Franklin County Children Services (FCCS)
2019 3.10 Mill Replacement Levy Proposal
HSLRC Meeting Minutes
May 02, 2019

The Human Services Levy Review Committee (HSLRC) meeting was called to order by Jesse Hemphill on May 02, 2019 @ 11:06 a.m.

ROLL CALL

HSLRC members present: Jesse Hemphill, Jim Bowman, Michael Curtin, Zak Talarek, Jerry Friedman, Jean Carter Ryan, and Rose Handon.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Rachel Buske.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF METTING MINUTES

Mr. Hemphill announced that the first item on the agenda was the approval of the March 21, 2019 minutes. Mr. Friedman made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Curtin seconded the motion. All members voted "Aye" and Mr. Hemphill announced that the motion had carried.

Mr. Hemphill asked Ms. Buske to lead the Committee through the next agenda item which was the Levy Scenario Update.

LEVY SCENARIO UPDATE-OMB

Ms. Buske provided the Committee with an overview of the materials in the packet:

1. The meeting agenda

2. A spreadsheet with Historical Revenue 2014-2018 and the 2019 Revenue Projection, broken out by line item

3. A spreadsheet with Historical Revenue and Expenditures 2014-2018 and the 2019 FCCS and OMB Projections

4. A chart that compares the percent change in county child population matched against the percent change in Children Services' expenses

5. A spreadsheet that compares various levy scenarios based on a replacement versus a renewal as well as different Social Services expense projections

6. A one page Managed Board and Care contractual summary

Ms. Buske explained that OMB provided the historical revenue breakdown at the request of Mr. Friedman, and noted that the majority of federal revenue is Title IV-E, which is the revenue category that would be impacted by the new law. She also pointed out the child protection allocation under State funding, which is projected to increase by $3 million starting in 2020.

Turning to the historical revenue and expenditures with the 2019 projections, she explained that the FCCS projection is very similar to the approved budget and that the OMB projection is lower.

Ms. Buske explained that she reviewed actual spending year-to-date to determine if the projections from the last meeting needed to be revised. She stated that Personal Services and Fringe Benefits were not revised and projections continue to indicate that it is very likely that FCCS will go over budget in these areas.

Ms. Buske explained that the FCCS projection for Materials & Services is much higher than historical spending, whereas the OMB projection is lower and more closely tied to prior years' actuals. The OMB Capital projection is similar to the FCCS projection, since FCCS does not have any major building purchases or renovations planned.

Ms. Buske noted that most of the items in Social Services appear to be trending downwards from the 2018 actuals with the exception of Managed Board and Care. OMB verified that the $2 million in Medicaid savings for higher end cases would begin in February and so OMB reduced the Social Services projection by $2 million. The 2019 projection is approximately 0.5% higher than the 2018 actual, giving FCCS a small cushion.

Ms. Buske also noted that she reviewed monthly actuals from the last two years to determine if there were any patterns that might impact OMB's projections. She did not see any reason to either increase or decrease any of the projections after this review.

Ms. Buske then pointed out that the chart that compares FCCS spending to Franklin County population growth does not seem to indicate a direct relationship.

Mr. Friedman noted that it was a dramatic trend downward and questioned whether or not there will be a significant increase in population that will counteract this.

Ms. Buske explained that there is a population increase projected, but that past increases have not necessarily led to an increase in placement days. FCCS has projected a decrease in placement days from 2018 to 2019. After 2019 FCCS is projecting an increase from 2020-2029. Ms. Buske questioned if the increase might end up flatter than FCCS predicts.

Ms. Buske explained that when she and Mr. Talarek looked at the Social Services growth over the last three years, expenses increased by an average of approximately 1.6 % per year. For the three projected scenarios, OMB used the 1.6% growth rate for the first; a 2.0% growth rate for the second; and the third uses the 2.75% growth rate for placement costs with a 2.0% growth rate for the other categories in Social Services, based on the FCCS projection. The third scenario has an increase of approximately 2.67% for Social Services overall.

