

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Room 473, Human Services Building, Salem

September 14, 2001

Minutes

<b><u>ATTENDING</u></b> Cindy Becker	DHS—Chief Administrative Officer
Larry Cole	League of Oregon Cities
Dena Comer	DHS—Director’s Office Administration, LGAC Support
Jean Cowan	Lincoln County Board of Commissioners
Ron Dodge	Polk County Board of Commissioners
Barry Donenfeld	Mid-Willamette Senior Services
David Foster	Oregon Housing and Community Services
Robert Furlow	Douglas County Health and Social Services
Donnie Griffin	DHS—Deputy Director
Jono Hildner	Consultant
Lisa Joyce	DHS—Legislative and Intergovernmental Relations Manager
Diane Linn	Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
Lydia Lissman	DHS—Seniors and People with Disabilities Services
Donna Middleton	Oregon Commission on Children and Families
Bobby Mink	DHS Director
Linda Modrell	Benton County Board of Commissioners
Jim Neely	DHS—Children, Adults and Family Services
Anne Peltier	Linn County of Conference Local Health Officials
Lillian Shirley	Multnomah County Health Department
Bill Wagner	Cascades West Council of Governments
Doug Wilson	DHS—Finance and Policy Analysis

**INTRODUCTIONS/OPENING**

Meeting called to order by Jean Cowan, Co-Chair.

Due to our nation’s tragedies earlier this week, lunch was cancelled and the meeting will adjourn shortly before 12 PM so that people may attend the memorial service on the Capitol steps during the lunch hour.

General discussion addressed the issue of whether or not lunch should be served at meetings, due to a tightening budget and large amounts of leftover food. It was decided that lunch will no longer be served, unless an extensive agenda requires the group to meet through the lunch hour.

Minutes of the July 13, 2001, meeting were approved and roundtable introductions were made.

Larry Cole announced his retirement from the LOC, though he will continue to attend meetings as a representative of the League.

Cowan stated that once membership has been established, a mailing list will be distributed to the entire group.

Cowan explained that this meeting's agenda is a revision of the one originally mailed.

## **ROLE OF LGAC**

### *Handout #1 Principles for State and Local Government Partnership*

Cowan explained that a conversation has been needed between DHS staff and LGAC regarding the committee's vision and role. She further commented that LGAC is vital in that it represents a broad spectrum of interests, but that it is foreseeable that the groups could break down into two interest areas; one of policy development and one of technical detail.

Bobby Mink provided a brief history of LGAC. The committee was established in 1992 after the passing of Senate Bill 1099, which mandated at least nine service integration projects. After a few months during which LGAC was abolished, it was reestablished in order to discuss operationally how to better complete the projects. It was expanded under Gary Weeks' leadership to include policy discussions.

Mink commented that there should be a forum where the two major players in Human Services can talk about issues. Statutorily, the two major players are DHS and local government. Local government includes the mental health authority, the public health authority, and the seniors program, which is selected by local government. Mink suggested to have an integrated policy around human services, the only way to accomplish that is to discuss the issues.

Mink agreed with Cowan that issues could be divided into two groups: policy and operational. Operationally, as the reorganization is implemented, what DHS does is

going to have an impact locally, which may or may not impact mental health, public health, and services to seniors. From a policy standpoint, more work can be done around budget policy and substantial legislative policy. If DHS is required to reduce its budget by a certain amount for a special session, it would be appropriate to have a dialogue in LGAC as to how it will be done.

Mink stated that he visualizes LGAC as an information and idea-sharing forum for substantive policy and operational issues. Mink doesn't want to be the only one sharing issues and suggested that short- and long-term policy issues be placed on the agenda. An example of a policy issue that will be before us for years to come is the development of a system for addressing "Baby Boomer" issues as they age. Issues will also come up with the implementation of the Oregon Children's Plan.

Dianne Linn responded by commenting that the history of LGAC and how the group spends its time and connects with each other is very important. Further, she asked how the group could get to a place where they can trust each other more; there still seems to be a jurisdictional angst which cannot be afforded with respect to time, energy and resources. All jurisdictions within the state may be looking at mid-year budget reductions. How those reductions are contemplated may either do damage to service delivery, or efficiencies can be found that work for both entities so that the best services possible can be provided for clients.

