



**Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD)  
Oversight Committee (OC)  
August 27, 2009  
11:45-12:15 networking lunch  
12:15 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.  
King County Chinook Building Room 123  
Meeting Notes**

---

**Members:**

Bill Block, Kelli Carroll, designee for Councilmember Bob Ferguson, Mervyn Chambers, designee for Norman Johnson, Mike Creighton, Nancy Dow-Witherbee, Dr. David Fleming, Jaime Garcia, Betsy Guerra, designee for Marilyn Littlejohn, Judge Helen Halpert, Zandrea Hardison, Shirley Havenga, V. David Hocraffer, Mike Heinisch, Darcy Jaffe, Bruce Knutson, Judge Barbara Linde, Terry Mark, designee for Jackie MacLean, Barbara Miner, Karen Murray, designee for Donald Madsen, Mario Paredes, Sheriff Susan Rahr, Dan Satterberg, Crystal Tetrick, Dwight Thompson, Ward Urion, designee for Merrill Cousin, Kathy Van Olst

**Other Attendees:**

Bryan Baird, Jason Beauchere, Jessie Benet, Trish Blanchard, John Bruels, Krista Camenzind, Kathy Crane, Tricia Crozier, Anne Daly, Stacey Devenney, Roopali Dhingra, Elisa Elliott, Melissa Fisher, Beth Goldberg, Becky Guerra, Betsy Jones, Karen Kent, Lisa Kimmerly, Amy King, Andrea LaFazia, Sarah Lapp, Anne Lee, AJ McClure, Alex O'Reilly, Eleanor Owen, Alessandra Pollack, Amnon Shoenfeld, Lois Smith, Joyce Stahn-Mardock, Faith Richie, David Roberson, David Stone, Mary Taylor, Patrick Tippy, Greg Trollan, Thomas Walton, JoEllen Watson, Mark Wirschem, Cindy West

---

**1. Welcome and Introductions, Co-Chairs Havenga & Rahr~**

Co-Chair Havenga called the meeting to order, welcoming the committee and introductions were made by each person in attendance. She also explained to the group the new policy regarding those who wish to speak during the public comment segment. The new policy taking effect at this meeting requires speakers to sign in on the public comment sign in sheet, then be called upon later by the OC co-chairs.

**2. Approval of the Meeting Notes from the July 23, 2009 Meeting, Co-Chairs Havenga & Rahr~**  
Minutes were approved as revised by consensus.

**3. Executive's 2010 MIDD Budget Update, Kurt Triplett, King County Executive~**  
The Executive introduced Pam Bissonnette, Assistant County Executive.

The Executive addressed the OC with an overview of his budget proposal and pledged to give as much detail about it as he can, as information comes in. He reminded the OC that even though he is still a month away from his budget transmittal, he is trying to ensure everyone understands exactly what he is about to propose.

He began with the County's extraordinary fiscal crisis: facing a \$56.4 million deficit in 2010, and an additional \$60 million deficit in 2011 that urgently needs to be addressed. He went to legislative session this year seeking revenue tools: utility tax, dedicated public health fund, either one would have

helped dramatically and would have made the need to use the MIDD funds a lot less, but the county didn't get those tools.

What King County did get, which is extremely helpful, was some flexibility in the mental health fund. The good news is that the County is allowed up to 50% supplantation, but Executive Triplett is proposing the use of just 30% supplantation for two reasons:

- a. First, he wants to see the MIDD plan implemented. His goal, along with the Department of Community and Human Services, was to try to delay, defer and not cut to keep the integrity of the plan because it's a necessary plan and needs to keep running.
- b. Instead of having to make automatic cuts year after year, Executive Triplett is proposing a 30% supplantation to create stability for the County and create certainty with the MIDD.

Another thing he pointed out was that the County needs to remain consistent with the legal use of the funds. He also recognized there was an extraordinary prioritization process. He said that he appreciated the process very much, he listened to it and evaluated it, but admitted he made the decision himself to not fully abide by it. He said he listened to all sides, discovered the energy around the process, a lot of good programs that seemed to be in conflict with each other and he said that he alone made the decision to give funds to everybody rather than cut programs.

The last he added was that he eliminated the new strategies process which was the only way to preserve much of the MIDD plan itself.

The Executive took time to thank Amnon Shoenfeld, Beth Goldberg, Jackie MacLean, and Terry Mark.

#### Member comments:

**Darcy Jaffe:** Can you share with us where you're planning to use the supplementation money?

**Executive Triplett:** We don't have that sheet completely finished yet, so we've freed up about \$13 million. The primary categories, won't surprise anybody, were to completely sustain mental health court, drug court, prosecutor services and services associated with that and use some of it to replace lost state funding and use some of it to preserve some services in Public Health. The budget will be transmitted on Sunday, September 27.

**Mike Heinisch:** When you were trimming, did you also try to balance across the various types of services based on demographics, youth, adults, older adults, DV survivors, and sexual assault survivors?

