



10:00 a.m. – Noon, Monday September 1, 2016
Intensive Services Division Meeting
Lutheran Community Services
4040 South 188th Street, SeaTac WA 98188, 3rd Floor

<p>Members Present: Brian Carroll, Carol Almero, Ellie Carrithers, Heather Hanson, Josh Fullerton, Julie Robinson, Kris Sanborn, Michael Yu, Nikki Brown, Rhianna Brill, Rod Johnson, Sara Schumacher, Shawn Sivly, Rachel Stewart-MacTavish</p>	<p>Members Absent: Andrew Hill, April Stallings, Chuck Cole, Dave Kucklick, DeAnn Adams, Erin Hathaway, Jeff Judy, Jen Kamel, Jenn Ryan, Jessie DiPardo, Julie Robinson, Katie Bass, Kymm Dozal, Mary Johnson, Megan Kelly, Nichole Southard, Rhianna Brill, Ryan Kiely, Shelly Hahn, Terry Pottmeyer, Tom Rembiesa</p>
---	--

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
1. Call to order		
2. Review of minutes	Minutes were reviewed with no suggested changes.	
3. Up-dates	Rod Johnson shared that he has been meeting with the BRS Program Managers periodically to talk with them about WACF and the BRS division work as well as discussions with CA management.	Rod suggested that the chair of the Intensive Services Division should attend these meetings. He was asked to make sure a change in who attended from WACF would be agreeable to the CA staff members.
4. Re-Naming the BRS Division	It was proposed that the name of the BRS Committee change to the Intensive Services Division to reflect the evolution of the membership that include facility based providers who serve CA children but not under the BRS contract (RACs) or past BRS providers that want to remain involved in this division (CRCs). This is also in anticipation of CA contracting for other intensive services outside of the existing BRS contract – for example the new emergency services contracts.	The attending members agreed to change the BRS Division to the Intensive Services Division of WACF.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<p>5. Legislative Agenda</p>	<p>Brian Carroll presented the Intensive Services legislative agenda and reviewed it with the group. The agenda will focus on funding the full cost of care that promotes the idea that the rate structure should be commensurate with the intensity of services.</p>	<p>There was no dissent to the proposed agenda.</p>
<p>6. Blue Ribbon Committee</p>	<p>There is a legislatively created committee that is to look at whether CA should be moved out of DSHS and a separate, cabinet level department created. (Representative Kagi is a primary architect of this piece of legislation.) The committee is currently looking at three options but seems to be deciding that Option C is the best option. Several other states (AZ and WI) have already done this and provide some guidance about the process and outcomes.</p>	<p>The options will be posted on the WACF website.</p>
<p>7. CA Meeting Request Regarding Legislative Proviso</p>	<p>CA has sent a request for providers to attend one of a series of small group discussions with “caseworkers, members of provider communities and stakeholders” so that they can “better understand and strengthen the array of placement options for children and youth.” They want to identify “gaps and needs in the continuum” and “develop recommendations to better meet the needs of children and improve placement stability.” This request is CA’s response to the 2016 Supplemental Budget Section 202 (20) proviso that directed CA to create a plan with providers to improve placement stability and promote a continuum of care. In addition to identifying a continuum of care and identifying gaps in the services, the plan was to address some very specific areas including: analysis of cost effectiveness, common and consistent assessment criteria to determine the level of care, and models for stabilizing funding.</p> <p>Brian Carroll had approached CA several times to inquire about the department’s steps to fulfill the proviso. This is CA’s response and it does not seem that having a number of 2-3 hour focus groups will achieve the intent of the proviso.</p>	<p>Members who are planning to attend were asked if they would thank the department for starting the process to achieve the goals of the proviso – that this is a good first step but that each of the items in the proviso seem to require its own focused discussion and work. Providers are hoping that these focus groups will be the impetus to creating one or several groups to fully address each piece of the proviso. The proviso will be posted on the website for review and to aid with talking points.</p> <p>It would be helpful to make sure that there is a WACF member at each of the focus groups to push this message with the department.</p>