds, and Scotland) indicated the requesting shelter complied with the requirements and the shelter was eligible for funding, but no distribution occurred.

Section 455.230, RSMo, requires annual statistical reporting for shelters receiving domestic violence fee funding. The statute requires the designated authority administering the allocation of funding to more than one shelter to compile the reported statistics from shelters; however, the statute does not explain what is to be done with the compiled data. Our survey results indicated 45 counties received annual reports from shelters that complied with Section 455.230, RSMo.

Local domestic violence fees not being distributed

State law does not require the designated authorities administering domestic violence funding to make distributions and has not established a maximum amount that may be retained. Eighteen counties did not distribute domestic violence fees in 2017 and, collectively, were holding \$254,000 at December 31, 2017. In these 18 counties, there were 2,679 domestic violence incidents, or 6 percent of the total 45,253 domestic violence incidents reported during 2017. An additional 6 counties distributed some funds throughout the year, but held more than a year's worth of revenue, totaling approximately \$50,000, at the end of the year. The detailed list of counties and amounts is available at Appendix D. According to officials in these counties, the funds were being held because no requests for funds were received, or there is no shelter in the county. As detailed at Appendix C, all of the cities surveyed that collected domestic violence fees distributed funds during 2017.

A centralized distribution model could improve effectiveness

Due to the decentralized manner in which domestic violence fees are currently distributed, funds are not being distributed where there is a demand for services. Counties are holding funds if no requests for funds are made by any shelters. Additionally, some counties do not contact shelter officials in other counties to ensure victims are served. At least three surrounding states (Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas) require fees collected at the local level be remitted to a centralized state agency. The state agency then oversees the distribution of those fees to the shelters throughout the state.

A centralized registration and reporting system for shelters requesting domestic violence funds, such as used in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas,



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

would enable more consistent reporting and better oversight of domestic violence funds. Such a system could determine which shelters are eligible for funding and receive and compile the required financial and statistical reports. Having a centralized agency administer the distribution of fees would also allow fees to be more strategically distributed based on need.

Recommendation

The General Assembly revise Sections 455.200 to 455.230, RSMo, to reduce the administrative burden placed upon political subdivision and shelters, and require local entities collecting domestic violence fees to distribute them at least annually. The General Assembly should also consider establishing a centralized shelter registration and data collection process and authorizing centralized collection and distribution of domestic violence fees. These functions could be handled by one of the state agencies already administering domestic violence programs.


Auditee's Response

Due to no state or local entity having oversight or management responsibilities over funding for domestic violence shelters on a statewide basis, no management response can be obtained. The views of any applicable county or city officials were obtained as appropriate and considered a part of our audit fieldwork.

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Shelter Locations and Domestic Violence Incidents by County

Year Ended December 31, 2017



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Domestic Violence Fund Financial Activity - Counties

Year Ended December 31, 2017

County/City of St. Louis	Optional Fees Collected			Beginning Balance	Domestic Violence Fee Revenue	Donations	Interest & Other	Disbursements	Ending Balance
	Marriage	Criminal	Civil						
Adair		X	X	\$ 42,379	3,542	0	271	0	46,192
Andrew	X	X	X	0	6,160	0	0	6,160	0
Atchison	X	X	X	3,592	3,949	0	16	3,592	3,965
Audrain			X	2,772	3,805	0	9	3,344	3,242
Barry		X	X	0	6,588	0	22	6,610	0
Barton	X		X	1,452	5,507	0	0	5,471	1,488
Bates			X	382	632	0	0	677	337
Benton	X	X	X	3,200	5,619	0	15	5,981	2,853
Bollinger	X	X	X	0	1,102	0	3	1,104	1
Boone	X	X	X	33,702	26,126	0	23	27,806	32,045
Buchanan	X	X	X	0	15,581	0	0	15,581	0
Butler	X	X	X	4,592	8,306	0	0	8,315	4,583
Caldwell			X	1,617	600	0	0	0	2,217
Callaway			X	798	10,486	0	71	10,000	1,355
Camden*									
Cape Girardeau	X	X	X	11,331	16,450	0	0	14,431	13,350
Carroll				2,183	285	0	3	1,000	1,471
Carter				165	181	0	0	346	0
Cass	X	X	X	13,036	20,778	0	39	22,918	10,935
Cedar	X	X	X	3,602	4,059	0	0	7,355	306
Chariton			X	138	229	0	0	250	117
Christian				0	2,455	0	0	2,455	0
Clark			X	27,616	4,267	0	313	0	32,196
Clay*									
Clinton	X		X	853	5,816	0	4	6,672	1
Cole	X	X	X	7,231	13,622	0	53	13,634	7,272
Cooper	X	X	X	2,569	4,970	0	16	5,061	2,494
Crawford*									
Dade	X	X	X	30	40	0	0	60	10
Dallas				0	572	0	0	572	0
Daviess			X	784	499	0	1	0	1,284
DeKalb	X	X	X	0	472	0	1	474	(1)
Dent*				4,088	4,119	0	0	3,742	4,465
Douglas				110	970	0	4	850	234
Dunklin		X	X	4,044	1,844	0	55	0	5,943
Franklin				4,471	3,905	0	46	0	8,422
Gasconade				295	565	0	4	500	364
Gentry				295	260	0	0	300	255
Greene	X	X	X	52,131	46,907	2,920	236	50,000	52,194
Grundy		X	X	67	582	0	0	491	158
Harrison	X		X	266	540	0	1	807	0
Henry		X	X	95	982	0	0	1,077	0
Hickory			X	1,333	1,138	0	0	1,332	1,139
Holt		X		125	135	0	0	135	125
Howard			X	20,685	1,670	0	324	0	22,679
Howell		X	X	0	14,533	0	41	14,574	0
Iron				11	255	0	1	250	17
Jackson	X	X	X	57,092	172,469	0	132	182,000	47,693



