

**JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN**  
**MINUTES FROM CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**MARCH 22 AND 23, 2009**

---

**Members Present:** Honorable Judge Leonard Costello; Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson; Charlotte McCullough; Mary Armstrong; Jeanine Livingston; Judge Chris Wickham; Nancy Foll; Mark Courtney; Maureen McGrath; Tom Byers; Carole Holland; Ken Nichols; Nancy Sutton; Steve Hasset; Mary Meinig; Beth Canfield (alternate for Catherine Lanham); Brenda Lopez; Jerry Meninick; Sharon Osborne; Gwendolyn Lawson Townsend; Gwen Gua for Honorable Carleen Anderson; Jim SiJohn (alternate for Henry Cagey); Jeannie McShane; Ian Grant; Ron Murphy (alternate for Marian Harris).

**Staff Present:** Julie Dunnington, Sarah Lee, Melissa Takade, and Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; Jann Hoppler and Tim Kelly, DSHS Children's Administration; David del Villar Fox, DSHS; Tom Byers, Cedar River Group

**Others:** Marna Miller and Stephanie Lee, Washington State Institute of Public Policy; Roy Hogan; Roberta Nestaas, Lutheran Community Services; Ray All Knee (Qualsten), Yakama Nation

---

**MARCH 22**

**Welcome and Agenda Overview:** Co-chair, Judge Leonard Costello, welcomed all the committee members and members of the public to the fourth Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) quarterly meeting and introduced the committee's leadership. He briefed the committee on some minor logistics and then presented an overview of the day's agenda. He also reviewed the committee's ground rules and announced that all committee documents were available at the committee's website, [www.joinhandsforchildren.org](http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org).

**Introductions:** Judge Leonard Costello requested that all the committee members introduce themselves and mention the constituency for whom they represent. **Legislative Overview on SSB 6832:** David del Villar Fox, legislative liaison to Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS CA) Children's Administration presented an update on the contents of Senator James Hargrove's bill, SSB 6832. Each of the changes contained in the bill are cited in the Legislative Update form provided to the meetings attendees. He explained each of the changes and how they were derived from the recommendations from the CWTDC quarterly report presented to the Children's Legislative Oversight Committee meeting in December.

**Lessons Learned – Other States' Experiences with Performance Based Contracting:** Charlotte McCullough presented information on other states' experiences with performance based contracting (PBC). Charlotte McCullough explained that she would present the material in the PowerPoint presentation and Mary Armstrong would facilitate a discussion at the end of the presentation to address committee members' concerns regarding PBC.

Charlotte McCullough's presentation on PBC had many different components: examples of contracts in other jurisdictions; similarities and differences between states; advantages and disadvantages of PBC; challenges of PBC; what's working and what's not; and success factors and lessons learned. This information is contained in a PowerPoint presentation that is available through the committee's website, [www.joinhandsforchildren.org](http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org). She also spent time describing different payment models as well as methods to build in incentive and penalty payments based

on performance. After Charlotte McCullough's presentation, the committee took a brief break. When the meeting reconvened, committee members engaged in a discussion around the earlier presentation's implications for the State of Washington with regard to Phase I and Phase II.

Before the committee began this discussion, Judge Leonard Costello told the committee that CWTDC member Catherine Lanham had sent a message that she would not be able to attend and she would like Beth Canfield to sit in as her alternate.

Steve Hassett asked what would happen if contractors spend their funding more rapidly than is sustainable and can then no longer accept additional children to their programs. Mary Armstrong answered by stating that many states establish a risk pool for precisely these types of situations. She added that states must also acknowledge that these situations will arise, and prepare for situations. Charlotte McCullough added that contracts must contain a mechanism to handle these types of situations.

Ian Grant asked about the utility of administering financial penalties to already failing systems especially if the contracts establish a "no eject, no reject" policy. He likened this practice to what happens in the school system under "No Child Left Behind." Charlotte McCullough replied by saying that it is important to establish performance-monitoring systems to avoid poor system performance from the outset. Anecdotally, she stated that most states lean toward incentives rather than penalties. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson added that in Wisconsin, the state child welfare agency would notify an organization that they are being penalized, but the state would offer a period of time for the provider to remedy the problem before the penalty is officially administered. Charlotte McCullough added that posting current performance levels, like posting a monthly performance scorecard, or a data dashboard, could also improve performance.