Ms. Handon asked if the money FCCS has saved factors into these scenarios.

Ms. Buske explained that the spreadsheet documents the beginning cash and the ending cash balance, which demonstrates how much cash they start the year with and where they end once yearly revenue is added and yearly expenses are subtracted.

Mr. Talarek asked Ms. Buske to clarify that each of the scenarios includes the anticipated Medicaid savings. He explained that each scenario incorporates the $2 million savings and includes the $3 million in additional state revenue. Mr. Talarek verified with the County's Government Affairs Liaison that they are still waiting on the sub-house bill, which is still pending. The Liaison has heard rumblings about a maintenance of effort component, so that if there are additional dollars that they be tied to a local source of funding. In Franklin County, the voters have been generous in terms of supporting levies in the past, so this would be an issue for a number of counties that don't have local levies and that only use state dollars and general funds.

Mr. Curtin referred Ms. Buske back to the chart and asked what drove that dramatic increase from 2014 to 2015.

Ms. Buske noted that 2015 is when FCCS started to see a spike in placement and also there was an increase in board and care rates.

Mr. Talarek added that prior to 2015 FCCS had reduced some of the provider payments and so for the next three years they increased rates to make providers whole. This is also when FCCS began to address the need to increase staffing to address staff turnover and started to bring in additional personnel. He also believed there were some capital costs associated with the rehabilitation of the Main Street facility.

Ms. Buske walked the Committee through the projections she used to build the various scenarios. Personal Services and Fringe Benefits used the same rate as the FCCS projection (2% each year and 3% every third year due to contract renegotiations), with the exception of healthcare that was projected at 6%. OMB used CPI-U for Materials & Services and kept Capital flat.

Social Services costs are the most difficult to project, which is why OMB provided three different growth rates for comparison.

Ms. Buske walked the Committee through the different levy scenarios:

1. A 3.1 mill replacement with a projected 1.6% Social Services growth rate: This scenario projects that FCCS will have an ending cash balance of approximately $137.5 million at the end of 2024. Under this scenario, FCCS would most likely not need to replace the 1.9 mill levy and would be able to request a renewal.

2. A 3.1 mill replacement with a projected 2.0% growth rate: This scenario projects that FCCS will have an ending cash balance of approximately $130.3 million at the end of 2024. Under this scenario, FCCS would most likely not need to replace or increase the 1.9 mill levy and would be able to request a renewal, with the understanding that FCCS would need to save approximately $10 million over the ten years to have the recommended cash balance at the end of 2029.

3. A 3.1 mill replacement with the FCCS recommended 2.75% growth rate for placement costs and a 2.0% growth rate for other Social Services: This scenario projects that FCCS will have an ending cash balance of approximately $117.9 million at the end of 2024. Under this scenario, FCCS would need to increase the 1.9 mill levy by approximately 0.375 mill to meet the recommended cash balance at the end of 2029.

4. A 3.1 mill renewal with a projected 1.6% Social Services growth rate: This scenario projects that FCCS will have an ending cash balance of approximately $91.9 million at the end of 2024. Under this scenario, FCCS would most likely need to increase the 1.9 mill levy by approximately 0.45 mill.

5. A 3.1 mill renewal with a projected 2.0% Social Services growth rate: This scenario projects that FCCS will have an ending cash balance of approximately $84.7 million at the end of 2024. Under this scenario, FCCS would most likely need to increase the 1.9 mill levy by approximately 0.625 mill.

6. A 3.1 mill renewal with the FCCS recommended 2.75% growth rate for placement costs and a 2.0% growth rate for other Social Services: This scenario projects that FCCS will have an ending cash balance of approximately $84.7 million at the end of 2024. Under this scenario, FCCS would most likely need to increase the 1.9 mill levy by approximately 0.945 mill.