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding
Domestic Violence Fund Financial Activity - Counties
Year Ended December 31, 2017

County/City of St. Louis	Optional Fees Collected			Beginning Balance	Domestic Violence Fee Revenue	Donations	Interest & Other	Disbursements	Ending Balance
	Marriage	Criminal	Civil						
Jasper	X		X	16,112	33,368	0	0	31,449	18,031
Jefferson*	X								
Johnson	X	X	X	642	6,414	0	10	6,420	646
Knox		X	X	8,309	750	0	122	0	9,181
Laclede	X	X	X	12,315	9,615	0	12	21,300	642
Lafayette	X	X	X	10,367	21,241	0	0	20,989	10,619
Lawrence				347	6,617	0	0	6,742	222
Lewis	X	X	X	9,532	9,306	0	0	9,482	9,356
Lincoln	X	X	X	28,801	21,006	0	486	24,639	25,654
Linn				690	275	0	0	275	690
Livingston	X		X	1,596	1,416	0	6	2,000	1,018
Macon			X	537	560	0	4	0	1,101
Madison	X	X	X	2,111	912	0	4	996	2,031
Maries	X	X	X	903	1,872	0	2	2,070	707
Marion	X	X	X	6,402	14,837	0	0	14,800	6,439
McDonald	X		X	0	3,392	0	0	3,392	0
Mercer		X	X	0	215	0	0	215	0
Miller	X		X	61,315	6,435	0	1,052	0	68,802
Mississippi*									
Moniteau	X	X	X	2,100	2,644	0	23	2,384	2,383
Monroe	X	X	X	416	567	0	0	416	567
Montgomery		X	X	17,922	3,428	0	151	5,012	16,489
Morgan*									
New Madrid	X			0	1,110	0	0	1,110	0
Newton	X		X	4,117	7,782	0	13	7,574	4,338
Nodaway		X		2,652	3,268	0	0	2,652	3,268
Oregon				286	310	0	4	286	314
Osage		X	X	3,393	2,004	0	0	2,500	2,897
Ozark	X		X	265	270	0	0	250	285
Pemiscot				13,961	647	0	24	0	14,632
Perry	X	X	X	5,348	9,413	0	0	9,656	5,105
Pettis	X	X	X	4,844	9,038	0	33	8,916	4,999
Phelps	X	X		3,930	12,729	0	1	13,570	3,090
Pike	X	X	X	3,379	4,304	0	0	4,113	3,570
Platte	X		X	8,495	29,467	0	84	30,676	7,370
Polk	X		X	1,482	9,572	0	0	10,090	964
Pulaski	X	X	X	16,293	13,990	0	68	16,293	14,058
Putnam			X	80	150	0	0	170	60
Ralls		X	X	401	513	0	2	648	268
Randolph	X	X		0	11,897	0	0	11,897	0
Ray	X	X	X	3,590	4,409	0	20	4,455	3,564
Reynolds			X	231	284	0	0	0	515
Ripley*									
Saint Charles*									
Saint Clair			X	419	727	0	3	779	370
Saint Francois	X	X	X	7,283	14,378	0	36	14,347	7,350
Saint Louis	X	X	X	425,959	312,416	0	3,905	303,740	438,540
Ste. Genevieve	X	X	X	5,324	9,286	0	5	10,259	4,356
Saline	X	X	X	34,764	5,680	0	599	12,013	29,030
Schuyler				2	206	0	0	198	10



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding
Domestic Violence Fund Financial Activity - Counties
Year Ended December 31, 2017

