

JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN
MINUTES FROM CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 7, 2011

Members Present: Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson; Judge Leonard Costello; Rebecca Peck; Jeanine Livingston; Liz Mueller; Gwendolyn Gua; Mary Meinig; Sheila Huber; Benjamin de Haan; Frederick Hayes; Mary O'Brien; Maureen McGrath; Catherine Lanham; Sharon Osborne; Gwendolyn Lawson Townsend; Nancy Sutton; Jeannie McShane; Nancy Foll (on phone)

Other: Representative Ruth Kagi

Staff Present: Benjamin Berres and Melissa Takade Partners for Our Children; Tammy Cordova and Richard Pannkuk, DSHS Children's Administration;

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Overview

Judge Leonard Costello, Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) co-chair, welcomed the committee members and reviewed the ground rules, offered updates and asked for committee members to introduce themselves. He gave an overview of the meeting's agenda and described the first item on the agenda, an update on the feedback about the proposed demonstration site options for Part II of 2SHB 2106. This would be followed by a continuation of the discussion on the proposed sites that commenced at the previous CWTDC meeting in October. He summarized the rest of the agenda then gave the floor to the two co-chairs from the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues for their presentation.

Feedback on Proposed Demonstration Sites Presentation

Nancy Sutton and Jeanine Livingston gave the first portion of the PowerPoint presentation. They summarized the Advisory Committee's work since the last CWTDC meeting. They stated that little feedback on the proposed demonstration sites had been submitted and that the feedback that was submitted was mixed in reaction. Overall, most input supported the proposed East Side A and West Side A demonstration site proposals.

The following lists describes the Children’s Administration offices that are included in each of the demonstration site proposals

East A Demo Site

- Clarkston
- Colfax
- Moses Lake
- Spokane/Lincoln County

East B Demo Site

- Ellensburg
- Goldendale
- Sunnyside
- Toppenish
- Tri-Cities
- Walla Walla
- White Salmon
- Yakima

West A Demo Site

- Everett
- Lynnwood
- Sky Valley
- Smokey Point
- King West
- Martin Luther King Jr.

West B Demo Site

- Pierce South Tacoma
- Aberdeen
- Long Beach
- Shelton
- South Bend
- Tumwater

This feedback is summarized on the PowerPoint presentation. Nancy Sutton and Jeanine Livingston said that there was no feedback compelling enough for the Advisory Committee to alter the geography of the proposed demonstration site locations. The single most discussed piece of feedback was whether there was adequate private service capacity in the East Side A site. The Advisory Committee felt this to be a justifiable question that warrants greater scrutiny. They would conduct a survey in the area to learn more about the private service provider capacity.

The Washington State Tribes affirmed their support the East Side A and West Side A options presented at an October Indian Policy Advisory Committee.

There are still a few key questions that are pending: How much will this cost? What are the precise timeframes for transition? What are the minimum qualifications for potential private service providers? The Site Selection Committee will hold joint meetings with the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues to help get answers to some of these questions.

The Advisory Committee co-chairs recommended that the full CWTDC hold a vote today on the proposed demonstration sites. Judge Costello opened up the floor for discussion.

Liz Mueller said that it was a longstanding concern about whether a private agency can perform the difficult task of case management within the context of an extremely rural Tribe.

Maureen McGrath felt that there were some significant features missing: Lack of infrastructure, timing, etc.

Gwen Gua asked whether the CWTDC should vote before or after they hear the results of the survey. She wants to make sure that the private agencies will “do good by children of color.” Jeanine Livingston said that having questions answered for the committee’s work is important, but that having sites identified is most important to really focusing on those answers. She

continued on to say that if there is not adequate service capacity, then the Advisory Committee can come back and report this finding to the CWTDC.

Sharon Osborne followed up on the comments of Liz Mueller. She agreed that she wants the comparison in the demo sites to be properly matched, but that Washington is a predominantly a rural state. She said that she would choose East B and West A.