Steve Hassett asked whether other states' courts have intervened in a particular child's case and placed the child into the care of a state child welfare agency because the court felt that the child's care was compromised by the poor performance of private provider case management. Or the converse, whether other states' courts have placed a child into the care of private provider case management primarily due to the public child welfare agency's poor performance? Charlotte McCullough and Mary Armstrong weren't aware of any instances matching Steve Hassett's description.

Mark Courtney asked about what resources are available for private contractors who want to increase their organizational competencies. Charlotte McCullough offered to provide contacts for private contractors who want to consult with organizations in other states who already hold performance-based contracts.

Jim SiJohn noted that he saw no mention of tribes in Charlotte McCullough's presentation. He asked whether tribes were involved in the states that she included in her presentation. He asked whether there are any statistics regarding how tribal children were affected in other states. He also asked about the use of tribal notification in the state of Montana. He wanted to make sure that the tribes don't move backwards. Charlotte McCullough apologized for not explicitly addressing tribal involvement in the examples she included in her presentation.. She claimed that with every single state with tribes who have gone through this process, contracts have always included language that enforces compliance with Indian Child Welfare laws and policies. Charlotte McCullough would try and find some information about tribes in other states and would bring that information to the group.

Gwen Gua asked a question regarding program monitoring and if there was community and tribal involvement. The presenters were not sure about this in other states. Mary Armstrong said that she was pleased at how racial and ethnic disproportionality monitoring was being built into every single outcome indicator crafted by the Outcomes Advisory committee in the *Domains and Indicators used to Measure Outcomes* document. She also encouraged DSHS CA to continue their hard work on improving systems for Native American children. Sharon Osborne echoed this statement, but added that it is important to learn from other states' challenges and successes.

**Reflections:** Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson wanted to thank Charlotte McCullough and Mary Armstrong for their presentation and all the committee members for their participation. She made a couple of notes during the presentation and reflected upon those notes. First, she talked about the importance of distinguishing between Phases I and Phase II as a method to conceptualize issues. Another theme she witnessed in the committee's discussion is how this process will be "better for the children and families we serve." She recognizes that everyone around the table desires to keep children safe, but to do this we must improve upon what we are already doing, while engaging community partners throughout. She added that DSHS CA is working on making internal changes, such as building infrastructure, capacity, and competencies that don't currently exist today in order to implement and manage performance based contracts. She agreed that the issues around rates, incentives, and penalties are large and that DSHS CA will rely heavily on the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues for input. She added that all future agreements and contracts will have language that clearly supports and honors all federal mandates and federal government-to-government relationships with tribes. She wanted to underscore the word "share" because this process is about our "collective" work and accountability. She felt that the CWTDC and the community need to continue to talk often and with clarity throughout this process.

After Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson finished her comments, the committee took a break for lunch. Before the committee dispersed, Judge Leonard Costello mentioned that the Advisory Committee on Outcomes and Evaluation Issues and the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues switched the order in which they would present.

**Update on Phase I:** When the committee reconvened from lunch, Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson with the help of Jann Hoppler and Tim Kelly gave an update on DSHS CA's activities relating to Phase I. They brought five handouts. These handouts are available at [www.joinhandsforchildren.org](http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org). The presentation had a range of purposes: to revisit selected concepts; to report on communication efforts; to review the cornerstones of Phase I; to address frequently asked questions; to provide further information; to solicit feedback; and, to provide some rumor control.

Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson began the presentation by talking about the importance of creating a "continuum of care" for families and children, not just four service category bundles. She hopes that the community can collectively create the vision of a full continuum of care. With regard to the roles and responsibilities of the 'master contractor,' she wanted to make clear that the master contract organizations have a higher degree of responsibility over subcontracted agencies. She presented an overview of everything that DSHS CA is doing to maintain open communication networks with stakeholder communities. She explained that the goals of the DSHS CA communication campaign is to be "open, visible, to hear from people, but also to provide information to keep the dialogue open."

Before she turned the microphone over to Jann Hoppler, she wanted to provide clarification about the number of master contractors that DSHS CA is hoping to consolidate to by the end of Phase I. Ideally, Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson would want a single master contractor per region, but she understands that it may not be feasible to achieve that level of contract consolidation in the first round of contracting. At this point, DSHS CA is going to issue an RFP competitive process that is looking for “an agency that can partner and be flexible, an agency that can speak to the values that CA has laid out for children and families, an agency who can work with sub contractors, an agency that is committed to building capacity and improving services.” DSHS CA will use an independent group to evaluate proposals to avoid any conflicts of interest. She wanted to assure all the committee members that CA will be “transparent and visible” in the procurement process and will adhere to all procurement guidelines.

