



MINUTES

Oregon Child Foster Care Advisory Commission November 20, 2017

Members present:

- Katie Robertson
- Denise Loraditch
- Robin Donart
- Carolyn Cruz
- Emily Reiman
- Bill Wagner
- Tim Colahan
- Kari Reick
- Katherine Bartlett
- Gina Valerie Colas (phone)
- Denise Loraditch

Guests and staff:

- Kali Scolnick – Casey Foundation
- Stacey Obrecht – with Public Knowledge. Attending today to discuss report done in 2016 regarding Child Welfare
- Melissa Davis – with Public Knowledge. Independent reviewers that produced the 2016 report.
- Victoria Demchak
- Katherine Bartlett

Public Comment: None

Minutes: September minutes will be available for commission review at the January meeting.

Transitioning to full day meetings: As January 15 meeting currently falls on a holiday, Bill Wagner asks group to reschedule the meeting for January 22nd, 2018. Group agrees.

Bill Wagner and Emily Reiman suggest transitioning to full day meetings to allow time for the sub-committee meetings. Time suggested is 9:00-4:00. Group agrees.

Speaker/Discussion and Q&A: Fariborz Pakseresht, Director, Department of Human Services discussed his aims for DHS as a new director. Expressed how he wants to balance accountability

and empowerment so that staff are comfortable making decisions and feel supported in making decision.

Foster care and foster parenting is a key part of what we are doing. That will be part of the rebuilding process within CW with Marilyn Jones.

Q: If you could do one thing to change the culture of the organization (DHS), what would be that one thing?

Director Pakseresht: Unfortunately, I don't think there is just one thing. It begins with listening to feedback. If we want to make a change, we need to be able to explain why we are trying to make that change. How will it impact the people we are asking to help us? What does it actually mean within the work environment? Would we be able to give them the tools, resources and training that they need to do the job differently? Most importantly, are we as the leadership of the organization willing to demonstrate and model those core values in that emerging culture? Basically, walking the talk. If you can put those elements in place, and are clear about where we are going, why we are going there and how we are going to get there, along with some of the other elements that I talked about, I think we can begin to move the organization.

I am clear in my own mind that changing culture takes time. Realistically, in public sector organizations, culture change is a 5-7 year proposition. That doesn't mean that you can't see changes next month. Change begins to occur incrementally. It is about winning the hearts and minds of those who do the work. Five to seven years is a long time, but we are really talking about bringing a different mindset in the way that we do the work.

Our culture change model at Oregon Youth Authority, which we are trying to incorporate into this new environment, begins with safety. **Safety for the people who work in the organization and safety for those who we serve.** That is even relevant to those of us who are sitting around this table. If you didn't feel safe, we couldn't actually have this conversation.

What we build on the first layer of safety is **caring and supportive relationships.** For staff, and for those who we serve. Meaning our people who work for us and the children we serve need to know that we actually care about them, and the relationship is authentic.

The next layer in the building of the culture is **high expectations and accountability.** Meaning, I am the first and foremost to be accountable in this organization and that accountability extends through the leadership rank of this organization to that front line person that does the work. We should also keep our providers accountable, our foster parents accountable, our children accountable. Accountability also comes with empowerment and high expectations.

The next layer in building the culture is **meaningful participation.** Meaning, as an employee of this organization I am actually going to participate in a meaningful way to create that emerging culture. I am going to be engaged in my work environment. If I am a youth in this organization, I am engaged in my own future and am participating in creating my future path. If I am being served in Aging and People with Disabilities, I actually have a say in what my future is going to look like.

Ultimately, at the top of this pyramid is **community connection**. Meaning, we cannot do this work by ourselves. It takes a community to help the children that we have in the foster care system or the child welfare system. It take a community to keep the seniors that we help safe, and give them the elements that they need to be independent and making decisions for their future.

We call this positive human development at the Oregon Youth Authority. We will probably call it something else in DHS, but the elements are the same. So that is the culture change part of this strategy as we move forward.

Q: I didn't hear you say anything about bio-families in the culture change. There is a huge divide between the foster family and the bio family. DHS is like the rest of us and don't think very highly of these low income bio families. I didn't hear you mention that we are going to include them in this culture change and support them. If we leave them out of this, we're never going to change anything.