County/City of St. Louis	Optional Fees Collected			Beginning Balance	Domestic Violence Fee Revenue	Donations	Interest & Other	Disbursements	Ending Balance
	Marriage	Criminal	Civil						
Scotland				200	170	0	0	0	370
Scott	X	X	X	0	7,928	2,392	2	10,322	0
Shannon	X			952	660	0	3	0	1,615
Shelby			X	645	140	0	7	464	328
Stoddard	X		X	6,487	3,257	0	65	0	9,809
Stone	X	X	X	2,147	5,856	0	0	8,003	0
Sullivan			X	1,417	185	0	0	0	1,602
Taney	X	X		7,234	7,530	0	43	7,234	7,573
Texas*	X			20,924	6,732	0	136	0	27,792
Vernon	X		X	769	4,677	0	18	5,463	1
Warren	X	X	X	7,857	8,110	0	620	16,516	71
Washington	X	X	X	1,749	3,817	0	11	5,576	1
Wayne			X	0	518	0	0	518	0
Webster		X	X	1,917	9,145	0	30	5,459	5,633
Worth				0	45	0	0	0	45
Wright				82	560	0	2	500	144
City of St. Louis	X	X	X	125,958	78,242	0	0	120,000	84,200
Total	60	57	81	\$ 1,214,385	1,169,864	5,312	9,310	1,224,755	1,174,116

*The county did not submit a survey or answer the survey fully.

Source: Survey responses submitted by the counties and City of St. Louis

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Domestic Violence Fund Financial Activity - Selected Cities

Year Ended December 31, 2017

City	Beginning Balance	Domestic Violence Fee Revenue	Donations	Interest, Grants & Other	Disbursements	Ending Balance
Kansas City*	\$ 316,594	301,062	0	340,518	858,920	99,254
Springfield	1,858	23,023	0	0	23,364	1,517
Independence	18,714	84,370	0	0	82,698	20,386
Columbia**	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lee's Summit	2,442	29,033	0	0	29,272	2,203
O'Fallon	986	16,044	0	0	17,030	0
St. Joseph	203	34,794	0	0	32,859	2,138
St. Charles**	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Peters**	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blue Springs	1,785	23,527	0	0	23,690	1,622
	<u>\$ 342,582</u>	<u>511,853</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>340,518</u>	<u>1,067,833</u>	<u>127,120</u>

* Disbursements for this city include both disbursements to shelters and other operating expenses.

** The city has not passed an ordinance authorizing collection of the optional domestic violence fee.

Source: Survey responses submitted by the cities

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Counties Holding Domestic Violence Monies

Year Ended December 31, 2017

County Holding Funds	Reported Fee Revenue	Expenditures	Fund Balance	Estimated Years of Revenue Held	Balance Distributed In 2018
Miller	\$ 6,435	0	68,802	11	Yes
Adair	3,542	0	46,192	13	
Clark	4,267	0	32,196	8	Yes
Texas	6,732	0	27,792	4	
Howard	1,670	0	22,679	14	Yes
Pemiscot	647	0	14,632	23	
Stoddard	3,257	0	9,808	3	
Knox	750	0	9,181	12	Yes
Franklin	3,905	0	8,423	2	Yes
Dunklin	1,844	0	5,944	3	
Caldwell	600	0	2,217	4	
Shannon	660	0	1,616	2	
Sullivan	185	0	1,602	9	
Daviess	499	0	1,284	3	
Macon	560	0	1,101	2	
Reynolds	284	0	515	2	
Scotland	170	0	370	2	
Worth	45	0	45	1	
County Total			\$ 254,399		
County Partially Holding Funds					
Carroll	\$ 285	1,000	1,471	5	
Linn	275	275	690	3	
Madison	912	996	2,031	2	
Montgomery	3,428	5,012	16,488	5	
Saline	5,680	12,013	29,030	5	
Shelby	140	464	329	2	
Partial Hold Total			\$ 50,039		
Grand Total			\$ 304,438		