Ms. Buske noted that the high end Social Services expense projection with replacing the 3.1 mill levy is not that far off from where the low end would be with the renewal, but if you replace the 3.1 you are driving the two levies further apart and Mr. Spinning had stated that part of their goal was to bring them closer together.

Mr. Bowman asked if FCCS had indicated how much closer the two levies should be.

Ms. Buske explained that in 2014 FCCS wanted to renew the 1.9 mill levy with 0.4 increase and argued that that the increase might not be enough. In 2014 the Committee recommended a straight 1.9 mill levy renewal and it was more than enough. FCCS has only started dipping into their cash this past year and they added 75 FTEs since the last levy. FCCS has been able to implement the flexible staffing initiative that makes it easier for them to keep caseloads manageable and allows them to offer more prevention services.

Mr. Curtin asked if he was correct that when the Committee had its initial meeting at FCCS, Mr. Spinning indicated that ideally over time FCCS would like to increase the 1.9 mill levy so that the two levies closer together.

Ms. Buske agreed that Mr. Spinning had said that and stated that it would makes sense, because there is a big difference between them and they are five years apart, but this has no impact on expenses.

Mr. Curtin noted that it would be addressed probably over several levy cycles.

Ms. Buske noted that it is ideal to address the smaller of the two from a cost perspective. She noted that most of the renewal scenarios suggest it is most likely that the 1.9 mill levy will need to be increased when it expires in 2024. But between now and 2024, the projections suggest that FCCS will be able to maintain the recommended cash balance with a 3.1 mill renewal. With the renewal, the cost to a taxpayer is approximately $84.53 for every $100,000 of valuation; under the replacement that amount would increase by approximately $24. A best estimate at this time, is that FCCS would need to request an increase of somewhere between the 0.45 mill and the 0.625 mill scenarios, which would be less expensive.

Mr. Talarek noted that these scenarios do not incorporate any other savings that may be operationally possible, like the IT savings due to the move onto the State IT network discussed previously or other cost savings or efficiencies over the next 10 years that FCCS could hopefully implement.

Ms. Carter Ryan noted that the political climate might be more favorable for a replacement now, but reiterated that FCCS had not demonstrated the need for an increase now.

Mr. Talarek agreed that the political climate is a factor, but stated that FCCS has done a lot to maximize federal revenue, increase kinship care and reduce congregate care, while increasing prevention services. He reminded Ms. Carter Ryan that she had stated that there needs to be a focus on aiming for improvement and that maybe the prevention efforts with the Opiate Crisis and other issues might work and that asking for an increase because something bad might happen or because things are always going to be awful might not hold.

Mr. Bowman asked for verification that the 3.1 mill levy now costs an owner-occupied taxpayer $84.53 per $100,000, and that with the proposed replacement the cost would increase to $108. He also verified that the renewal will not result in a tax increase. He stated that it is very powerful to be able to keep taxes flat.

Ms. Buske pointed out that before FCCS had confirmed the $2 million in Medicaid savings for this year and could assume the additional State funding would most likely be included in the revenue projections, OMB still projected that the 3.1 mill renewal scenario would allow FCCS to end 2024 with an estimated cash balance of $44 million. This was the worst case scenario. With the revised projection, they should have a cushion of approximately $15 million.

Mr. Curtin and Mr. Talarek noted that FCCS put together their request before they knew it was likely that the State would be increasing the child protection allocation. The FCCS model had no way of anticipating this increase.

Ms. Buske agreed and also reminded the Committee that FCCS projects expenses very conservatively. In 2014 FCCS was unsure that alternative response diversion could be increased above 50% and now it has been increased to 65%.

Mr. Bowman noted that FCCS builds in a cushion with their budget and does not typically spend the entire budgeted amount.