Director Pakseresht: That is why we need your perspective at the table. I don't have the understanding that you do. I don't know the intricacies that exist within the system. That is why I needed a child welfare director who has that understanding. What we are going to try to do as we move forward, is that we are going to make decision based on the best interest of the child. And decisions that actually would allow that child to prosper in the future and have the healthiest development possible. Be it in a family that is not rich or, as you put it, is poor. The other part of DHS is self-sufficiency. A large percentage of the kids and families that are in the child welfare system also are receiving assistance from our self-sufficiency program. It's not that, just because you don't have enough income we are going to write you off. Perhaps that has been the practice in some instances, but clearly, that is not how we think, that's not how Marilyn thinks. One of the things that she is going to be doing (also mentioned in the Public Knowledge Report), is we have a whole lot of data in DHS, but we are not utilizing and leveraging that data in a way that can contribute to the best decision for that child and that family. We are going to start doing that. In fact, a research agenda has already been developed for child welfare. When we approach things from that perspective, then we aren't going to make philosophical decisions based i.e. every child has to go to their family of origin, or that every child has to be pulled out of a home that doesn't have enough resources. We will look at every individual situation and make the best decision. That best decision will informed by your commission as well. Especially as relates to the Tribes. We have a Tribal liaison, but we are still trying to figure out what the best environment is, not only for the Tribal kids, but for other diverse populations. As far as what is the value of ethnic diversity as it relates to foster homes. We have work to do and we can't do that without your help.

Comment: A key piece of that culture change is training. Training at the caseworker level, at the CPS worker level in terms of value judgments and leaving behind your personal thoughts and values on what it should look like in this home . . .

Comment: . . . or what is safe. We have these 22 year old social workers that have never been in a not-affluent home. So you are making criticisms on a population that you have never even dealt with.

Comment: I know there has been a huge redesign in terms of the training. I think it is an empathy piece, it's a cultural diversity piece. All of that needs to be layered into the training that the caseworkers or people at the very ground level that are coming into the homes are going to be [inaudible].

Comment: Appreciate you (Director Pakseresht) stepping in. I know that you come with an excellent reputation and it is exciting to hear what you say about moving forward. The one thing echoes along the same line . . . when you were talking, I didn't hear a lot about working with legal parties or service providers in how to build those relationships. I am curious how to take that and encourage that behavior locally as well as all the way up and do it with a focus. There are a lot of different committees that I don't think are tied anywhere into one unit and there are subcommittees. Unifying the pieces first, to try and figure out what the game plan is.

Director Pakseresht: Appreciate those comments. As Marilyn will share with you, she is also facing the same dilemma. There are so many committees that are telling us what to do that you are wondering which direction to go. One of her main challenges is to bring these all together and have a unified movement. We have a unified plan that focuses on safety, and there are more things that we need to consider to bringing into one direction that we are all going to move forward with.

We have a lot of work to do with CASA as a partner. This whole concept of legal representation . . . I know there is some controversy around that. But we will move forward if we are open to working together, and the best interest of the child is at the center, and we can overcome some of these tribulations. . . personalities, policies and red tape that gets in our way. Frankly, we will begin to see this organization move. The greatest asset we have in child welfare is our people. I do agree that there are younger caseworkers. Some are really good. Some of them just don't have the experience. There are many people in this organization who are willing to step up and help if they see that the organization is serious about change and that you are actually going to support them. In this system, in this model, generally in public sector – I'm being very transparent about this, those people who really do good work, get assigned more work. So part of changing the culture is also that. I am being very open with you. There are numerous instances when you go to dismissal and there is nothing in the file about anything that they have done wrong. Management is responsible for these practices. We can't blame the caseworkers because management, and ultimately I am responsible as Director of this agency. It might take some time to get to where we want to go, but it begins with clearly communicating expectations around empowering that caseworker in court, or working with CASA to deliver the value of the organization. At the end of the day, I don't think we are misaligned with you (CASA) or any other provider or stakeholder out there about the best interest of the child. Easy to talk about, a little harder to get there.

Comment: I didn't mean to make this about CASA. I am in no way saying that there's not collaborative work going on, because there is at the local levels [inaudible] state levels. I just

want to encourage that all the way down and some of the work coming from the ground up vs. top down.

Q: We are a new commission and we are trying to figure out what our scope is and what our [inaudible] moving forward. We've had a lot of conversations about do we focus on things that seem like the most urgent priority, or do we focus on things where we think we can have the most impact? Do we focus on things where nobody else is [inaudible]? If the two of you (Pakseresht and Jones) were sitting on this commission as external partners, what would be the first thing you would want to focus on?