Jeanine Livingston said that she hears the interest to go with East B, but that if the Tribes in that site opt out of participating, then there would not be an adequate sample size to meet the statistical requirements. To get a large enough sample size the site boundaries would have to be expanded from Oregon to Canada and from the Cascades to practically Idaho leaving large holes in the center of the state. Ultimately the Advisory Committee felt that particular orientation of a site wouldn't be practical.

Liz Mueller suggested that the Advisory Committee seek out whether the tribes situated north of the boundaries of the East Side A (Coeville, Spokane, and Kalispel Tribes) would be interested in participating in the demonstration project. She said that it was a longstanding concern about whether a private agency can perform the difficult task of case management within the context of an extremely rural Tribe. Sharon Osborne said that she hasn't heard a definitive answer whether the Yakima Tribe would or would not participate.

The CWTDC wrapped up the discussion and Judge Costello opened up the floor for public Comment

Public Comment

Matilda Sampson of the American Indian Community Center in Spokane commented that the American Indian Community Center is concerned about their visitation contract.

Vote on Demonstration Site Proposals

When the CWTDC reconvened after break, Nancy Sutton responded favorably to the suggestion that the tribes situated north of the boundaries of East Side A should be approached to ascertain their interest in participating in the demonstration project. She suggested that if the Tribes are to be included in the demonstration, that the entire county be included in the as well.

Sheila Huber asked a clarifying question about whether the friendly amendment to ascertain the interest of the Tribes to participate meant that the boundaries now included the counties in which they were located. Nancy Sutton responded that East A boundaries would remain the same but that if any tribe responded favorably to the request, then the Advisory Committee could come back to seek the input of the full CWTDC about a possible expansion. Sheila Huber asked a follow up question whether the CWTDC should apply the same considerations about the inclusion of remote tribes to the West Side A demonstration site location. Nancy Sutton said that she has heard no input in that regard. Jeanine Livingston said that during the last Site Selection Committee meeting that there was some discussion whether or not to include Skagit County in the West Side A proposal, but the Advisory Committee ultimately felt there were parts of Snohomish County that met the criterion for a site to include rural regions.

Maureen McGrath asked about the characteristics and anticipated use of the survey Nancy Sutton had mentioned previously. Jeanine Livingston said that if the survey/fact-finding efforts garnered enough evidence to alter the demonstration site proposals, then the Advisory

Committee would return to the CWTDC with this information to chart revisions if deemed necessary.

Jeanine Livingston thanked Liz Mueller for her suggestion and said they would accept it as a friendly amendment and that the CWTDC would, if voted forward, extend an invitation to the Tribes in Colville, Kalispell and Spokane to participate; that the East A demonstration site boundaries stand until or unless they accept that invitation; and if they accept that invitation, that the CWTDC will incorporate Pend Oreille and Stevens Counties into East A. So the CWTDC would be voting on East A as it stands unless those Tribes accept the invitation; should the Tribes accept the invitation, then East A would be expanded to Pend Oreille and Stevens Counties. Gwen Gua suggested that Okanogan County be included as well.

Gwendolyn Lawson Townsend asked about why the CWTDC cannot wait until the results of the survey/fact-finding mission of the Advisory Committee are complete. Liz Mueller responded by saying that she wouldn't want to hold up the process for the result of the survey/fact-finding.

Sharon Osborne asked a second time about whether the Yakima Indian Nation had been explicit about their determination to participate or not participate. Jeanine Livingston replied that no Tribe has given a definitive indication that they will not participate. The only indications are that Tribes are not interested.

Judge Costello asked if there was a motion from the CWTDC regarding the recommendation from the Site Selection Advisory Committee.

Sheila Huber asked whether the vote would be on the sites separately or as a combined recommendation.

Fritz Hayes offered a motion.

Nancy Foll suggested that the invitation to the Tribes to participate should come from a governmental representative rather than the Advisory Committee. Judge Costello said that the Advisory Committee would determine which governmental representative should bring this up.

The CWTDC took a vote. The votes were recorded.