**Executive Triplett:** I'll admit we didn't have a detailed conversation about that and wish we had the opportunity to talk about that. The group that's hit the hardest is youth services. So we didn't have a detailed discussion of impact on everybody and that's kind of why I tried to hit everybody a little bit rather than eliminate strategies.

**Dwight Thompson:** On the positive side, first of all. The workgroup: issue was to prevent strategies from being cut. So this proposal (although doesn't agree with all of it) is essentially in line with the prioritization.

Secondly looking at your delays, they are still consistent with the policies. It's very hard for us to separate these types of cuts from the budget and policy.

**Bruce Knutson:** We were very engaged in the whole process and I really appreciated your comments about how you really believed in MIDD and all the good work that we had to do to come up with these great strategies – which include you and I just wanted to mention that. These strategies are all excellent and will all make a great difference in the lives of the kids that we serve. I guess my question is, what do you think our chances are in the future of getting the taxing authority that we need? It's pretty frustrating for me to see that we had to turn to MIDD to help, and I fully understand doing it, when I really wish we would have been successful in getting the legislature to give us the taxing authority we need.

**Executive Triplett:** I don't know, I'm optimistic. Last year, before the session, I met with 33 King County legislators, state reps and senators. I essentially walked them through the financial challenge that's facing the County. Those talks went very well and we actually kept a utility tax alive all the way

to about the last four days of session. They actually had the votes for the utility tax in the House. There were leadership discussions back and forth in the final days and we couldn't quite get there in the Senate. The reason we couldn't get there in the Senate was unfortunately the revenue tool package we had, had a car tab added to it. Not one we sought, although we would have taken it. But, we didn't ask for it to get put on and that cost us the votes in the Senate and there was a back and forth between the House and the Senate about the car tab that was completely separate from the issue that we took. The House insisted on the car tab, the car tab went through, the car tab got adopted, then the car tab got vetoed so essentially we lost a revenue tool and didn't get the other one. If the state's budget hadn't continued to deteriorate, is I would say I'd be really optimistic to get the utility taxes. I still think there's a fighting chance for it, I really do. Then if not that, I think there'd be a Public Health tax. Also, there is still a one-tenth of one percent sales tax that could be levied that could help Criminal Justice and Human Services and Public Health. There's a chance to go to the ballot as well. So I think there are a couple tools people have between the session. I'll be honest, I don't know how the next Executive is going to balance the budget, I really don't. I've done everything I can to make pretty tough choices and at least help set that stage, preserving the public safety system, preserving the Public Health system making some pretty difficult decisions.

**Dan Satterberg:** I just wanted to follow up with Dwight's positive observation. I think this is really good work, I think this is really responsible. You can't go down and ask for a supplantation rule and not use it. I'm a glass half full, this glass is half full and I know a lot of people are somber about the money, but remember 2 years ago we didn't have a penny. So we have even after supplantation rule, what \$30 million or so of new money that can go and provide new services and I think that puts it in perspective.

**Mario Paredes:** Thanked the Executive for recognizing the importance of community mental health and substance abuse treatment and for not reducing those strategies.

**Joyce—NAMI member: (Directed toward the OC)** Is King County going to be able to sustain any level of decent employment services in this environment.

**Amnon Shoefeld:** I can speak to part of that. The strategy that you're referring to: Strategy 2b, employment services is for both CD & MH programs. The great majority of that reduction is for CD providers. Basically we weren't quite ready to implement. There were a number of issues we had resolve order to get the money out to CD providers and we weren't there yet. In line with the general strategy of delaying things that haven't started yet rather than cutting things that already started, that's where we delayed. The funding for MH employment services will be maintained.

**Joyce:** Thank you.

**Zandrea Hardison:** I just had a question about the delays. So for the programs that have been delayed, will that just be taken up at the next legislative session?

**Executive Triplett:** So going back to what I was trying to do which was trying to preserve the integrity of the plan. Because of the way the legislature itself acted, money will keep flowing back to the plan over time. I tried to hit the straight 30%, but at the end of the third year, it goes down to 20%, then to 10%. My hope, again is if we get a new revenue tool. My intent is that it really is a deferral or delay.

**Sheriff Rahr:** Kurt, thank you very much for coming. I think it's real helpful for people to have direct access to the decision maker in the proposed budget. I really appreciate you coming.

**Executive Triplett:** As always, I let folks know, if you have questions beyond this, sometimes it's hard to ask them in a big meeting. Feel free to email me, talk to Beth, talk to Pam. I'm happy to follow up with folks. Again, thank you so much for all your work leading up to this and your support throughout this process.

