



10:00 a.m. – Noon, Thursday, March 2, 2017
Intensive Services Division Meeting
Lutheran Community Services
4040 South 188th Street, SeaTac WA 98188, 3rd Floor

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

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<p>1. Legislative Agenda</p>	<p>Bills have to be out of committee now and the funding requests need to be out of committee by tomorrow to be considered on the house/senate floor, though they can come back in the budget process:</p> <p>2SHB 1661- Creating Dept of Children, Youth and Families. WACF has been supportive and testified pro. This seems to be moving forward, still waiting on Senate and addressing issues. Focus on redistributing resources and not a "new dept". The cost estimates are around \$19 mill for 2 years. Bill has bi-partisan support.</p> <p>Areas of focused concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensuring that Tribes are identified as sovereign entities. 2. Performance based contracting is required for all grants and contracts by the new Dept. <p>2SHB1713 - passed and WACF was pro, "implementing recommendations from children's mental health work".</p> <p>****Our WACF priorities are not in legislation but are in the reinventing foster care process. Funding for travel time for therapists, visitation funds, including BRS in the forecast process. Pro on FAR legislation, increasing service time.</p> <p>Senator O Ban initiated a foster care licensing bill earlier in the session, seemed too prescriptive for a law and worked with him to approach reform in WACF's administrative work with CA.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<p>2. CA/WACF Meeting</p>	<p>Reviewed CA meeting minutes and notes from Linda Conchi:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Budget highlights-more social workers, extending FAR timeframes, funding Wendy's wonderful kids and class-wide pay increase. Not funded-reimbursement for visitation mileage, higher rate for client home travel, licensing staff and PBC expansion. 2. CA leg priorities-FAR Bill, BH 1791, Definition of Parent and info sharing with CRC. 3. WACF for support in Blue Ribbon Commission Funding and proposal for new cabinet level dept. CA has concerns with the changes made in the substitute bill and PBC requirements....this echoes WACF concerns. 4. Continuum of Care strategy moving forward: Reviewed the process, started late and didn't leave much time in sessions for community input. WACF gave heads up that there will be concerns presents, indicated that WACF has not taken a position on the report. CA indicated that the report does not adequately address next steps, dollars attached but no money in the Gov budget, things that cost money will be part of a supplemental budget ask. 5. SB 5105, Sen O'Ban bill killed, see previous notes. 6. Rep Kagi's reinventing foster care: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand PBC \$2.5 mill 2. Dept of Child/Fam- \$19 mill 3. CA reducing caseloads to 18 and adding transportation staff \$9 mill 4. Full reimbursement for travel time- \$4.8 mill 5. Reimbursement for travel for parent/child visits \$3 mill 6. Wendy's Wonderful Care-\$.5 mill 7. Budget for in-home Services in not being cut back because of money underspent last year. CA is earning more fed funds currently and has offered the leg a one time swap of funds: state for federal. CA is trying to move some money to bolster staffing levels, increase transportation options for parents, create more of an array of services in visitation, beef up FPS and allow CA social workers to buy supplies for parents....trying to eliminate poverty related barriers to help placements with kin. 8. Discussed coordinated care-barriers to accessing information. 9. Giddens/Ballmer FC project: Gave information about the project, Jennifer stated CA is in the loop. 10. Status on out of state children: 49 children placed out of state, happy with current services, numbers have stabilized and the kids are staying shorter durations. Looking at the renovation of unused state facilitates, \$9700 per month payment for out of state youth (average payment). <p>Status on Strive: CA stating that POC is having difficulty getting participation.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<p>3. Continuum of Care Report</p>	<p>This report came about from a proviso passed by Rep Kagi. WACF was actively involved with the legislation that required CA to collaborate with providers and examine services.</p> <p>WACF has concerns about the process and the outcomes. FOCUS groups started in August, then meeting with providers etc. Issues were the continuum of care, CA talked about the issues they identified but spent little time discussing what we can do to make the changes.</p> <p>Continuum of Care report-</p> <p>Recommendations are pretty much what CA wanted to have anyway. How does the Dept figure how many beds they need in each category, how can we increase suitable other placements with intensive service support. How can you proceed if you do not know how many beds you need? We wanted a task force approach to this process, they are holding a work session on this report.</p> <p>Member Thoughts: Data that they presented does help-data that kids transition to BRS pretty quickly (avg 6 placements) and out of state young ones have an avg of 14 placements. Data can inform how we can serve children much quicker.</p> <p>Needed more creativity about the continuum, what wasn't there and not what could we do.</p> <p>Report did include Coordinated Care, how to bring in wraparound services.</p> <p>One issue: mental health is moving to HCA and not moving CLIP placements, they will remain with DBHR.</p> <p>Professionalizing foster care- attempted previously but didn't work (FPAWS). Plan didn't look like what foster parents thought they should provide. Worried about approaching that again.</p> <p>What is needed: Look at well-being indicators that would support placement recommendations. Break down what children and youth need first, then plan for placement resource that support those desired outcomes.</p> <p>Disparity of services for youth in residential treatment across the state. There is not a consistent expectation for what should be provided, engaging providers to examine the possibilities for collaboration, how resources are used, what are the best practices. Are there funding models support by actuarial data?</p>	