Director Pakseresht: What I would ask is what is it that we want to accomplish? What is the first intended outcome? I'd also be very cogniscent of the fact that somehow we need to involve all those people who are doing the work. Whatever this commission or any other body comes up with is going to have to get implemented. We have had numerous [inaudible] commissions and other commissions that have put a lot of effort into things like this, to the extent that they are not implemented because they are [inaudible]. Implementation takes place through the organization. If I was sitting on this commission, I would connect the organization to the work that we are doing . . . that is not all of your work. We have to help with that. Don't want to think that these guys (commissions and other stakeholders) are making our life really hard, and we know what we are doing and they are just interfering with us. We need to see that you are actually adding value to the work that we do. I can commit to you that both of us (Pakseresht and Jones) will partner with you and will carry that message to the extent that we can see when you are clear with us as to what you want us to accomplish, we will deliver for you.

Speaker/Discussion and Q&A: Marilyn Jones, Director of Child Welfare, Department of Human Services

Bill Wagner addressing Marilyn Jones: Emily left you with a good question I guess if you want to address it first or last.

Director Jones: What happens a lot of times is a committee comes up with a really good idea, and they want us to fix it, but what we haven't done is talk to the people who are doing the work. We want to move the dial. This is not about what we did 20 or 40 years ago or yesterday, this is a complete culture shift. That culture shift means that we have to be completely transparent. When this committee has something they want to do, but they aren't sure how to go about it, then have that conversation with us and let us help move that bar. We are the ones that are going to help you implement it.

You asked about training and how important that is. I couldn't agree more, but when we talk about training . . . this last two years has been devastating for staff in the field. They felt like they were unsupported, like they had no value, that they were overworked and expected to do things. A lot of times people will call and you say you are too busy – out in the field you can't say that. When you get a call on a child, it doesn't matter if already had five that day, you can't say I'm sorry I'm too busy. You have to go. Knowing that and how understaffed they were just from turnover . . . it takes about a year to a year and a half to get a caseworker up and running. As we lost our really good staff, they felt less and less valued. For me to be able to go in and say you

need training . . . they're going when? Yes, I would love training but I don't have time for it. We lost a lot of traction for training. People would say wouldn't training be great? I would say it would be great, but we still have to get the caseloads under control, and we have to start valuing our staff. There are a lot of layers coming, but I would say partner up with us. Give us a chance to see if we can move the dial with you. When you have something you want to move, let us know and let us implement it.

When I arrived, I heard about the Public Knowledge Report, the Secretary of State Child Welfare Audit. We had the Unified Plan, the Children and Family Safety Review's (CFSRs), the projects, the PIP . . . everybody was [inaudible] and going out to staff. I finally said we have to stop. We need one voice. One voice and one direction, so we created the Child Welfare Action Plan. This is almost completed. It is about what Fariborz talked about – child safety, child and family safety and well-being (it has to be about the family), system alignment, service and intervention effectiveness and community engagement. We took all of those reports and put it into one report. When our child welfare people and any chair can say here are the goals. It would say here that this is what our researchers are doing to fill the gaps in every single one of those reports. We have the Unified Plan and what their tasks are and where they fall underneath. We are then going to move forward and do the fundamental map. The fundamental map will say what our goal is and what we want for our outcome and how do we get there? If I'm a caseworker, and I know this is the goal and this is how I am going to move the dial for the federal government, state government and central office and for staff, then I can follow a, b, c, d.& e, and that's how I'm going to that outcome. It is basic, but it helps break things down. We won't have 6-7 plans. We will have one plan that they can speak to anywhere they go. It tells about goals and outcomes, it tells about the reports, but it is not confusing. We are doing one forum now. We aren't going to go out and have 20 forums. We are bringing everybody and having tables so you can go to whatever table you find and you can rotate. You can move from one table to the next and ask people questions. We'll be able to get the feedback from the community, the CASAs, the Judges and DAs in that area, the community members who work with us, our DV advocates. Anybody that's in that forum, we'll be able to talk to and get their ideas about where they feel like we need to move the dial. It is not going to be top down anymore, it's going to be bottom up.

Director Jones: Presents her background and experience to the group.

As Faiborz said, if we don't have system alignment and community engagement, we won't ever have child safety. We have to have all of those pieces together, and we need our community partners at the table 100%. If we want kids to stay in places with their families, then let's wrap services around those families so those children can stay home and do well when it is appropriate.