Gwen Gua asked Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson if there is going to be a group of Tribal community members to aid and provide guidance to DSHS CA on language pertaining to Indian Child Welfare laws and policies. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson responded by saying that this is on the agenda for the upcoming Indian Policy Advisory Committee meeting.

Ian Grant asked if all of the RFP materials would be posted on the Internet for public consumption. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson said they would be available.

Nancy Foll was curious whether some contracts could be offered statewide, such as foster parent recruitment. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson agreed with her point, particularly with respect to foster parent recruitment. She said that is a discussion that needs to be addressed.

Jann Hoppler continued the presentation beginning on Slide 14. She passed out some handouts to solicit information from CWTDC members regarding the service bundle categories. She also gave an overview of some of the comments that have been submitted earlier. She talked a little about some of DSHS CA’s ideas about master contractors. Slide 18 offers an explanation of the upper limits of the number of master contractors.

Ian Grant asked a question about how master contractors will coordinate with each other, specifically, who would be the “glue” between all the contractors. Jann Hoppler suspects that all stakeholders will need to help with this issue, but that in Phase I, DSHS will play a primary role in coordination because they will retain case management.

Jeanine Livingston asked about how contract monitoring will be administered within DSHS CA. Jann Hopper said that this area is still being discussed internally, but that DSHS CA is probably going to bring in a team of experts to help. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson said that they are working with HR to help with reassigning personnel to build this infrastructure.

Charlotte McCullough asked whether DSHS CA would look favorably upon collaborative joint bids. Jann Hoppler said they would look “warmly” on those types of bids.

On Slide 24, Jann Hoppler presented a preliminary RFP timeline process for Phase I. In the timeline, DSHS laid out separate RFP processes for each of the four services bundles. Charlotte McCullough responded by saying that this will look more expensive for private providers that want to bid for multiple contracts.

Jeanine Livingston said that she is “deeply concerned” about the period of time from when a private agency would know that they have been awarded a contract and the time they have to

ramp up staffing and initiate their own subcontracts. She is concerned four months is inadequate for this process.

Sharon Osborne asked whether the timeframe presented was based on interactions with providers or being driven more by what the department can realistically accomplish. She wants to be assured that the process of developing a timeline will be collaborative.

***Outcomes and Evaluations Issues Advisory Committee Report:*** Judge Leonard Costello introduced the next segment of the meeting and offered accolades to all advisory committees on all of their hard work. Ken Nichols and Mark Courtney presented the report from the Advisory Committee on Outcomes and Evaluations Issues. Ken Nichols started by reviewing the advisory committee's progress and work to date and then handed the presentation over to Mark Courtney. Mark Courtney talked about the current work of DSHS CA and how it intersects with the work of the advisory committee.

Mark Courtney reviewed definitions and introduced the latest draft of the *Domains and Indicators used to Measure Outcomes* document. He also talked about the importance of monitoring racial disproportionality and how each and every measure listed will be broken down by race/ethnicity and tribal affiliation. He also talked about the distinction between process and quality of care measures and outcomes measures. He mentioned the importance of measuring outcomes by age groups because outcomes differ substantially between different age groups. He discussed some of the recent revisions to the document and pointed out a few future directions for the advisory committee. Lastly, he asked the committee for suggestions for revisions or additions.

Charlotte McCullough asked if the document could also mention that data will be broken apart by gender. Mark Courtney said they would make that change.

Nancy Foll asked to get some clarity around the 21 Priority Performance Measures of DSHS CA and whether those measures are measurable using the FamLink system. Mark Courtney confirmed that those measures are new, and they will be measurable in FamLink, but that there are no accurate baselines yet. Ken Nichols added that FamLink is "getting better every day" and that the output is now working.

Discussion facilitator, Tom Byers, summed up the purpose of the conversation: "Are there huge indicators or measures that the committee has missed?" He also said that he wanted to get a vote at the end of the discussion to approve the outcomes document as a draft. He suggested that the committee review all the indicators first.

Ian Grant asked why there was not an outcome that assessed client service satisfaction. Mark Courtney responded by saying that he felt this is not an outcome, but a measure of the quality of service provision. Charlotte McCullough added that many private agencies already do these types of assessments on a regular basis.

Tom Byers asked the committee to shift their discussion to the Permanency and Stability Outcomes Indicators.

Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson asked that the line in the fourth bullet in the outcomes document in the permanency and stability section, "within a specified period of time," to be defined more clearly. Mark Courtney said that this line is referencing a section at the beginning of the document. There is one end-parenthesis that needs to be removed from that line.