Ms. Buske stated that because placement cost are 51% of the budget and there are so many variables that impact these costs, it is understandable that FCCS would budget conservatively. She pointed out that FCCS projected an increase for 2018 and actuals came in lower. Then, based on the 2018 projection they did midyear, they asked for more money in 2019 and now expenses will be lower in 2019 than they were in 2018. Obviously contractual rates are going to go up and that is an issue, but after the projected decrease in placement days for 2019 FCCS is immediately showing an increase starting in 2020. It is possible that the increase in placement days is going to be flatter than that. From their projections they won't be back to their 2018 level for placement days until 2022/2023.

She reminded everyone that from 2009 to 2013 FCCS actually saw a pretty significant decrease in placement days. The case mix is an important factor, but FCCS has increased kinship care (approximately 31%). Maintaining that rate or even increasing it to say 35% would be significant, particularly if they can lower congregate care which is very expensive. With all of these variables it is difficult to project.

Ms. Buske explained that a big issue will be the Managed Board and Care contract. There was a significant increase from 2018 to 2019 because FCCS found that providers were having trouble keeping costs under control. They are putting out the RFP now and OMB reached out for information but has yet to hear back. It will be included in the next Committee packet if it is available. Ms. Buske directed the Committee to the one page Managed Board and Care contractual summary and discussed the case rates as well as the fact that there is no additional charge if a case comes back into the system within one year of being closed. She reminded everyone that FCCS has hired a consultant to review the model and make recommendations for the case rate as well as performance metrics.

Mr. Talarek stated that he thought that when FCCS did the last contract in 2015, it included an increased rate of 3% for the first year and then 1% for each of the next two years.

Ms. Buske reminded everyone that the 2019 Managed Board and Care projection was set at the contract rate.

Ms. Handon asked if it is typical for FCCS to do a one year contract extension as it did for 2019.

Ms. Buske stated that she believes that FCCS normally negotiates for a three year period and would ask why they only renegotiated for one year this time around.

Ms. Handon asked about overall expenses.

Ms. Buske noted over time the cost increases with Managed Board and Care are increasing at a higher rate than regular board and care. She added that it is important to remember that there are also overheard costs, but they didn't break that down at all. With the performance charts FCCS provided, it appeared as though both of the providers were not performing as well as the in-house services.

Ms. Handon continued to question what a thorough Managed Board and Care report card would look like.

Mr. Talarek elaborated that with cost increases and performance reporting, there are concerns related to Managed Board and Care. It would be difficult to move away from Managed Board and Care because FCCS would need to hire additional staff and it would take a while to do so since it would involve a third of the caseload. It would make sense to have one of the recommendations involve a report on Managed Board and Care for the mid-levy review.

The Committee and staff revisited the discussion of the various scenarios presented earlier. Mr. Talarek commented that the one scenario with a proposed 0.45 increase was the same size of the increase that was recommended for the Office on Aging a few years ago. With Social Services expenses being flat, it is hard to believe that costs are going to shoot up drastically.

Ms. Buske noted that the increase in the placement days in the same period was approximately 26%. With the huge increase FCCS was able to manage cost increases.

Mr. Curtin reminded everyone that FCCS could come in early before the end of 2024 if there are dramatic increases in expenses.

Mr. Curtin stated that he feels FCCS deserves credit for their conservative budgeting approach, and that OMB deserves credit for really drawing down and bringing clarity based on actual historical spending.

Ms. Handon asked if any other levy requests were scheduled on the ballot.

Mr. Talarek explained that there are discussions to encourage that multiple levies are not on the ballot at the same time. There is an attempt to balance or stagger them.

Mr. Talarek noted that the ADAMH would be the next levy agency that would be preparing to go on the ballot. Their last year of collection is 2021. So they could either go in the fall of 2020 or 2021.

Ms. Buske asked if there was any further discussion or if not, was the Committee ready to formally discuss a recommendation.

Ms. Handon asked if a renewal request have ever been lowered by the County.

Mr. Talarek explained that FCCS had previously replaced a levy with a lower stated millage. The Committee has lowered the requests previously from both Children Services and ADAMH, when they asked for increases despite significant cash balances. With ADAMH there was uncertainty related to Medicaid expansion and the Affordable Care Act and that is why the last levy was for five years rather than for ten years. Also, Aging had to come back a second time with a request.