****Due to a number of absent committee member, the CWTDC could not reach consensus as defined by the ground rules. Additional votes from absent members would be accepted within the following 24 hours so a final decision could be determined. Votes would be accepted by the CWTDC co-chairs. Subsequently, there were enough "yea" votes to reach a consensus of support as defined by the Committee's rules on the motion offered at the meeting. This means that:*

- *West Side A will remain in its recommended geographical configuration presented by the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues and will now be considered the West Side demonstration site location*
- *East Side A will remain in its recommended geographical configuration presented by the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues and will now be considered the East Side demonstration site location*
- *The Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues will coordinate with the appropriate governmental representatives to seek out whether the Spokane, Kalispel, and Colville Tribes desire to participate in the East Side demonstration site. If*

any of the aforementioned tribes express interest in participating, the Advisory Committee will return to the CWTDC at the next meeting to request that the demonstration site boundaries be expanded to include Ferry, Stevens and/or Pend Oreille Counties.

Update on Part II Transition Issues

The co-chairs of the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues gave a presentation on the transition issues relevant to the implementation of Part II of 2SHB 2106. Details can be found in the PowerPoint presentation. Jeanine Livingston added that additional CWTDC participation might be needed on the Advisory Committee.

Maureen McGrath recommended that the some of the issues identified by the Legal and Practice Issues Advisory Committee should be brought forward to be discussed at the next Advisory Committee meeting.

Asst Secretary Denise Revels Robinson asked whether the transition issue of case transfers included the transfer of new and legacy cases. Jeanine Livingston replied that it did.

Update on Performance Based Contracting

Asst Secretary Denise Revels Robinson and Jeanine Livingston gave a short verbal update on the status of Performance Based Contracting. In summary, Children's Administration has been meeting with the Washington State Federation of State Employees. Their meetings have just concluded and they will be presenting the results to DSHS Secretary Susan Dreyfus. They will wait to present the findings publicly until after this meeting. Judge Costello asked if the summary of the document could be provided to the CWTDC. Representative Ruth Kagi added that there would be some other parties interested in the composition of this document.

Update from Financial Committee

Sharon Osborne updated the committee on the recent work of the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues. Details can be found in the PowerPoint presentation. Rich Pannkuk also contributed to the presentation.

Liz Mueller had a number of questions, but she asked whether the 1.3 Federal Laws had been taken into account. She also asked about whether culturally appropriate services were being included in the cost analyses. Lastly, she asked about whether the modeling factored in the recent cuts to ADATSA services.

Jeanine Livingston asked whether the cost model included a contract monitoring function at CA. She mentioned that other jurisdictions sometimes use a 50:1 ratio. She also asked about the original fiscal note attached to 2SHB 2106.

Maureen McGrath asked whether the staffing ratios being used to develop a cost model were the exact ratios required of the private agencies for Part II. Asst Secretary Denise Revels Robinson said that a clear distinction should be made between what training should be conveyed to both public and private workers and should focus first on what is required by law.

Jeanine Livingston commented that the CWTDC and its Advisory Committees should bring a copy of 2SHB 2106 with them to all meetings.

Sharon Osborne said that the Advisory Committee is open to all suggestions.

Asst Secretary Denise Revels Robinson asked what would be included in training. Rich Pannkuk said that they are working on that issue.

Sharon Osborne commented that she felt that training for public and private agency caseworkers should be conducted jointly because everyone will have to work together.

Liz Mueller asked whether resources would be diverted from other areas of the state to finance the implementation. Judge Costello said that this issue might have to be dealt with by the legislature.

Public Comment

Dan Evans of Lutheran Community Services commented on a number of issues:

1. He felt the meeting today was helpful;
2. He commented that his agency and others might have a sense of fatigue as things move more closely to Part II;
3. He was pleased and encouraged that Asst Secretary Denise Revels Robinson announced that there would be a report about PBC available to the committee soon;
4. He said that there is a real fatigue in the child-serving-agency world as a result of the work that occurred to submit proposals to the PBC RFP. He is concerned about the issue of timing;
5. He is concerned about Part II within the context of the current environment; and
6. He thinks that there will be a lot of nervousness on the part of the provider community to try and embark upon submitting a proposal for Part II.