Carole Holland asked if we could track high school related outcomes. Mark Courtney said that we would have to build a new field into FamLink or develop an agreement with OSPI.

Nancy Foll asked about the fourth bullet on the outcomes document and what constitutes “regular visits.” Mark Courtney said that this is referencing current DSHS CA standards. Nancy Foll replied by saying that it is important for potential contractors to know this type of information, even though that is in the DSHS CA operations manual. Steve Hassett gave a description of what regular visits entail.

Steve Hassett recommended that the final Well-Being indicator be split into two outcomes: what percentages of children are being identified as members of federally recognized tribes, and what percentage of those children are all requirements of ICWA being met?

Judge Chris Wickham requested that the advisory committee consider creating an outcome around the timeliness of adhering to ICWA requirements. Mark Courtney said that this outcome might best fall under a list of standards of practices. Judge Wickham suggested that the advisory committee move that point up to the top of the document.

Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson proposed a friendly amendment on the first bullet in the Well-Being section. She wanted the number of children placed with relatives and the number of children placed with a foster parent to be separated. She wants the bullet to provide more clarification.

Tom Byers suggested that the committee vote to consider the document as a draft and that the issue around tribal notification be referred back to the committee for further refinement. The proposal was moved. Carole Holland asked once more about monitoring educational outcomes. Judge Chris Wickham asked whether some educational outcomes should be broken out. Mark Courtney responded by saying that there is no readily available data to measure.

Tom Byers clarified that the CWTDC suggest that the advisory committee go back and attempt to refine the document with respect to tribal notification and educational outcomes. The committee voted unanimously to accept the *Domains and Indicators used to Measure Outcomes* document as a draft and that the Advisory Committee on Outcomes and Evaluation Issues would return to work further on tribal notification and educational outcomes.

**Legal and Practices Advisory Committee Report:** Judge Chris Wickham and Steve Hassett presented the report on the work and progress of the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues. Judge Chris Wickham began the presentation by talking about advisory committee membership and the meeting schedules. He also introduced the CWTDC to a number of documents crafted by his advisory committee that captures their work.

Steve Hassett presented the first document, the *Principles and Values used to Determine Core Services*. He then reviewed each principle on the list.

Chris Wickham then described the *Preliminary Service Array/List of Core Services* and the *Preliminary Service Array Definitions*. Steve Hassett began to talk about the high frequency of differences of opinion on service definitions and immediately recommended that the committee add “identification” to the ICWA provisions on the *Preliminary Service Array Definitions* document. Steve Hassett then took a greater amount of time explaining the *Preliminary Service Array/List of Core Services* document. The services described in this table are intended to be a list of services that should be available and accessible to all children and families in the child welfare system. This list is not intended to be a list of services that every child and family would

get, but rather a menu of services available. The advisory committee also identified a list of referrals and linkages to state and community services that contracted service providers will be required to develop within their region.

Facilitator Tom Byers was asked once again to help facilitate a discussion on the work of the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues.

Nancy Sutton suggested that “assessment of parental capacities and functioning” be added to the list. Both Chris Wickham and Steve Hassett agreed.

Ian Grant asked for a type of service to “promote normative experiences.” Chris Wickham and Charlotte McCullough agreed with the suggestion.

Charlotte McCullough suggested that Case Management and Aftercare be added to the list.

Mary Armstrong suggested that “network management” be added to the list. Charlotte McCullough added that this service could also help to assess community capacity. Steve Hassett suggested that this service might fall under the Practice Standards category.

Charlotte McCullough suggested that the committee add “referrals to faith-based services” as well as “business and professional training services.” Ian Grant said that it is important to offer these referrals because it fosters a sense of community belonging and engagement for youth. Brenda Lopez echoed these sentiments.

Carole Holland suggested that the Advisory Committee add the following to the section of referrals to state agencies and programs: “health and recovery services or medical assistance administration; Department of Early Learning; Department of Commerce; Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction; and, the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges.”

Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson suggested that the advisory committee add “general emergency assistance” to Food Bank. Judge Chris Wickham agreed.

Tom Byers suggested that the committee accept this document as a draft with the refinements suggested in the earlier discussion. Steve Hassett suggested that the committee adopt this document as a preliminary report and to send back to the advisory committee to discuss the new additions and revisions but to also align this document with the service array document prepared by DSHS CA.