I am here today hoping that I can be a partner with this council and be able to work with you to make changes. If you have something you want to do, let us know and let us be part of the conversation.

Q: When that (the Child Welfare Action Plan) is complete, can we get copies?

Director Jones: Yes. It is almost complete.

Q: Beyond just sending it out when you are ready, I think we should have you or your staff here to go over that plan in detail at one of our morning meetings we are going to start having in January. If you can let us know, Katherine would be even better, when that is ready we can be your guinea pigs.

Q: You did your work in [inaudible] County?

Director Jones: I did my work in Baker, Union and Wallowa Counties.

Q: Once you start working on your new plan, do you believe this (member is holding up a document) will change? (Bill Wagner clarifies that the question pertains to an existing organizational chart.) Referring to the chart, in the context of prevention implementation, member asks: Once you get your plan, get the plans together, do you see maybe there might be some reorganizing in terms of . . .

Director Jones: . . . It is going to be pretty fluid at this point as we move forward. I'm still trying to meet with staff that I have. To be doubly transparent with you, we are meeting for the first time tomorrow to talk about our leadership and what we are going to look like. But absolutely, as we start to look at what type of resources we need and what does that look like, it (the org chart) might shift. The most important piece is that central office, along with the legislature, and the staff, all have to work in conjunction together for the betterment of the child. If that means prevention work, self-sufficiency is huge for us. Being able to bring self-sufficiency in to help with those supports for those families so that we don't have to remove those children while they are getting treatment and while [inaudible] services.

Comment: Part of the transformation of the Oregon Health Authority with their new health system which is totally confusing if anyone had an opportunity to see how things were dismantled to create something that is supposed to be better. I'm not sure that, now that they are in this zone in my opinion we aren't doing what we used to do. We're not quite there to do what I think they want to do, so were in this kind of like zone.

Director Jones: You mean in providing services for families?

Comment: Yes. So one of the things is the fact that we devoted more than a year of planning for this new behavioral health collaborative. It seem strange that we are still working in isolation. Especially when we split DHS with Oregon Health Authority, and now there seems to be an even bigger divide. Whereas, you keep saying it is supposed to be operating more as one so we all know what our vision is collectively so we can move forward. When the right hand doesn't know what the left is doing, I think we create the chaos that has been continuing over the years. With my Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, one of the things that seemed to have worked in the past with the family unity model . . . I think the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde is still doing the unity model . . . we are returning back to that which is the wrap-around services and bringing the services to the family, to the individual, and if that child is at the development stage to make decisions for themselves, that they should be part of their plan. Instead of them going to 10 different places, we should bring all the services together and work

with that family so they all understand what each one of their roles are. Then, that family doesn't have the added stress of going to [inaudible].

Director Jones: I think that is something that we have done extremely well in the last year. We have a lot of ground to go, but I have watched it work where self-sufficiency is going out with child welfare and creating one plan and one voice. As we as an agency continue to build and strengthen that prevention piece, along with the child welfare piece.

Comment: What I hear you and Fariborz saying is to stop the reactionary mode and trying to figure out where all of the different issues are, and delve down to see what the root cause really is. What is it that is causing the disruptions and the chaos within the system? But, rather focus specifically on what we can do to build a solid foundation. Right now, honestly, child welfare is a house of cards. If somebody blows on it, it is going to fall apart. Build that foundation then build the solid walls and the structure that is needed to best serve the children and the families, and going back to preventative, and how do we work together completely collaborative. We have all of these reports, and when we compiled that, when there is issues, what's the process to actually go and look at what the root cause is, vs. . . . [inaudible].

Director Jones: As an agency, we are reactive, not proactive. I implemented that supervisors would sit down with each case worker one hour a week, and confer with them on each case so that you are intimate with the caseload that they are carrying. That way, your caseworker feels better because they know that someone is looking at it in case they are missing something, they have that support. Example of changing the culture.

Q: The PK report did a great job of bringing together a whole bunch of other reports and information and what needs to be done to fix the system, and was able to highlight improvements that would bring Oregon up to National standards in areas that were far down. The point that they make, and I really appreciate, is that all of this to change the system, a lot of it is going to cost money. When you talk to Duane Stark [inaudible] and Governor Brown, did the subject of money to fix the system come up? Because, that is going to be a big hurdle. Did it come up, and are you optimistic? Pessimistic? Be transparent. Be honest with us.