Linn asked how to streamline and get to the "brass tacks" issues within our complex bureaucracy. She commented that since DHS has begun the reorganization process, LGAC needs to meet Mink half way. It is critical not just to meet and discuss the issues, but also to decide who should be discussing each piece of the system. Multnomah County is currently going through a redesign of its mental health system, and as things change throughout the state, we're all in this together.

Linn proposed that LGAC consider breaking down, looking at the operational issues and splitting out some of the policy issues, and attracting more commissioners from around the state. As all of the counties operate differently, they cannot be expected to operate the same. In breaking down, it is important to honor everyone's role and make sure that each county has a voice at the table.

Jono Hildner added that one of the real values of LGAC has been a "good mix" of bureaucrats and politicians. This has allowed for discussion on procedure and policy issues. What could be better is to have the whole group meet on the issues, but also include sub-committee work, possibly involving others who aren't actually in LGAC. Specific issues could then be dealt with and brought to LGAC, rather than relying on DHS or the counties to include as a discussion item on the agenda. As changes develop,

policy and operational issues could be so intertwined it would be difficult to break them into completely separate areas.

Linn responded that while she doesn't disagree with Hildner, she is concerned that attending more committees and groups could be difficult to attend on a consistent basis.

Barry Donenfeld commented that he agreed strongly with all that Linn has said. Additionally, there are areas where opportunities exist for Oregon as a state. An option may be negotiating with our federal partners to do business differently than they do other places by using our state as a "lab." If we could design what does and does not work with our federal partners rather than merely following their rules and regulations, we could perhaps maximize the amount of resources available to help people. As resources become less available for all of the issues LGAC has talked about, we have to prioritize. There are huge data issues that have never been resolved, and until they are resolved it will be difficult for people to work together efficiently. Donenfeld suggested that a lot of the operational issues can be worked together at a lower level and brought to LGAC as recommendations with the understanding that while the group wouldn't adopt everything, we must adopt some so that people see the value in participating in the process.

Mink agreed with Donenfeld's perspective. The Department of Health and Human Services under Tommy Thompson's leadership may be more flexible than it ever has been. Mink suggested that we focus on that department and hopefully other departments will follow along. The opportunity is there; if we can work together to establish foundations for sponsoring planning to present to the federal government, we may be in fact very productive.

Cowan added that opportunities must be fully recognized and acknowledged Hildner's comments regarding a subcommittee format and the need for communication between the groups. Some of the questions that Linn raised around jurisdictional issues may get very "sticky," and LGAC needs to focus on some of those. We need to recognize that local government does have the authority and responsibility for some of those assurances. As revenues decrease, serious conversations about sharing responsibilities for services between local and state government are occurring. Local governments are wrestling with lower revenues and still continuing to provide needed services. LGAC needs to be able to have candid conversations about this.

Regarding the agenda item on principles for state and local government partnership, Cowan commented that the words look good on paper. Cowan also referred to Cole's comment at the July 13 meeting regarding issues stopping at county level and not continuing to the city level. While she would like to see this happen, it is difficult to

know how. It is good that Cole will remain with LGAC for a while as it important to view the whole spectrum of local government and how this is done.

Cowan commented that what the issues come down to is ability; local governments don't have the resources to send people to subcommittee meetings. Huge workloads and lack of support result in already difficult decisions on which meetings to attend. Cowan stated her concern for maintaining communication if LGAC is broken down into smaller groups.

Bill Wagner added that he would not encourage creating formal groups; the value of LGAC has been as an informal focus group for putting "red flag" issues on the table. The group should be a forum that Mink can use to see the important issues and determine if another committee is needed. LGAC could be a place where issues are discussed in common, among peers who have chosen to spend their time this way. Wagner proposed a regular agenda item regarding the SDA system and how it's working, and the issues that may come up for local partners. It would be helpful to Mink to hear from LGAC on this, not only from DHS staff.