Before the committee voted, Brenda Lopez wanted to express her concern about the second last bullet on the Principles and Values Use to Determine Core Services. She was concerned about agencies examining parents’ pasts needlessly. Charlotte McCullough suggested that the committee review all its documents for potential unintended consequences.

Carole Holland suggested that the *Principles and Values Used to Determine Core Services* should be examined for language so that the committee does not inadvertently create entitlements.

Mary Armstrong suggested that “domestic violence” be added to the third to last bullet. She also echoed the sentiments of Brenda Lopez about the bullet pertaining to “untreated parental trauma.”

The full committee unanimously voted to accept the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues documents with the refinements discussed in the earlier section.

***Public Comment:***

Roberta Nestaas of Lutheran Community Services wanted to make a couple comments. First, she wanted to get clarity on the degree of flexibility around the way that the RFP process would be handled by DSHS CA. She is still a little confused on how DSHS CA described it. Secondly, she wanted to point out that there is no solid statewide network of providers and that the providers are, in many ways, starting from scratch. She was also concerned about the union and non-union piece and how that is going to work out. She recommended that if it is not being talked about, that it should.

**MARCH 23**

***Welcome and Introduction:*** Judge Leonard Costello welcomed the committee back for the second day of the quarterly meeting and promptly reviewed the day's agenda as well as the CWTDC's meeting ground rules. He mentioned that all the committee's documents are available at [joinhandsforchildren.org](http://joinhandsforchildren.org).

***Site Selection and Transition Issues Advisory Committee Report:*** Nancy Sutton and Jeanine Livingston presented the report on the work and the progress of the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues. Nancy Sutton presented the first portion of the report by reviewing the recommendations presented to the legislature after the last CWTDC quarterly meeting. Jeanine Livingston discussed the work of the advisory committee over the last three months. She talked first about how the advisory committee arrived at a determination for the size of the demonstration sites. Next, she outlined the criteria determined by the advisory committee to guide them as they began to craft preliminary demonstration sites.

Mark Courtney, a member of the advisory committee, stated that the committee has not yet had a discussion on whether the demonstration sites are sized "such that private agencies will have any interest in operating at that scale or whether it is feasible for them to operate at that scale." Jeanine Livingston agreed with this comment and wanted additional community input as they go forward.

Ian Grant was curious why the committee chose using a ten percent difference in the rate of reunification after removal as the basis for choosing the size of the demonstration site. Marna Miller of the Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP) stated that the advisory committee needed to estimate the effect. WSIPP looked to the literature to see if there was any empirical basis to estimate the size of the effect, but didn't find anything substantial. Ultimately, the committee chose the ten percent change because it was a conservative estimate, but large enough to stand up to scrutiny.

Judge Chris Wickham suggested that the advisory committee use county lines as an additional criterion because that is frequently the way in which governmental and non-profit systems are organized. Jeanine Livingston and Nancy Sutton said that the advisory committee looked at using counties, but that they ran into complications. She said that they are still open to the idea. Jeanine Livingston mentioned that with the change the demonstration site can now use random assignment methodology, but the concern at the time was that to wholly locate a demonstration site in one region would completely decimate the infrastructure in a single region. Now, with random assignment, that is a moot point, so it might be worth going back to the legislature for guidance.

With the advice of David del Villar Fox, the committee began to think about whether the legislatively mandated criterion, “neither site must be wholly located in any of the department’s administrative regions,” is permissive rather than restrictive language. Jeanine Livingston agreed that it would be worthwhile to go back to the legislature for clarification.

Tom Byers suggested that the full committee take a vote whether to accept the six criteria recommended by the advisory committee as a draft and that the advisory committee takes the two additional suggestions from the CWTDC back to committee for additional consideration.

Steve Hassett added that the Attorney General’s Office contracts for legal services in the seven most rural counties. He suggested that the committee consider this issue as they move forward.

Tom Byers asked if there was there a motion to adopt the draft criteria crafted by the committee with the additional aforementioned criteria as refinements. The committee voted unanimously to accept the motion.

Next, presenters Jeanine Livingston and Nancy Sutton presented the preliminary drafts for the demonstration sites. The Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues brought four different demonstration site scenarios: two for the west side of the state and two for the east side of the state. They offered some demographic information on each of the proposed sites. As they continued to describe the sites, they explained to the committee that they would not be asking for a vote on the sites. Rather, they hoped, the advisory committee could garner some community and public input as they move forward. Jeanine Livingston told the full committee that any input could be directed toward Julie Dunnington through the [www.joinhandsforchildren.org](http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org) website.

