



**11:30 a.m. – 1:00, Thursday October 6, 2016**  
**Intensive Services Division Meeting**  
**Lutheran Community Services**  
**4040 South 188<sup>th</sup> Street, SeaTac WA 98188, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

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

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<b>1. Call to order</b>		
<b>2. Review of minutes</b>	Minutes were reviewed with no suggested changes.	
<b>3. Legislative Agenda</b>	There is some discussion about presenting all three legislative asks on one page as they are all revenue requests. There will then be one page summaries that can be handed out specific to each request. The Intensive Services Division will be requesting an improvement in the rates to BRS providers that reflect the actual cost of care. The CPA Division and FFPS Division are requesting for a reinstatement of the mileage reimbursement for Parent-Child Visitation Services and full payment for travel time for in-home services.	The final versions will be presented at the next Intensive Services Division Meeting.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<p><b>4. Continuum of Care Meetings - Impressions</b></p>	<p>WACF members report that the number of people present at the various meetings on the west side of the state were low. It is unclear what attendance was like on the eastern side of the state. The first half of the meeting was used by CA staff to present a power point presentation regarding the current service array and the provider reimbursement issue which left very little time to discuss the points that were included in the Proviso. It also left very little opportunity to suggest a different process to fulfill the Proviso requirements – like creating task groups to address each item in the proviso.</p> <p>There is a current CA decision package related to vendor rates although the scope is very narrow. Within the package is a request for \$100,000 “for a consultant to analyze rate data and assist in developing new rates.” The link to the decision package is: <a href="https://www.dshs.wa.gov/data/budget/2017-19/010-PL-AH-Improving-the-Placement-Continuum.pdf">https://www.dshs.wa.gov/data/budget/2017-19/010-PL-AH-Improving-the-Placement-Continuum.pdf</a></p> <p>Beyond the Continuum of Care focus groups and the decision package, Rich Pannkuk from the Office of Financial Management has requested a meeting with a variety of providers to discuss vendor rates. The agenda of the meeting is unclear. WACF representatives will be attending the meeting.</p>	<p>A letter will be drafted and sent to CA management encouraging them to take advantage of the conversation they initiated with the focus groups by creating task groups that focus on the various requirements of the Proviso.</p> <p>It was also suggested that it would help to know how much money is being spent on different services: In-home versus out-of-home, foster care expenses by type, etc.</p>
<p><b>5. Recruitment for BRS Foster Homes</b></p>	<p>Linda Thomas asked that this be included on the agenda for the meeting. She shared that the CPS Division has focused on foster home recruitment for some time but the issue has not been addressed on the BRS side. In general, it seems that many agencies recruit BRS homes from their existing CPA homes; once a CPA home has some experience and capability, the agency approaches them about taking BRS level children and youth.</p> <p>Many BRS capable homes are CA homes and provide care via the Extra Cost Plans. This provides them a higher rate of pay than the BRS providers can pay. The trade off, however, is that while the foster parent is paid a higher rate, the home and child do not receive the intensive, wraparound type of services that a BRS private agency home would receive. As a result, it is estimated that the children in these homes are not receiving the therapeutic interventions and supports that they need to progress. Further it is guessed that the lack of monitoring and supports presents a liability risk to the state given the level of children and youth in these homes.</p> <p>Carol Almero suggested that a tiering of foster homes based on skill level would be a way to both identify which families were capable of caring for BRS level children and youth while also helping to professionalize foster care. Tier 1 foster homes would be new foster homes and/or those foster homes preferring or needing to serve more typically developing, less complicated children and youth and Tier 2 foster homes would be capable of serving BRS level children and youth.</p>	<p>This will be included as an agenda item at future meetings to better organize the approach to CA and to decide if there are other actions to take.</p> <p>It would be helpful to get data from CA on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many ECP homes are there by Region?</li> <li>• What are the permanency outcomes related to these homes?</li> <li>• How many disruptions are there from these homes?</li> <li>• How many over-capacity waivers are there for these homes?</li> </ul>

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Decisions</b>
<b>6. Meeting with CA – Intensive Services Program Manager</b>	Linda Thomas suggested that a quarterly meeting with Michael Campbell, Intensive Services Program Manager at CA, would be nice for this WACF Division. The quarterly meeting could be followed the next month by a phone conference meeting with all of the BRS Program Managers across the state.	CA will be approached about this as a possibility.