Cole commented that he sees the need for a forum, and that while he agrees with Donenfeld that subcommittees would be helpful, he is concerned about adding more groups. When LGAC broke into subcommittees two years ago, it was difficult to attend extra meetings. Cole suggested task forces that could meet in the morning, have lunch in the middle, and full LGAC in the afternoon.

Robert Furlow shared his experiences in Utah surrounding a group similar to LGAC, which advised the Governor. With all of the planning issues, there is a need for commonality where both policy and operations mix. Furlow suggested that the formation of additional groups might be counterproductive when different "silos" are already in existence. The challenge is to bring the local DHS field staff together with local delivery systems, and LGAC is an excellent opportunity to accomplish this.

John Hartner commented that with the multiple issues in existence, there is no way to effectively deal with all of them. On the other hand, we must focus on the many successes. LGAC is an opportunity to present to Mink all of the things we see working and not working. There are many issues, while not completely resolved, that have gotten the attention of DHS as a result of LGAC bringing them forward.

Linn added that profound ideas in this discussion include the focus group perspective and taking messages to the leadership of DHS. The time spent in LGAC discussing the issues are critical; there must be a dialogue. How we design and balance the agendas is also a factor. Issues should be targeted such as accountability measures and red tape, which are

forced down from the federal government, and assessing how much time it takes for local government staff to accomplish the tasks. We've got to figure out a way to streamline to deal with the heavy load and collectively go to the federal government.

Cole added that the issue is broader than DHS. Perhaps there should be a Governor's task force to address the paperwork reduction issue across the board within the state.

Donenfeld agreed with Cole, adding that it's not just paperwork; paperwork is a result of some of the accountability requirements that may not need to exist. For example, in DHS, we support a huge and expensive eligibility bureaucracy. There are areas we could look at that use up huge amounts of our resources and determine whether or not we need to keep doing things the way they've been done.

Cowan further commented that this conversation needs to continue, and the group may want to wordsmith the Principles of State and Local Government document.

Wagner and Lisa Joyce briefly discussed the use of the word "both" in a sentence of the document. While it was agreed that the word would remain as it is, Joyce will add the word "partners" for clarification. Joyce also commented that there were some formatting problems which occurred in the printing and which will be corrected.

Linn commented that she sees nothing objectionable in the document, and that it is positive; the issue is in how the group talks to one another. She added that perhaps how local government is done is a mystery to the public. It is therefore critical to connect up and accomplish some tasks that the public can see.

Cowan responded by stating that there appears to be no need for having conversation surrounding the principles document; there are deeper issues than the words.

## **MEMBERSHIP & AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS**

*Handout #2 Bylaws,  
Local Government Advisory Committee*

Cowan began the conversation by explaining that there is confusion regarding who the members of LGAC are, how they are appointed, etc. In light of the roles conversation, if this committee is going to be having "big picture" discussions, it is important to determine who the members are and whom they represent.

Additionally, Cowan remarked that it is time that the Bylaws are looked at to ensure they are being followed, or revised to reflect the current functioning of LGAC.

Cowan added that careful agenda development must also be addressed so that the group can do the most useful work possible. Cowan has been working with Sue Kupillas and Linn to resolve the issue.

Joyce commented that page five of the bylaws states that the Executive Committee sets the agenda.

Linn remarked that the challenge involved with the agendas is that there is no time to think about them; items just appear on them. The use of LGAC time should be very focused.

Joyce suggested a brief conference call between herself, Linn, Cowan and Kupillas to set the agenda.

David Foster expressed subcommittee concerns and suggested that Article Five be removed from the Bylaws. Rather than keeping this section, an Executive Committee could shape the agendas.

Cowan suggested that no more time at this meeting be spent on proposed amendments to the bylaws.

Joyce responded by pointing out the amendment needed to AOC section with regard to the roles of County Commissioners.

Cowan referred to the membership issue by discussing membership representation as it exists now. There are two extra members, according the Bylaws, who are representing different interest groups. Cowan suggested that if there are extras, perhaps they could be listed as alternates.