Gwen Gua asked if the proposed demonstration sites would change now that the committee had offered new ideas on placement criteria. Jeanine Livingston replied that it was very likely that the sites would change shape. Jeanine Livingston hoped that the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues could present solidified site proposals at the June quarterly CWTDC meeting.

Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson asked for as much descriptive information as possible about each of the proposed sites. Demographic information was posted on the [www.joinhandsforchildren.org](http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org) website.

Ian Grant asked if it were possible to let other committee members have map manipulation access. Jeanine Livingston replied that this is not available because the Research and Data Analysis Division at DSHS created the maps.

***Finance Advisory Committee Report:*** Carole Holland and Sharon Osborne presented the report on the work and progress of the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues. Carole Holland started the presentation and offered many thanks to a large number of individuals that regularly attend meetings to help. Sharon Osborne explained that the advisory committee has done a substantial amount of work to compile information on cost modeling and projections as well as where money is being currently spent by DSHS CA.

Carole Holland said that the advisory committee is still working on a number of issues: unit costs, start-up costs, quality assurance resources, and capacities. At the next meeting, the advisory committee is going to take a look at how FamLink works and how agencies will be able to interface with this system.

The committee had a brief conversation about potential changes to the flexibility of federal funding streams.

The Advisory Committee on Financial Issues did not have any recommendations requiring a vote.

**Report to the Legislature:** Judge Leonard Costello talked briefly about the process of reporting the CWTDC's progress to the Washington State Legislature. He talked about what summary information will be included in a written report and the questions that will be directed at the legislature for additional clarification. He said that anyone is welcome to attend this meeting and encouraged everyone to submit input on the report. Julie Dunnington clarified further that this report is supposed to be a high level overview of the progress of the CWTDC. A draft of the report will be mailed out to the committee members for review before it is submitted.

Nancy Foll added that she believes that the job of writing the report to the legislature is a "difficult and daunting" project because of how difficult it is to convey the "intricacies" of the project. Judge Leonard Costello also wanted to express his "utter amazement" at the amount of decisions and progress that has been made by the committee.

Gwen Gua talked about the importance of using prescriptive language in the report about diversity.

**Public Comment:**

Qualsten, a Yakama Nation member, greeted the committee and thanked the committee for their time. He made a number of comments. First, he said that the report to the legislature should tell the legislature to proceed very cautiously with respect to the Yakama Nation. He said this because the Yakama Nation is a sovereign treaty nation who signed their treaty agreement with the United States on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 1855. Second, he does not want other service providers or organizations to come into the Yakama Nation under an agreement with the State of Washington and have their Native American children to be placed in these new agencies. He does not want any external organizations placing Yakama children up for adoption in families who receive money to do so. Third, he invited a member of the CWTDC to visit the Yakama Nation to give a PowerPoint presentation to the elected officials of the Yakama Tribal Council. He thanked the committee again for speaking and asked that his comments be committed to text. He also commended the positive relationship between the Yakama Nation and Regional Administrator Ken Nichols. Lastly, he stated that he appreciated when the committee members talk from their hearts.

Roberta Nestaas of Lutheran Community Services made a couple of comments. First, she said that adding the additional site selection criterion of basing demonstration sites on county lines must also be balanced with the need to firm up the demonstration site proposals in a timely manner. If using this additional criterion means that the committee will be delayed in producing new proposals, she said that basing demonstration sites on county borders wouldn't make a significant difference to providers. Second, she said that it is unlikely that there is a substantial amount of untapped private funding available in the community to supplement their organization's contracted activities. With regards to her agency's funding sources, only 1.3 percent comes from Lutheran organizations, 73-75 percent of funding comes from federal/state/county sources, and 3 percent comes from local United Way organizations.

Roy Hogan, speaking as a private citizen, talked about his duty as a social worker to promote a wide range of established social worker values. He talked about the array of issues with which

that social workers often engage. He talked about the need to employ robust communication to help reduce the fear and resistance among public agency staff and social workers. He requested that DSHS CA hire a full time employee to manage and disseminate HB2106 related communications. This person, he suggested, can also reduce the prevalence of rumors and misinformation as well as solicit information from front-line workers and supervisors. He read selections from articles and presentations by CWTDC member Charlotte McCullough. He explained that frontline workers “undeniably believe that the decision to privatize is a direct reflection on how legislators and the public value the quality of their work.” He also requested that a front-line public social worker be added as a voting member to the CWTDC.

**Closing:** The next meeting is June 14 and 15 at the Doubletree Hotel in SeaTac.