Ms. Handon wondered what the effect of reducing the millage from 3.1 to 3.0 would be. The Committee briefly discussed this before moving on to its recommendation.

HSLRC LEVY RECOMMENDATION

Ms. Handon asked if the Committee was ready for a motion on the levy recommendation.

Mr. Curtin noted that the recommendation should include some very supportive and positive language promoting prudent management to optimize making every federal dollar count and working to economize where possible. He also noted that FCCS deserves a pat on the back for its success within the recommendation for a renewal.

Mr. Bowman added that with a recommendation, they should look at the 1.9 mill levy in five years and increase it accordingly to bring the two levies closer together if needed.

Mr. Curtin agreed with the way they laid it out at that first meeting; there is prudence in the long term plan. This is a part of laying bricks towards that long term plan.

Ms. Handon asked if the Committee will we come back maybe in 24 months or so to take a look at where FCCS is at the mid-point.

Ms. Buske explained that there is a mid-levy review that the Committee implemented for this purpose. The next one scheduled would be ADAMH, sometime in the fall.

Ms. Handon clarified that there would also be a mid-levy review for Children Services.

Ms. Buske affirmed that there would be.

Mr. Hemphill asked if there was a motion to recommend a renewal of the existing 3.1 mill levy.

Ms. Handon made a motion that the Committee recommend a 3.1 mill renewal, which was seconded by Mr. Friedman. All members voted "Aye" and Mr. Hemphill said the motion carried.

HSLRC OPERATIONAL AND PROGRAMMATIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. Buske reminded the Committee that it had previously decided that it should recommend that FCCS implement more cost savings and efficiencies, particularly now that FCCS has begun spending some of its cash reserves. This was a recommendation in 2014 and FCCS did a good job in terms of increasing kinship care and increasing the use of alternative response but they did also add FTEs which did mitigate most of the cost savings that were achieved. FCCS did mention that they plan to try to limit congregate care further. Ms. Buske also noted that anticipated cost savings from moving onto the State IT network were not included in projections. There are also other opportunities in Personal Services, Fringe Benefits, and Materials and Services for additional cost savings.

Ms. Handon reiterated that Managed Board and Care has been used for 10 years but the agency had not provided a clear understanding of its impact or any information on whether or not there are other entities that could perform better. She would like to see a report card that demonstrates the return on investment. She wanted to see if managed care still makes sense 10 years later and wondered if staffing issues are as much of an issue for these entities.

Ms. Carter Ryan asked how children and families fare under managed care.

Ms. Buske noted that performance in-house appeared to be better.

Ms. Handon reaffirmed that a managed care assessment was something that the Committee should look at heading into a mid-levy review.

Mr. Friedman raised questions about the random assignment of children to Managed Board and Care, with twenty-six cases/month to one provider and thirty-four cases/month to the other provider. He questioned if the pool of people includes people with high needs and low needs; how the capitation rate is being set; and does it make sense based on need and based on whether or not lower need people could be handled more easily with in-house staff. He would like to see an evaluation with an individualized plan that determines and tracks indicators and demonstrates outcomes.

Ms. Handon promoted that another recommendation she would like to consider related to FCCS' use of community surveys. She would to see them do more consistent surveys from community members as well as their customers more frequently. She argued that FCCS needs more visibility in the community. Often people only hear about Children Services if there is a mess up on a case or for the yearly Santa Drive. There are missed opportunities to talk about the good services this agency provides.

Mr. Friedman stated that he believes that there should be an oversampling of people on the advisory board and the participation of system users. For someone out in the community who has had no contact with the agency, maybe they have heard good things, maybe bad things, and maybe they have not heard anything, but the people who actually have involvement need to be heard.