Joyce added that alternates are fine, however the Bylaws state they would not be permitted to vote.

Linn remarked that LGAC doesn't vote often, as it is a focus group.

Joyce commented that by ensuring current representation, the group stays in balance and fulfills its purpose through defining whose job belongs to whom. Further, terms of office are not clear; it is uncertain when people's terms started or when they end. If there we're going to have bylaws, they need to be applied, however they can be very simple.

Cowan responded by stating that the Bylaws are clear that there shall be eight members who are locally elected officials; seven county commissioners and one representative of

the LOC. The appointment of those individuals should come through those organizations.

Cole suggested using the terms “officio” and “ex-officio” to determine who votes.

Cowan responded by stating that the Director of DHS is an ex-officio member. It is critical to the conversations at the table that the DHS Director and other appropriate staff are in attendance.

Mink added that the Bylaws were developed when Gary Weeks was Director of DHS. They were modeled after issues occurring with Seniors at the time. Mink’s perspective is that he likes the idea of a forum, but also must include information going back out. It’s important that representatives of human services groups report back to affiliates. It is also important to have representatives reporting back to AOC. Mink would like two individuals from counties who operate a large umbrella human services departments. At times LGAC will want to make some formal advice, whether or not Mink accepts it, and get it on the record.

Linda Modrell joined the discussion by stating that the way the Bylaws are spelled out are fine with her, however some elected officials are reluctant to give up their seats on the Committee when they are no longer in office. This prompted the Bylaws, to have some structure to membership. There was and still is a place for the Bylaws.

Cowan stated that Community Corrections must be formally added as one of the interested groups. Additionally, the at-large representatives are Foster, Fultz, Snider, Middleton, Hockman, and Wagner, which total more than four.

Foster commented that he might have marked his blue mailing card as a member when he should have marked it as an interested person.

Cowan remarked that everyone sitting at the table is a valuable asset, yet can understand that some formality is necessary.

Linn asked if staff could evaluate who’s here and make sure everyone fits each category and bring the member representation issue back to the table.

Joyce responded that she would do that. Additionally, she understands from the group, that LGAC needs nothing but an Executive Committee and ad-hoc task groups as deemed necessary, rather than other standing committees.

Cowan confirmed Joyce's understanding, and stated that we must determine whom the Executive Committee includes.

Mink asked if an ex-officio member could be an Executive Committee member, as he would like to be included.

Hartner suggested to Cowan that perhaps broadening the at-large membership from being recommended by AOC to also include those people in LGAC who may want to nominate someone.

Linn suggested making that recommendation to the AOC.

Cowan brought the membership conversation to a close by stating that she and Joyce will work on the at-large membership, along with the recommendation for a bylaws amendment and take the list formally back through the AOC. Additionally, she commented that there needs to be a group of more than herself to design the agenda and discuss the kinds of issues which will produce a more effective conversation. It is important for Linn, as past chair, and Kupillas and Cowan to discuss the agenda, yet it is important also to not ignore the Bylaws.

### **DHS REORGANIZATION UPDATE**

*Handout #3 Recommended County Groupings,  
16 SDA Locations*

Mink began a brief reorganization update by stating that DHS has appointed all of its new Service Delivery Managers and referred the handout of the SDA map including a list of those managers and their phone numbers. Mink's instructions to these managers, as they begin planning, included being in contact with local advisory groups in every county, and the local human service providers. Mink asked that if LGAC members have not heard from these managers soon, please let him know. What DHS does as part of their service delivery must include local partners. Recruitment and interviewing are currently happening for the management team for each SDA. Depending on the size of each SDA, there may be an Assistant SDA Manager, but there will be program managers; one manager for child welfare, one for public welfare, and one for senior and disabled services. Mink has asked them to be very inclusive in those interview panels and provide feedback about the candidates. While it is not for LGAC to choose who those candidates would be, it is important to hear advice regarding their strengths and weaknesses.

Mink met with all 16 candidates, however he did not do the actual hiring. Bill Fink and Shirley Iverson completed the hiring, however Mink spent 15-30 minutes with each to indoctrinate them on the direction of the reorganization and the expectations of the

Governor. There were approximately 75 or 80 candidates, whose applications Mink screened, and eliminated those not acceptable for the position.

On Monday of this week, Mink met with the newly appointed SDA Managers and DHS Cabinet members. The Governor was also present and spoke to the group regarding his expectations. Additionally, Representatives Winters and Bates spoke to them about legislative expectations. Mike Greenfield from DAS also presented his expectations to them. Mink explained to the group, in dialogue format, what is needed to be successful in these positions. The 13 items Mink outlined in his presentation, including accountability issues, will be put into a document and made public. Tuesday was to be a work session on the points made, however the nation's tragic events called an early close as people returned home. The work session will be continued within the next couple of weeks.

Mink stated that his plan is to get the SDA managers together every three or four months to make sure everyone has the same outcomes in view. The way the outcomes are accomplished may be different, depending on where the work is being done. Mink is very happy with this group of sixteen, however he would like to hear from LGAC how things are going in each area.

Mink added that DHS has identified \$10 million, which has been removed from the budget as a result of reorganization. \$4 million has gone away, which has been identified as staff cuts, almost all being managers. No case managers or direct supervisors were included in that group. \$6 million is identified for reinvestment into training of staff and managers, and marginal information system improvements and organizational development assistance. The \$6 million also includes office moves, as staff moves from one place to another for a good mix. How we're saving and prioritizing the \$6 million is still being worked on. The results should be available within the next few weeks, any may include staff, reprioritizing services and supplies, and a lessened reliance on temporary employees.

Mink added that the latest presentation DHS made to the Emergency Board was not at all difficult, and resulted in the Board unscheduling part of \$6 million for Information Systems without requiring further explanation from DHS.

Mink asked that Joyce send out a description of the Information Systems items, along with the minutes, to LGAC.

Joyce responded that she would.

Mink closed his comments by again asking for feedback from LGAC on the progress of inclusive communication in the hiring of the management team for the SDAs.

Cole referred to the SDA map handout and suggested that each of the SDA managers meet with county and city managers and elected officials on a monthly basis. Cole further offered his assistance in making that happen.

Mink agreed and asked Joyce to find out how this can happen and to perhaps work with Cole on this.

Cowan asked, referring to Mink's directives to the SDA Managers, if any directives have been given regarding the physical location of the offices. Will the offices be in the same location as the SDA Manager, or located differently?

Mink responded that his expectations are that there be a management presence in each county, recognizing that in Hood River, Wasco, and Sherman counties this must be further discussed.

Cowan suggested that the presence issue could be overcome by the second in command to the SDA manager being physically located in another geographic area.

Peltier remarked that the map document includes "Recommended" in the title.

Cowan responded by confirming they are no longer recommended, but rather completed.

Joyce commented that she would see to the correction of the SDA map's title, and if people had not yet received a spiral-bound copy of "Remaking DHS...Phase II" she would make sure to get one to them. The document is also available on the website.

Wagner remarked to Mink that in his area, both the DHS managers and the local partner managers have been meeting for a year. There was a meeting scheduled, but the SDA Manager decided to cancel it without rescheduling. Wagner suggested that perhaps all of the SDA managers are not clear on Mink's expectations.

Mink responded by stating that he will speak with the manager on that.

#### **UPDATE ON CHILDREN'S PLAN**

*Handout #4 Summary of HB 3659:  
Early Childhood System of Supports*

Mink introduced Ramona Rodamaker from DHS' Director's Office, and asked Middleton to add to the presentation as well.

Rodamaker distributed a summary of HB 3659, which is the bill that makes up the Oregon Children's Plan. Rodamaker provided a brief overview of the plan, explaining that SB 555 was passed to create an early childhood system for children aged 0-18, while the Oregon Children's Plan specifically includes ages zero to eight. Rodamaker explained that her document includes a set of goals which the early childhood system must meet, as well as the Plan's features.

Rodamaker added that the Plan was funded at \$60 million, \$11 of which was received by DHS. Those dollars will follow the families; they will be used to provide direct services to first-born children and their families who do not have other resources.

Rodamaker explained that the Plan is in its beginning stages of planning the operation. On September 13 a policy group met for the first time, consisting of herself, Middleton, Mink, Kate Dixon from the Department of Education, Wilma Wells and Barry Kast, and a member of the School Board. This group will address the system and operational issues, and to provide the necessary and distinct program resources.

Middleton added that the budget portion includes statewide distribution of the home visiting system, prenatal support, coordination with the public health system on Babies First, and a possible statewide hotline for new families. The budget also addresses how resources are distributed in mental health and alcohol and drug programs.

Peltier referred to the Plan beginning with first-born, and asked how that will be "teased out."

Middleton responded that the issue is that some of the resources will be focused on first birth, including mental health and alcohol and drugs. DHS may be looking at resources from other systems, such as public health, to stretch the money further.

Rodamaker added that screening assessment would be available across the zero-to-eight age group, and that some of the programs are only budgeted at 60-80 percent. This should not be thought of as a distinct program, but rather as a pool of resources.

Hartner commented that he looks forward to partnering with these other organizations in approaching the issues from a family point of view. We need to look at all the problems these families have, perhaps through improved screening for drug and alcohol and mental health. We must also assess these families from the standpoint of their strengths in order to help move them ahead.

Middleton responded that what is meant by “universal screening” is at first addressing the strengths of the family, and secondly screening for alcohol, drug, and mental health.

## CONTRACTS

*Handout #5 Memo from Cindy Becker,  
Community Contracts Process Improvement  
Handout #6 Community Contracts Task Group,  
Draft List of Participants*

Cindy Becker distributed her draft of a participants list for a Community Contracts Task Group and explained that this group was discussed at the July 13 meeting. We’re looking at the contract areas of public health, mental health, alcohol and drug, and the AAAs. Becker referred to her memo of August 28, which included a one-page summary of the process improvement.

Becker explained that the task group will be focusing on two areas, one is the process by which we contract with local governments, and the other is the content of those contracts. Becker’s goal is to have a new system in place by the next biennium.

Becker introduced Bill Nickleberry, who will lead the process, and Charlotte Hartwig, who will be the project manager who will keep the group on task.

Becker explained that as a response to her request that LGAC recommend the names, which are those on her handout. Not all the names from DHS are on the list. A representative from the Department of Justice will be added to the list, as well.

Becker responded by stating that not only is it important for people to attend the meetings, but it is her expectation that they report back to people they represent.

Donenfled commented that if the process will take a year, there should be some preliminary products that could be shared for feedback. A problem with contracts is that a lot of county counsels read contract language differently.

Becker responded that communication would be built into the process. The issue is getting the correct people on the task group.

Cowan responded by saying she’d like to find a mechanism whereby the right people are identified.

Becker replied that she will start with the current list, although she is concerned that it is a balanced group. Becker stated that if LGAC has more names to please let her know.

Cindy closed her presentation by explaining that she has asked Hartwig to interview the participants ahead of time to discuss issues and problem areas within the contracting process.

### **OTHER ITEMS**

*Handout #7 DHS Legislative Wrap-up*

No discussion of this handout occurred. Copies of this document were distributed to group members as informational only.

### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The agenda is dependent on a meeting with the Executive Committee.

### **NEXT MEETING**

Date: October 12, 2001

Time: 9:00a - 12:00p

Location: HSB 473

Note: 2:00 pm-4:00 pm Stakeholders/Partners Meeting

Location: HSB 473

If you would like copies of the handouts, contact:

Dena Comer  
DHS Director's Office, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
500 Summer Street NE, E-15  
Salem, OR 97301-1097  
Telephone: (503) 945-6843

**Americans with Disabilities Act Notice:** Do you have a physical or mental impairment that makes it hard for you to communicate? If so, you can get this document in Braille, computer disk, large print or oral presentation by contacting Jessie Ferge, Department of Human Services, Director's Office, (503) 945-6609, TTY (503) 945-6214.