Director Jones: I am incredibly optimistic. Did we talk dollars? No. We talked about need. We talked about if you want lower caseloads that there is only one way to get lower caseloads. If you want to have face-to-faces where people go out and they actually have quality face-to-face, then you have to have that time. We created a great [inaudible] system that now takes about 70% of the caseworker's time vs. letting them do the social work they need to do. We put these things in and we make demands, but what we don't realize is, what is it taking away? One thing that you give takes away from another. I do feel optimistic. We were well invested in this last biennium. We have 50 star positions that are being hired right now. There are trainers & educators. They will work with our consultants who will be out there to support our staff. These are our best and brightest that will be taking these positions. I have authorized that they can hire 50 positions at the same time to replace because these are internal. I know nobody likes to hear this but we will do double fills on those. That way we won't have to wait for the two month process of hiring. It might be more money. Looking at things we can do that are new and innovative that will help us deal with the money situation as well as not just taking away positions. There are ways that we

can work together as a team to make our effort better without saying everything you want us to do is going to cost money. I think there is a lot of things we can look at.

Director Jones reports out about SB 5526 and our \$750,000 that CW received from general fund appropriation. The report will be available January 1st.

Working Lunch and Discussion of Sub-Committee Structure

Emily Reiman: Purpose of forming sub-committees is to break down the work of the Commission. The Commission currently meets every other month. Don't believe that is enough time to accomplish the work of the Commission within the timelines. Hoping smaller sub-committees will be able to meet more frequently, and report their work back to the full Commission for adoption. Discusses how the Chairs committee met and broke down the subject areas for the sub-committees into three areas:

1. Placement and provider issues.
2. System Coordination
3. Judicial System

No expectation that these will be the permanent sub-committees. They can exist for the next year, then we can re-evaluate and shift course if needed.

Each sub-committee is to have their own charter or mission that should include the themes:

- Child Safety, wellbeing, trauma informed care
- Compliance with the 4080 requirements for the Commission
- Equity and Inclusion
- Youth Advocacy
- System Integration
- Permanency

Recommend: Chairs of the sub-committees join Bill and Emily for a "co-chairs" committee, responsible for setting the agendas for the Commission, and aligning the work of the sub-committees.

Recommend: Extending the length of the Commission meeting, allowing the sub-committees to meet in the afternoon, and the chairs of those sub-committees to meet at the end of the day.

Recommended structure of sub-committees:

- Two members of the full Commission sit on each sub-committee
- Total of five voting members on each sub-committee
- Minimum of three commission members
- Two outside voting members, and two additional outside non-voting members

Question about public meeting law regarding the sub-committees. Bartlett will send the group the public meeting laws/rules for review.

Proposed Sub-Committee Structure:

1. Placement and Provider
 - a. Robin Donart – Chair
 - b. Denise Loraditch
 - c. Katie Robertson
2. System Coordination
 - a. Kari Rieck – Chair
 - b. Carolyn Cruz
 - c. Emily Reiman
3. Judicial System
 - a. Valarie Colas – Chair
 - b. Timothy Colahan
 - c. Lluvia Merello
 - d. Bill Wagner
4. Chairs/Exec
 - a. Robin Donart
 - b. Kari Rieck
 - c. Valerie Colas
 - d. Bill Wagner
 - e. Emily Reiman

Next Steps:

- Better defining the scope and charters of the sub-committees
- Identifying potential subject matter experts
- Clarifying if the committee wants to convene before the Jan. 22, 2018 Commission meeting

Recommend: Each sub-committee meet before the January meeting, and have a draft version on scope and recommendations for other membership.

Recommendations to the Commission:

1. The three sub-committees listed on the white board (listed above)
2. The co-chairs committee that results from the creation of those three sub-committees
3. The external membership to include up to two additional voting members and two non-voting members
4. Extend Commission meetings to be full day so sub-committees can meet directly following the Commission meetings
5. The three recommended sub-committee chairs (Robin, Kari, Valerie)

Donart: Moved

Colahan: Seconded

In favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstain: None

Passed

Public Knowledge Presentation and Q&A: Melissa Davis and Stacey Obrecht

Discussion of the Child Safety and Substitute Care Independent Review, and how it was implemented.

Review focused on children and youth currently or formerly in custody of DHS child welfare, with emphasis on safety.

Q: Do you have an ongoing role with the State regarding follow-up or evaluation of changes or efforts resulting from the review?

A: No, not in any formal capacity.

Q: Unified Safety Plan is a result of the report. Are they on the right track in your estimation?

A: We are not in a position to really know, so unable to comment.

Q: If the cultural change is essential, and the legislature created this commission to look at the whole system, it seems that one of our jobs should be to look at getting the culture changed. How would we measure that as a Commission? It's OK to say "Well, you should hire some consultants." One of the things we're going to talk about is what our mission is going forward and what it takes to accomplish that mission. If you were to advise us on how we monitor as the culture changed. Next I'm going to ask you about some other pieces of that culture.

A: I don't think it is just the culture at DHS. It is the culture of the whole system. That makes it more challenging. It is not all for DHS to own. It's been created over decades by the whole system. A lot of that has to do with things you all brought up this morning. Some of that is national policy that drives those things, and some of it is the culture of the agency. As Fariborz said, it requires winning the hearts and minds of the people within the system and agency. You measure that by continually going back to then and keep asking. That is where you will start to see it.

In terms of measurement is to identify the things in terms of what you want to see changed and set up a system to be able to go back and see if anything has changed. A great way to measure is to go back and ask the same people the same questions at intervals and see if anything has changed.

Q: Is there data to measure the culture change?

A: I think it is about asking the people who are experiencing it. There is quantitative and qualitative data. The qualitative data is about the experiences and perceptions of the people in the system. Quantitative data would be for things like seeing faster responses to abuse.

Comment: Concern about constantly changing the standard. We can't measure until you have stable standards to measure. Need a solid foundation to build off of.

Q: Was there any conversation regarding juvenile records and the safety of a child in a foster placement?

A: We spent a lot of time on the certification exception issues of foster providers. You can't over apply or under apply those exceptions.

Q: DHS came up with Differential Response. Did you have a chance to see if they were able to do that?

A: That was happening at the same time we did the review. From a national perspective Differential Response is a great thing if implemented well.

Q: Do we recommend that this be reviewed annually, quarterly?

Q: What are the measures we need to measure in the future? That is something that we could make a recommendation on.

Q: Do you know if anyone has mapped policy barriers and at what level they occur? Federal, State, local.

A: We didn't find any deal breakers in your laws or policies that effected any of the recommendations we had in our report.

Q: If you were governor, and we were your commission, what would you ask us to focus on?

A: Prioritize and narrow your focus. Partner with DHS as much as you can. The division between DHS and the rest of the system is happening because of commissions that are set up like this one to not include DHS. It means that changes will be slower. Think about things that this group can drive that don't have to be driven by DHS. What I would say you don't do is try to change the culture of DHS because that needs to be driven within that agency and that leadership. Look at things within the system that you can influence.

Comment: Does it make more sense to align the sub-committees to focus in on what are the things the Commission is focused on? The way the legislation is written, there are so many things. If we are putting things out to sub-committees, and they are focusing on their things, then we are spread thin. How do we bring that back into focus?

Q: In that regard, it seems to me that DHS is doing a pretty good job of trying to fix major things. For us perhaps we just keep our eyes on those things. But maybe we focus on what wasn't touched on, and be a partner with them. Are we monitors of their process or not? Is that an appropriate role? Would it be appropriate for this group to get a PK report on the issue of permanency vs. safety?

A: None of these recommendations can be solved just by DHS. They can't do it alone.

Q: Are the three sub-committees a good start? Do you believe that this matches with the PK? Are we off base here by starting with those three?

A: I don't think we can answer that because your scope is larger than what ours was. I don't think you are off base. Those are all critical areas and they all intersect with things in our review. I like the idea of trying to unify them toward a singular purpose for this Commission.

Comment: The sub-committees intent was to gather the information and syphon it through and take it back to the Commission and decide the next steps. This is a funnel for our work but we don't know what our work is yet.

Q: Are you planning on defining your singular purpose through doing work first then defining or planning to define the purpose and letting the sub-committees support that?

A: Both

Suggestion: Invite the disenfranchised people we work with to come and speak with us. Would like to see it be mandatory. We have to have the disenfranchised input before we put a recommendation forward.

Q: At the end of your report you identify a number of stakeholders and data sources. Is it important that we reach out and try to access some of that information?

A: I doubt that their information would be much different than what we got.

Bill: Meeting adjourned