Mr. Curtin agreed that people who have been touched by the agency provide important feedback. With an agency like FCCS a broader survey will be collecting more non-opinion than opinion.

Ms. Buske noted that these concerns could be potentially be a part of the cost savings and efficiencies recommendation, but also as its own recommendation, the Committee would encourage FCCS to continue to be responsive to the changing needs to the community: making sure they are connected to the people they are serving, looking at whether or not services are achieving their goals, and whether or not there are other things being tried other places that might work here.

Ms. Handon speculated that kinship providers would be a rich source of data that could be sampled.

Mr. Friedman agreed that kinship data could be a powerful outreach tool in terms of encouraging people who wouldn't otherwise think of kinship to make their homes available. He recommended that some of these issues around user participation and sampling could be looked at more consistently across all the levy agencies and that standardization is important. He asked if OMB looks at performance data on a monthly basis or if OMB is only engaged during the budget process.

Ms. Buske explained that each agency has a Strategic Business Plan and that services are broken into programs. Children Services has a number of programs that include: Adoption Services, Child Assessment and Placement, Child Enrichment, Child Protection and Family Services, and Youth Transition Services. As a part of the process, FCCS has performance measures that are reported on each year. FCCS report measures either monthly, quarterly, or annually. She explained that first quarter data for 2019 is due soon and once it is submitted, she will review and analyze it, looking for trends and comparing it to prior data.

Mr. Friedman asked if the measures have targets.

Ms. Buske indicated that the measures do have targets and that some of the measures are the same as what FCCS reports for the CFSR (with the federally set targets). She highlighted that one of the measures tracks cases diverted to alternative response.

Ms. Buske explained that the data are submitted through the budget system. OMB has reporting deadlines and follows-up if data are missing or late. Agencies will sometimes change their measures.

Mr. Talarek further explained that for the second quarter, when agencies start developing their budgets for the following fiscal year, OMB asks for projections for 2019 data and estimates for 2020. While agencies are sometimes hesitant, he explains that measures should highlight success or identify problems that need to be fixed. He referred the Committee to the budget website to see measures tied to programs, with prior year's actuals as well as projections and estimates.

Mr. Talarek stated that OMB would be happy to share these reports with the Committee ahead of time. His opinion is always to encourage agencies to look at what they are already collecting for the federal government.

Mr. Friedman noted that he thinks it would be useful for the Committee to understand which measures are required versus which ones are developed for agency specific initiatives. The Committee has minimum impact in terms of what the federal government is requiring or what the Supreme Court is requiring, so that's information. From the Committee's perspective, the focus should be more programmatically and administratively, how are they handling the dollars and what are the outcomes that they are achieving. He stated he would be interesting is receiving this information, so that he could drill down as necessary. It would help the Committee make suggestions as to what might be meaningful to the community. It would be a helpful tool for analysis or for when there is an article about an agency in the newspaper.

Ms. Buske explained that it is a challenge with agencies when they are developing Strategic Business Plans and measures to make sure they see them as evolving documents. There is always a struggle with agencies to make sure they will report their successes but also be ready to explain why they have not performed as expected and to be able to illustrate that a problem might be an outlier based on consistently reported data.

Ms. Carter Ryan asked how this information is communicated to the Boards for the agencies that have Boards that are supposed to be challenging and guiding agencies.

Mr. Talarek explained that the Office on Aging is a Board of Commissioner agency so County Administration has more direct influence but that one of the Deputy Administrators works with the other agencies on a consistent basis.

Ms. Handon mentioned the impact of Fentanyl and the deaths in Ohio. It is a pervasive public health issue that requires the agency to look at its practice model as how to embrace the needs across the board for the parents, their caregivers, and the children impacted by addiction. While FCCS discussed working with community partners, FCCS will need to deliver services uniquely for that population, due to this issue.

Ms. Buske noted that some projections seem to indicate that the impact of the Opiate Crisis might be leveling off somewhat. This might explain the projected placement day decrease for 2019 and the flatter rate of increase from 2020-2024.

Ms. Handon informed the Committee that she is concerned based on what she has heard that the problem is getting worse not better.

Ms. Buske told the Committee that she attends the monthly Board meetings and detailed the information that she and the Board typically receives. She noted that lately the Board has been asking more questions requesting more detailed information on contracts, including: prior year rates, more information about vendors and whether they have been used in the past, what are other vendors who offer these services, etc.

Mr. Bowman asked how many people are on the Children Services Board and how members are appointed.

Ms. Buske stated that the Board has nine current members, but it is supposed to have eleven members. She explained that ten members are appointed by the Commissioners, and then one of them is the Chair of the Citizen Advisory Committee.

Ms. Buske walked the Committee through the draft report outline. She noted that the draft would be similar to previous reports but would include a section explaining the new law. There would be an overview of the agency, a description of services, and information about notable accomplishments including the increased use of kinship care and alternative response. The report would explain the Committee's recommendations.

Turning to the recommendations, Ms. Buske reminded the Committee that it had discussed cost savings and efficiencies as one recommendation and an analysis of Managed Board and Care that would include information from the consultant's report. She also mentioned that she and Mr. Talarek had discussed that a recommendation related to looking for opportunities to increase revenue would make sense as well.

Mr. Freeman announced that he connected Mr. Spinning and the Ohio College Medicine Government Resource Center at Ohio State. They plan to get together to explore if there are other Medicaid revenue opportunities. Mr. Friedman mentioned that he hoped this effort might yield something.

Mr. Curtin thanked Mr. Friedman for making that connection.

Mr. Freeman asked if the report could add a section on the review process that better explains the roles and responsibilities of the Committee. It would recognize that the Committee needs to respond to current information while it is the Board that is steering the ship operationally.

Ms. Buske agreed and stated that the report would mention that Committee has started holding mid-levy reviews.

Ms. Handon and Ms. Carter Ryan asked if the report would touch on how children are doing in the system and if FCCS providing enough services to the people that need them.

Ms. Handon also noted that many of the federal review statistics are not favorable.

Ms. Carter Ryan raised the concern that there are many children who may need some form of assistance that are not being reached by Children Services, through no fault of the agency.

Ms. Handon noted that the child welfare approach is often reactive and focuses on putting out fires.

Ms. Carter Ryan stressed the need to be proactive to deter children from having to enter the system.

Ms. Handon commended Children Services for the prevention services provided, but stated there is always room for improvement and ways to strengthen services.

Ms. Buske summarized the four recommendations that the Committee had discussed:

1. Identify and implement cost savings or efficiencies

2. Maximize existing and available revenue opportunities

3. Conduct an analysis of Managed Board and Care and present findings to the Committee

4. Engage in responsive community engagement that focuses on new services and new ways to conduct outreach

Mr. Hemphill asked if Ms. Buske had enough information on the recommendations.

Ms. Buske stated that she did and asked if anyone had any additional input.

Ms. Handon noted that the discussion did not touch the elephant in the room and that is the fact that the workforce is not stable.

Ms. Buske explained that the cost savings and efficiencies recommendation would touch on turnover to encourage the agency to review what seems to work and what can be improved upon or eliminated to stabilize the workforce without draining resources.

NEXT STEPS-OMB

Ms. Carter Ryan asked Ms. Buske when she will provide a draft report for the Committee to review.

Ms. Buske stated that she will send the draft no later than May 17, 2019. The next meeting will be on May 23, 2019, which is in three weeks. Ms. Buske informed the Committee that the next meeting agenda would focus on soliciting feedback on the draft and working to finalize the report so that it can be sent to the Board of Commissioners.

CLOSING REMARKS

The next HSLRC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 23, 2019 for further discussion related to the levy request.

Mr. Hemphill asked for a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Carter Ryan made a motion to adjourn the HSLRC meeting and Mr. Friedman seconded.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:34 pm.