Source: Survey responses submitted by the counties

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Summary of Survey Responses

Year Ended December 31, 2017

County/City of St. Louis	Someone Designated to Administer the Allocation and Distribution of Fees	Shelter Funding Request Met Statutory Requirements	Shelter Met Eligibility Requirements	Statistics Reported Complied with Requirements
Adair	N	Y	Y	Y
Andrew	Y	U	U	U
Atchison	Y	Y	Y	Y
Audrain	Y	Y	Y	Y
Barry	Y	U	U	U
Barton	Y	U	U	U
Bates	Y	N	U	U
Benton	U	U	U	Y
Bollinger	Y	U	U	U
Boone	Y	Y	Y	Y
Buchanan	Y	Y	Y	Y
Butler	Y	Y	Y	Y
Caldwell	Y	U	U	U
Callaway	Y	N	N	U
Camden	NOA	NOA	NOA	NOA
Cape Girardeau	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carroll	N	U	U	U
Carter	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cass	Y	U	U	U
Cedar	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chariton	Y	Y	Y	Y
Christian	N	U	U	U
Clark	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clay	NOA	NOA	NOA	NOA
Clinton	Y	U	U	U
Cole	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cooper	N	U	U	U
Crawford	NOA	NOA	NOA	NOA
Dade	N	U	U	U
Dallas	Y	U	U	N/A
Daviess	Y	Y	Y	Y
DeKalb	Y	U	U	U
Dent	Y	Y	Y	U
Douglas	Y	Y	Y	U
Dunklin	N	Y	Y	Y
Franklin	N	U	U	U
Gasconade	N	Y	Y	Y
Gentry	Y	U	U	U
Greene	N	N	Y	N
Grundy	N	U	U	U
Harrison	Y	U	U	U
Henry	Y	U	U	U
Hickory	Y	Y	U	U
Holt	Y	Y	Y	N



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding
Summary of Survey Responses
Year Ended December 31, 2017

County/City of St. Louis	Someone Designated to Administer the Allocation and Distribution of Fees	Shelter Funding Request Met Statutory Requirements	Shelter Met Eligibility Requirements	Statistics Reported Complied with Requirements
Howard	N	U	U	U
Howell	N	Y	Y	N
Iron	N	U	U	U
Jackson	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jasper	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jefferson	Y	NOA	NOA	NOA
Johnson	Y	N	U	U
Knox	Y	U	U	U
Laclede	Y	U	U	U
Lafayette	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lawrence	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lewis	Y	U	U	U
Lincoln	Y	Y	U	U
Linn	Y	Y	U	U
Livingston	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macon	U	U	U	U
Madison	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maries	Y	Y	Y	U
Marion	Y	U	U	U
McDonald	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mercer	N	U	U	U
Miller	Y	U	Y	U
Mississippi	N	NOA	NOA	NOA
Moniteau	Y	U	U	U
Monroe	Y	U	U	U
Montgomery	Y	Y	Y	U
Morgan	NOA	NOA	NOA	NOA
New Madrid	Y	U	U	U
Newton	N	Y	Y	Y
Nodaway	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oregon	N	Y	Y	U
Osage	Y	U	U	U
Ozark	Y	U	U	U
Pemiscot	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
Perry	Y	U	U	U
Pettis	Y	N	U	U
Phelps	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pike	Y	Y	Y	Y
Platte	Y	Y	Y	Y
Polk	Y	U	U	U
Pulaski	N	U	U	U
Putnam	Y	U	U	U
Ralls	N	Y	Y	Y
Randolph	Y	Y	Y	Y



Domestic Violence Shelter Funding
Summary of Survey Responses
Year Ended December 31, 2017

County/City of St. Louis	Someone Designated to Administer the Allocation and Distribution of Fees	Shelter Funding Request Met Statutory Requirements	Shelter Met Eligibility Requirements	Statistics Reported Complied with Requirements
Ray	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reynolds	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ripley	NOA	NOA	NOA	NOA
Saint Charles	NOA	NOA	NOA	NOA
Saint Clair	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Francois	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Louis County	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ste. Genevieve	Y	U	U	U
Saline	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
Schuyler	Y	Y	Y	Y
Scotland	Y	Y	Y	Y
Scott	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shannon	Y	Y	Y	U
Shelby	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stoddard	Y	U	U	U
Stone	Y	U	U	U
Sullivan	Y	U	U	U
Taney	N	Y	Y	Y
Texas	Y	U	U	U
Vernon	N	U	U	Y
Warren	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne	N	U	U	U
Webster	Y	Y	Y	Y
Worth	N	U	U	U
Wright	N	Y	Y	Y
City of St. Louis	Y	Y	Y	N
<u>Summary of Results</u>				
Yes (Y)	83	55	54	45
No (N)	24	5	1	4
No Answer (NOA)	6	8	8	8
Unknown (U)	2	45	50	55
Not Applicable (N/A)	0	2	2	3
Total	115	115	115	115

Source: Survey responses submitted by the counties

Domestic Violence Shelter Funding

Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence Shelter Statistics Year Ended December 31, 2017

Region	Total Sheltered*	Non-Residential Services	Unmet Requests for All Services
Central	1,302	2,575	1,387
Kansas City	2,593	3,695	14,769
Northeast	740	2,771	268
Northwest	1,286	3,251	1,459
Southeast	322	2,354	1,595
Southwest	1,978	1,409	3,591
St. Louis	2,373	8,099	5,113
Totals	10,594	24,154	28,182

*The sheltered totals by region do not include transitional housing. The sheltered information listed on page 4 includes transitional housing.

Source: Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence data