

**JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN**  
**MINUTES FROM CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**OCTOBER 22, 2010**

---

**Members Present:** Co-Chairs Judge Leonard Costello and Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson; Corinna Burris; Nancy Foll; Ian Grant; Gwen Gua; Judge Frederick (Fritz) Hayes; Sheila Huber (alternate for Steve Hasset); Catherine Lanham; Jeanine Livingston; Maureen McGrath; Jeanne McShane; Mary Meinig; Jerry Meninick; Ken Nichols; Sharon Osborne; Andi Smith (alternate for Carole Holland); Nancy Sutton; Gwendolyn Lawson Townsend; Tom Tremaine (alternate for Liz Mueller).

**Staff Present:** Julie Dunnington, Melissa Takade, and Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; David del Villar Fox, Rich Pannkuk, Becky Smith, Deborah Purce and Tammy Cordova, DSHS Children's Administration; Jennifer Strus, Washington State Senate Committee Services; Sydney Forrester, Washington State House of Representatives Office of Program Research.

**Guests:**

Representative Ruth Kagi, Washington State House of Representatives.

---

***Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Overview***

Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) co-chair Judge Leonard Costello welcomed the public and the committee, gave an overview of the agenda, reviewed meeting ground rules, described how the audience could offer public comment and asked all of the CWTDC members to introduce themselves. During introductions, Judge Costello welcomed new committee member Judge Frederick Hayes, who is replacing Judge Chris Wickham. He also explained that Rebecca Peck would be replacing the Honorable Henry Cagey as an IPAC representative; however, Rebecca was unable to attend this meeting.

***Performance-Based Contracting Update***

The Children's Administration Core Management team, led by Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson, gave an update on Part 1 – Performance-Based Contracting. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson led things off by giving an overview of the presentation, which is focused on providing more in-depth information around four primary areas: (1) principles around wraparound services, (2) roles and responsibilities between CA and Master Contractors (MCs), (3) program expectations around in-home services, and (4) dispute resolution. She mentioned that CA would be issuing a draft Request for Proposal (RFP) for Master Contractors, for public comment soon.

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson started the presentation by talking about the principles used in wraparound services, which is a team-based approach based on the families' strengths. In other states where wraparound is used, it's the parents who facilitate their own team meetings. It is empowering. Services need to be community-based and culturally competent. The wraparound approach will be included in the RFP.

Before handing the next section of the presentation off to Tammy Cordova, Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson asked for questions.

- Sharon Osborne asked if there has been further thought on how training will be delivered. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said there was an existing contract with Eric

Trupin and Eric Bruins, who are in the process of putting together a training plan. CA is also in the process of planning other cross-training, as well.

- Gwen Gua asked, relative to training, if there has been a discussion how to insert the training around Indian child welfare issues. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson responded CA will work with IPAC to put together the training, and there will be training provided to private agency partners on the government-to-government framework for tribes with federal and state requirements for serving Indian families and children.
- There was a question asked if there have been talks with the recognized Indian organizations that serve the urban communities, and families and children from tribes outside Washington State. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said CA has already been working with the agencies that are serving urban Indian children and youth. Part of those discussions is the impact on tribal children who are placed outside of Washington State. Once CA has all of their decisions, that part of the plan will be finalized.
- A follow-on question concerned the children that are in the opposite position, where their tribes are outside the state of Washington, and they're largely served not by any of the 29 tribes in the state of Washington but by the urban Indian programs in the Puget Sound area or Spokane. The speaker was wondering if there are conversations being conducted on this issue. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that issue will be addressed.

There were no more questions regarding the wraparound approach, so the presentation was turned over to Tammy Cordova, who addressed roles and responsibilities for CA and for Master Contractors. CA will retain responsibility for:

- Investigating allegations of child abuse and neglect.
- Placement, care and authority decisions for children placed out of home care.
- Determining case open and closure.
- Writing and filing court petitions and reports.
- Completing initial family assessments and licensing foster homes and facilities.
- Determining the rate that a foster home is paid to care for a child and determining eligibility for federal and state reimbursement programs which will include eligibility for relative guardianship assistance and adoption assistance.
- Developing the case plan which includes goals and objectives, and identifying those things that are needed to address the safety threats that brought the family to CA's attention.
- Developing the core report that describes the progress and barriers to achieving safe permanency for a child.

She stressed that there will be an important partnership between CA and the master contractor. The master contractor will be responsible for:

- Developing the service plan in partnership with the family, CA and others that the family identifies as being important to them achieving progress.

- Coordinating, implementing and (jointly, with CA) monitoring the service plan, with lead responsibility to modify the service plan when needed.

Tammy Cordova then asked for questions:

- A question was asked about who was responsible for the family team decision meetings (FTDMs) and setting up CPT's – CA or the Master Contractor. Tammy Cordova responded that in terms of an actual FTDM, CA would be identifying that as well as the CPT. But when there is a meeting needing to be held around service delivery, the hope is that there will be monthly family meetings involving service providers, CA, and those who are important to the progress of the family and child so that there's less need for some of these incident-driven meetings. Becky Smith added that having the monthly meetings helps to assess the services. The FTDM and the CPT will remain the social worker's responsibility, but the monthly family meetings are different and address safety concerns and services that are being provided to the family.
- Sharon Osborne had a follow up to the question, saying that the process looks like a PQI system and that it appears to put the focus first on the family, and then who is involved in the process. She asked that CA focus more on, again, what is going to be put in place and how to assure outcomes are achieved.
- A question was asked about who would show up in court – the CA worker or the MC. The answer is that the CA social worker will be in court. When needed, CA will ask for the master contractor or the service coordinator to also be there to address specific issues.
- The follow-on question was whether the expectation of the MC being in court on an as-needed basis would be specifically incorporated into the master contract. The answer is yes.
- Catherine Lanham asked for clarification on who specifically would be attending the monthly family meetings. The answer is it would be the social worker, the master contractor, the family, and other family support people. For older youth, it would include the youth as well. For a child who's in out-of-home care, it would be the person who's caring for the child, the relative or the foster parent.
- Corrina Burris asked for a definition of PQI and for clarification on the FTDM process. Regarding the FTDM process, the FTDMs occur when placement is imminent or when it looks like a placement may be unstable and might disrupt. That process will continue. Sharon Osborne explained that PQI stands for Performance Quality Improvement, which is a system where the focus is on the goals you're trying to obtain. She believes that PQI delineates more clearly the roles and responsibilities of everybody concerned.
- Nancy Foll asked if CA currently conducts monthly meetings. The answer is that monthly meetings occur if a child is placed in a BRS home. A BRS provider will hold monthly meetings so they can update the social worker and whoever else is involved with that child. Nancy asked if these were face-to-face meetings. The answer is that it depends on where the child is placed. If there's courtesy supervision, you may get a courtesy supervision social worker. Nancy said that, though the concept is good, she had concern about the cost of having monthly meetings. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson commented that meetings don't have to be in person. It can be done by phone in a short amount of time. It's an opportunity to assess progress. The MC will have flexibility to accomplish that.

- Nancy also asked for clarity on how CA will define service outcomes. Tammy Cordova asked if she could hold on to the question because that issue would be coming up later in the presentation. Nancy agreed.
- Catherine Lanham asked who would be working with the children's schools. Tammy Cordova said currently social workers work with the schools because it's part of case management and planning. It will likely continue to be dependent on what the purpose is and what the needs are. Becky Smith added that foster parents or whomever the child is with, are also usually working with the schools and providing feedback to CA.
- Tom Tremaine asked if the MC is expected to be present at Local Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committee (LICWAC) meetings. The answer is that it would likely be similar to schools; it depends on what the goal is and the type of services being provided. It's important that the social worker attends all LICWAC meetings and the foster parents and whoever is particularly involved with that child in the case should also be invited. Tom asked for clarification – would the expectation for the MC then be a case-by-case basis? The answer is that it'll be similar to the court system - when CA needs somebody to show up, it is the expectation that they'll ask a service provider to show up. It would be the same for the master contractor or the service coordinator; if CA needed them to attend a LICWAC meeting, CA would ask the MC to be involved.
- Maureen McGrath requested more clarity about what the case plan is and what it is not, its goals and objectives, what provisions in place to prevent a situation where too many services or goals lead to a checkmark system where every box is filled, which would bankrupt the system. She also had a question regarding the monthly meetings, will members be invited and then it's up to them whether or not they want to participate? She can envision a situation where perhaps families are not informed in a timely manner. If that situation goes on too long, then the meaning of what a family meeting is will be lost. The answer is that CA strongly believes that families need to be involved and the hope is that families will be able to take a stronger role in leading these team meetings.
- Jeanine Livingston asked who will facilitate or be responsible for convening the family monthly meeting, the master contractor or CA? In addition, such tasks as sending out the invitations, setting up the location or the conference call, who's responsible for what? The answer is that would be part of the role of the master contractor because it's around a service provision. However, CA will continue to work on this and welcomes any input.

Becky Smith gave the next part of the presentation, which centered on in-home services. Whenever possible, CA would like to keep a child in-home safely. The issues are controlling safety concerns and having the ability to help the family become stable by providing not just support systems, but the right services for the family. The goal is to enhance the parents' ability to parent their children without further incidents of abuse or neglect. It's important that the right services are being provided in the family's current living environment, and for a provider to assess the situation and see first-hand how the family is currently living and what that situation looks like. That's why regular monthly family meetings are important – it's a chance to assess safety or parental concerns, if services need to change, and if any new concerns have come up. If there are any safety concerns, this is a time for those concerns to be addressed.

The master contractor will be responsible for not only coordination of service deliveries, but also ensuring that the documentation is done in a timely manner whenever possible and that it reflects what's currently going on. The MC will also be responsible for notifying CA about safety concerns. The goal is for children to remain safely in their homes without further abuse and

neglect for 12 months after the service is provided, and that there's no substantiated maltreatment within 12 months of services being provided or a case being closed.

Regarding out-of-home placement services and outcomes, families will need to make sure that the MC looks at progress in reducing safety threats that cause the child to be in placement and that services are being provided so the child can eventually live in a family setting.

Becky Smith then asked for questions:

- Jeanine Livingston had two questions. The first was the difference between the social workers' current shared planning meetings and the proposed monthly family meetings, and if the shared planning meetings will go away with the master contracting agency conducting the family team meetings? Becky Smith responded that they're reviewing all the meetings social workers are currently conducting and trying to consolidate them. The second question was around in-home services and family preservation services (FPS) and if funding limitations for these services will improve. The answer is that through the master contractor, there'll be different types of services that will be available to more families across the state, and they will be services that meet a family or child needs.
- Jeanine had a follow-up question relating to the providers conducting safety assessments – if these assessments will replace the required monthly visits the social worker must conduct. The answer is no, it never replaces the responsibility of the Children's Administration. As mandatory reporters, if the service providers need to call a family case back in, if there's a new maltreatment issue or if they can't control the safety, then CA needs to send, as is mandated, a child protective services worker out to reassess.
- Maureen McGrath asked if there is a reliable, validated tool private agencies will be required to use to create some synchronicity between the department's assessment and that of the service provider? The answer is that the tools haven't been defined yet; CA is reassessing its tools with the national training center.
- A question was asked of Becky Smith on whether Children's Administration will be responsible for training mandated reporters on their responsibility and what to watch for as mandated reporters? She answered that CA provides some of that training now, but that it needs to be more robust and they need to reinforce that training with the mandated reporters. Addressing racial disproportionality will be part of that training.
- Corrina Burris asked if CA works with birth parents who have successfully reunified with their families as a support to help other parents navigate the child welfare system, and if so, how will they approach the background check situation? The answer is that currently there is no statewide practice that uses veteran birth parents as supports, but when it does occur, it seems to be very successful. Regarding the question on background checks - they will have to look into how background checks are handled in those instances. Corrina suggested that perhaps a waiver could be created, depending on whatever the crime was that the parent had or how long it's been and whether or not the parents have had any subsequent or additional offenses since their finding. CA requested that if she had any information about what's already working and successful, to please bring it forward because they would be very interested in replicating that practice.
- Ian Grant voiced his concern that issues faced by foster youth who age out of the system have not been addressed. He asked if anybody could elaborate on how the

master contractor process would work for those foster youths who will age out soon. The answer is those services provided for a youth that turns 18 years old will not be part of the master contract and will be kept out separately. Because the transitional services are so unique, CA wants to ensure those services are addressed specifically to those youths.

Deborah Purce took over for the next part of the presentation on dispute resolution. She stressed that no matter how well drafted or accepted a dispute resolution process is, it is not going to work if people don't have good will towards one another and act in good faith. It is important to get the dispute resolved as soon as possible and that services continue to children during the dispute. She then asked for thoughts on the draft of this process.

- A question was asked if there are areas that are not subject to the dispute resolution process where CA has ultimate authority; specifically, between the service coordinator and the CA social worker – any areas where the CA social worker has the authority or the supervisor, or area administrator. The answer is CA retains authority in making sure that the services that are available and the decisions made for the child are in the best interest of the child.
- Sharon Osborne said there has to be shared responsibility between CA and master contractors. She is concerned about the 15-day deadline for resolving non-emergent issues. She pointed out that 15 days is really a long time in children and family's lives and that the resolution deadline should strive for 24 hours, no matter if the issue is emergent or non-emergent.
- Nancy Foll suggested that in the formal process, there be one CA contact person instead of three when filing the paperwork and that a meeting could then be convened if needed.
- Corrina Burris asked if (1) there is a process to deal with continuances of court hearings and (2) if there are accountability measures for staff workers. Deborah Purce will take these two questions back to the core team. Corrina also asked for more information for the parent dispute resolution process, which is a separate process. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said the parent dispute resolution process includes an ombudsman and that she will sit down with Corrina to review this process offline since it is not directly related to the topic about resolving disputes between CA and master contractors.
- Tom Tremaine asked if the proposed dispute resolution process will replace the existing process that exists between CA and LICWACs, and if not, how the two processes will be synchronized. He also asked if children would see tribes or LICWAC, depending on which is involved, as a necessary party to this evolving dispute resolution process. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson answered that any agreements, procedures, protocols, and intergovernmental agreements that exist now between the tribes and the state will continue to be honored and will be included in CA's expectations for the master contract agencies. Regarding synchronization, if something is not covered in existing protocols or agreements, CA would like input from the tribes regarding these concerns. Otherwise, existing agreements would prevail.

David del Villar Fox went over the next part of the presentation – the RFP work plan template. He explained the intent was to have potential master contractors start thinking about what will be requested in the work plans. The work plan template will be more detailed in both the draft RFP and the final RFP. The work plan should support the objectives of Children's Administration for the specified provision of services. It should incorporate innovative methods

to maximize positive outcomes. It would also describe how the potential master contractor would ensure compliance with ICWA, state law, and federal law, and reflect CA DSHS policies.

Rich Pannkuk gave the last part of the presentation, which was a review of budget work plan documents that will be included in the draft and final RFP. The first requests specific information about start-up costs. Start-up costs will be for the first three months, July 1 through September 30, 2011. The second requests detailed implementation budget information. Once the draft RFP is released, CA would like input about the documents.

### ***Financial Update***

The committee took a brief break. Upon reconvening, Rich Pannkuk reviewed, line by line, two budget documents: "State Fiscal Year 2011 Funding Overview Children's Administration" and "State Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Reduction Overview Children's Administration".

Regarding the funding document, \$567M is the state fiscal year '11 appropriation for Children's Administration. Of that, approximately \$323M is allocated to service units and approximately \$244M is allocated to administrative units. The \$567M was built off of a February revenue forecast. Since then, a September forecast came out that shows there will be a shortfall of the \$567M total, which will need to be made up through reductions. The target for reduction is \$19.2M.

CA applied a 6.287% reduction to a number of provisos, which are shown in his document. Applying the reduction to the provisos yields \$4.1 million, which leaves a gap of \$15.1M that will need to be made up through foster care and administrative reductions. It was decided to not reduce the foster care maintenance payment, which leaves 50 percent of the foster care budget or administrative reductions.

Rich then went over the budget reduction overview. To try to close the \$15.1M gap, CA will employ strategic initiatives (shown in his document) that will close the gap by \$2.9M. He then reviewed administrative reductions. Pending current negotiations with the union, a temporary layoff would be imposed for all staff within the Children's Administration, which would save \$1.6M in general funds or \$3.1 million in total funds.

Next, there is a plan to add two additional days to the temporary layoff days, which would save \$647,000 in general fund state and \$1.2M in total funds.

Lastly, CA plans to eliminate 100 vacant, funded positions for a savings of \$2.4M general funds and a total savings of \$5.1M.

This leaves a gap of \$7.5M, most of which will be made up through cuts in the foster care budget and the Family Foster Home Private Agency Fee. CA still needs to identify \$2.4M in general fund state reductions and additional reductions to make the \$19.2M target.

Additionally, if there is a decline in the November Revenue Forecast, then there probably will be further reductions in the state fiscal year '11. The legislature will build the final budget based on the February revenue forecast. Once these two revenue forecasts are issued, CA will have a better understanding about how much funding is going to be appropriated to the Children's Administration in state fiscal year '13. State fiscal year '13 is the funding that CA will use to determine what the final case rate is going to be under master contracts.

Judge Costello asked if there were any questions for Rich Pannkuk:

- Sharon Osborne asked for an elaboration on the case rate. Rich said that the case rate mustn't over-obligate CA to pay master contractors beyond what the appropriation level is. Therefore, the appropriation level is a key variable in determining the case rate.
- Jeanine Livingston asked about transportation: recognizing that most transportation is court-ordered or mandated, how will the department accommodate the demand in view of the reduction. Rich replied that if it's court-ordered, then CA will certainly provide transportation. He added that for all reductions, there are three variables: current appropriation, current expenditure level, and any current under-expenditure. He said that CA is meeting with the provider community to determine which is the best approach to move forward – the rate reduction, utilization or current under expenditures? He added that CA pays for transportation in many other places in the budget besides the index that is being reduced.
- Jeanine also asked about an earlier CA presentation where the anticipated budget for the master contracting agencies of \$155.6M. She wondered how the reductions impact that allocation. Rich said it would reduce by about \$16M, not anticipating the biennium budget and the future forecasts, which leaves approximately \$140M for the budget (not including foster care payments).

There were no additional questions. Judge Costello asked for public comment.

### ***Public Comment***

Nancy Roberts-Brown of Catalyst for Kids had a comment relating to the outcomes for out-of-home placement services. She sees outcomes for families making progress and reducing safety threats and outcomes for children able to live in a family setting, and both are really important. However, she doesn't see any outcomes about retaining the relationship or strengthening the relationship between the child and the parent.

Judge Costello thanked Nancy for her comments and the committee broke for lunch.

### ***Tribal Update***

After reconvening from lunch, Colleen Cawston, Senior Director for Indian Policy, DSHS, gave a historical overview of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) and the government-to-government relationship between the state and the tribes.

She explained that ICWA came about because of significant impacts of external policies that were imposed upon the tribes. These policies include: (1) religious policies that divided tribal locations and required tribal children to attend boarding school, (2) the resulting education that had no connection traditional tribal teachings and practices, (3) federal rules and federal policies, including the federal relocation act and distant government run boarding schools, (4) the drive (on both the religious and federal level) to remove Indian children from Indian families and Indian communities. In the 1970's tribal leaders showed Congress that there needed to be a heightened degree of government to government relationship. These leaders used statistics that showed there was a disproportionate representation of Indian children being placed out-of-home (statistics that still exist today).

Part of the government-to-government responsibility is early identification of a child as Indian when they enter the child welfare system and then notification to the appropriate tribe. There needs to be awareness of the placement preference that the tribes identify. Washington State has tribal-state agreements that are worked at the local level through regional offices and codified at Headquarters.

Colleen spoke about the role of the Indian Policy Advisory Committee (IPAC). IPAC serves as an advisor to the DSHS Secretary and includes a representative from each of the 29 federally recognized tribes in Washington as well as six recognized American Indian organizations. She also spoke about American Indian Policy 701, which calls the development of an annual plan that is submitted to her office and then forwarded up to the DSHS Secretary. The plan details in how IPAC and DSHS will work together in each CA region. This plan is going to be important as CA moves forward with master contracting.

To date, Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson and Colleen have completed and/or scheduled one-on-one, face-to-face visits with 16 of Washington's 29 tribal governments. Additionally, eight visits to the remaining 13 tribal governments were conducted by CA staff with tribal technical staff. They are working to identify what each tribe may be looking at as far as the intergovernmental agreement they would like to enter into with the department regarding providing services to their members and their community as it relates to 2106.

Judge Costello asked if there were any questions for Colleen:

- Ian Grant asked if there was a forum for tribal youth to speak about their issues and how they are involved in the process. Colleen will take that question back with her and provide an answer for distribution.
- Nancy Foll asked if any tribes have made any decisions thus far. Colleen replied that most of the tribes they've met with have indicated they're looking at a blended intergovernmental agreement, which they would still need some of the services from a master contractor. They will also be identifying services they directly want to be able to provide for their membership and/or surrounding membership. The possible scenarios are: (1) there would be no change and they will work directly with the master contractors; (2) they would submit an intergovernmental agreement and identify the services that they would provide to their membership; or (3) they would identify in a collaboration of multiple tribes for a geographic area in which perhaps one tribe would provide this set of services.
- Corrina Burris commented that she thinks Ian Grant's point of having the youth involved would have more impact on some of the results that would be occurring with the Indian or the native families.

There were no additional questions or comments.

## ***Part 2 – Demonstration Site Selection***

Andrew Kramer, DSHS Central Contracts Division, gave a presentation on Part 2 – Demonstration Site Selection. He gave an overview of Part 2, which requires the Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) to recommend two demonstration sites – one on the west side of the state and one on the east side where private agencies (one at each site) will perform case management services in conjunction with CA. Through random selection, about half of the cases during the demonstration site period will be assigned to the private agency, who will then work with the master contractor for the provision of services. CA will take the remaining children and families and work those cases, assigning them to the master contractor for the provision of services. Central Contracts is to make recommendations to the CWTDC to help inform the decision regarding where to locate the demonstration sites. The question at hand is how to base the recommendations.

Andrew said that there were two options: (1) open it to interested parties in performing case management services, and (2) assign it to two of the master contractors that are selected for Part 1. He said right now the preferred option is #2 – select two master contractors based on performance or ask all of the master contractors to consider and submit proposals as to how they would perform case management services. He wanted to hear the TDC members' thoughts about this, and to take questions about issues the project team needs to address or should be concerned about regarding Part 2. There are pros and cons associated with each option.

The committee took a brief break. Upon reconvening, Judge Costello summarized what Andrew Kramer presented previously: (1) there may need to be something in the request for proposal for Part 1 about what, if any, restrictions there might be in terms of getting involved in Part 2, involving case management services; (2) information may need to be included to let bidders know what they might be getting into if they submit a bid in this request for proposal in Part 1, and (3) information needs to be included to let bidders know that if they don't participate in Part 1 they may be excluded from submitting a bid for the case management services only in Part 2. Andrew agreed with this summation. He added he would like input from the committee as to whether or not Option #2 is the preferred option.

Judge Costello suggested that the committee discuss the options at this meeting, think about it further and then at the November meeting conduct further discussion after people have had the opportunity to think about it further. Andrew was agreeable to this suggestion. At this point, Andy took questions from the committee:

- There was some discussion about the number of children to be served in the demonstration sites. This number would speak to the economic feasibility of whether a private agency would want to do only case management in Part 2 for two years. The number is roughly 800 to 900, or 14% of caseload in each site. This number would vary depending on the site selected. There would need to be a total of approximately 1700 cases per site since half would go to a private agency and the other half to CA.
- A question was asked regarding the number of master contractors per region. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson responded that the hope there will be at least one in every region, but they won't know until the process is done.
- The intention of Part 2 was clarified – it is not to measure the system as it operates in one place versus the other, it's whether the private sector or the public sector in case management is more efficient, cost-effective, provides better service. Also, random cases can't be distributed across the state. The statutory language required an east side demonstration site and a west side demonstration site.
- Ian Grant advocated that foster youth, particularly tribal youth, be represented in the RFP process.
- There was a question regarding who will be on the RFP review team and what the next steps are. CA is working on that process and welcomes any recommendations.
- There was a question on whether the timeline for Part 2 can be moved because of the way Part 1 is proceeding. Andrew responded that he has to hold to the original statute deadline of 2012 and must proceed as such. However, the TDC could go back to the legislative oversight committee and recommend something different. The difficulty with the timeframe is the short amount of time they have to adequately look at performance as part of the decision regarding the selection of a Part 2 contractor.

- It was brought up that any action regarding moving the Part 2 timeline needs to be made soon because legislature will be in session, and that somebody needs to figure out how long an appropriate evaluation time with regard to Part 1 performance.
- It was clarified that Washington Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) is performing the evaluation for Part 2.
- There was a request to include community readiness in the RFP.
- A question was asked if a Part 1 master contractor became the case management entity in Part 2, would that entity perform both duties. The answer for now is yes, but the concern is a perceived conflict of interest. Andrew thinks that issue can be addressed adequately in the contract: the master contractors will be under performance based contracting, so they're going to want to be efficient. They'll want to complete cases in order to be compensated for those cases and not overlook state assigned cases versus the private agency cases.
- A question was asked about how much money was available for case management in Part 2. That information is not yet known.
- There was a concern voiced that to proceed with the master contracting agency design in Part 1 somewhat thwarts that which was to have been done in Part 2.
- It was asked if a decision has been made on the level of the insurance liability that agencies have to carry and could it be different between being a master contractor for service coordination and a contractor for social work. There has been no decision made on the amount of liability to be carried, and it could be different between service coordinators and contractors.
- A question was asked about how services will be delivered to youths in the demonstration sites. The understanding is that service delivery won't be different, but the communication will be different.
- Judge Costello requested that the questions and issues be kept on topic about Contracts and not program services. The purpose of the discussion is to make recommendations to Andrew Kramer's department about what needs to go in the RFP for Part 1.
- A suggestion was made that perhaps these questions be posted on the CA website or taken to potential bidders to get input from a broader stakeholder group. David del Villar Fox will take that suggestion back to the CA Core Management Team.
- It was asked, if the RFP contained language that asked if bidders were interested in participating in Part 2, would any decision made by the bidder at that time be binding. The answer is that they would be asking for interest only and therefore it wouldn't be binding.
- A question was asked if a non-master contractor applied to be a supervising agency, would that agency take on master contractor duties. The answer is no.
- It was suggested that having two separate agencies, public and private, accessing the master contracting agency's service delivery system might create a more fair evaluation.

Judge Costello brought the discussion to a close. There were no comments from the public

### ***Recap and Wrap-up***

Judge Costello indicated that CA Core Team members were available after the meeting to answer any questions. He noted that the next meeting was November 15<sup>th</sup> at the Doubletree SeaTac. Information will be forthcoming for the December meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.