To read Executive Triplett's letter and MIDD Spending Plan he previously sent to the OC, click here. <http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/MHSA/MIDDPlan/MIDDCommittees.aspx>

#### 4. MIDD Project Staff Report, *Andrea LaFazia*

Andrea mentioned the tentative schedule of meeting dates and locations for the remainder of 2009 and all of 2010. Those meeting dates are as follows:

**King County Chinook Building  
401 Fifth Avenue  
11:45-12:15 networking lunch  
12:15 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.**

#### **2009 Meeting Dates and Locations**

August 27, 2009	Room 123
October 1, 2009	Room 121
October 22, 2009	Room 123
November 19, 2009	Room 123
December 17, 2009	Room 123

#### **2010 Meeting Dates**

All meetings listed below are scheduled to take place in Room 123

January 28, 2010  
February 25, 2010  
March 25, 2010  
April 22, 2010  
May 27, 2010  
June 24, 2010  
July 22, 2010  
August 26, 2010  
September 23, 2010  
October 28, 2010  
November 18, 2010

Friday, December 17, 2010

~or~

Thursday, December 23, 2010

Also included for OC members were new Designee and In-Writing forms. Members were encouraged to send a designee to represent them in the event they are not able to attend the scheduled meetings and to please notify Andrea LaFazia or Bryan Baird of the alternate, even if it is last minute.

The In-Writing voting form should be used should there be an agenda item where we will have a roll call vote to allow all members to voice their vote in the event that they're not able to attend.

Andrea made reference to a handful of members terms expiring. The process is currently underway for those members being re-confirmed or new member being confirmed. The way those terms were initially developed on a staggered timeline of 1 year, 2 year, 3 year and 4 year terms. Every June, the OC will be going through renewal with a new or re-confirmation process. That is a process where the Executive appoints the member with the full Council confirming. Dwight Thompson went before Council this week on his appointment to the OC. Zandra Hardison is due up next month.

#### 5. **Prioritization Workgroup Recap, *Amnon Shoenfeld***

After reviewing minutes of previous meetings, Amnon found that it was at the January 22, 2009 meeting, Beth Goldberg and Kurt Triplett gave a report on the declining sales tax revenues for the MIDD. At that point, several members in that meeting expressed concern that if we don't have enough funds to support all these programs and we should be thinking about that now in case we have to make some cuts. That was when the Prioritization workgroup was established. The workgroup first met on February 6, talked

about our goal for this task, set out policy goals and the overarching criteria to be used and established in the prioritization tool. Staff was given the task by the workgroup to go and develop a tool that we could discuss. Staff came back two weeks later with the draft process that was changed quite a bit and went back with the final tool, where the Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD) management team had spent an entire day using the tool to develop 'draft scores' for all 37 strategies to test that tool. Staff brought the results back to the workgroup, where a lot of concerns arose questioning whether MHCADSD management had enough information to be making the rating decisions they made. MHCADSD management and strategy leads were then tasked to rate themselves. The rating tool was then sent out to everyone to solicit much more information so that staff would have that available. With that information received, (ratings came back from 33 of 37 strategy leads), then reviewed to re-score which resulted in the prioritization list. At that point, the scores got mushed together. Scores went up and the gap between the top and the bottom group reduced considerably. In addition, looking at where reductions were possible, one thing that was included in the tool, but was not scored were requests from all strategy leads to look at their strategy and identify any cost saving measures that can be taken in 2009 and 2010 in order to prevent strategies from being eliminated. Also, the strategy leads were asked if strategy funding were reduced, if they would recommend delaying or reducing the changing strategy itself.

## **6. Co-Chairs Report, Co-Chairs Havenga & Rahr~**

### ***In regards to the Prioritization Rating Process & Prioritization Workgroup***

**Sheriff Rahr:** Recognized that, with any difficult decision, some people would be happy, and some would not be happy with the final prioritization list. She expressed to the OC that this was a very open, transparent process from the beginning; the workgroup meetings where all issues were discussed were open for people to attend and participate. Part of the growing process of the OC is that we're never going to have a decision that is going to please everybody. This, she believes, was the OC's first difficult decision making process and hopes that everyone has a clear and consistent memory of how that prioritization work was done. With so much work to do outside of this workgroup meeting and not everyone able to attend each meeting or workgroup meeting, she recognizes that everyone may have gaps in their memory as a result of it. She emphasized the need for everyone to work together when decisions are made. Sheriff Rahr then opened up the floor for questions from anyone still having issues on what was done.

**Barb Miner:** What is the relationship between the Prioritization work and the spreadsheet?

**Sheriff Rahr:** If I recall correctly what Kurt said, he certainly looked at the workgroup recommendations, but did not abide by it 100% because he has a much bigger picture that he has to look at when he makes those decisions. The recommendation from the workgroup was a piece he relied on.

**Beth Goldberg:** We evaluated the prioritization in the context of the process that Amnon laid out, and then also paired it with the budget. It was a multi-faceted process. We did not ignore the prioritizations, but rather used it to inform the process.

**Jaime Garcia:** Is there a way we can see the prioritization recommendations next to the Executive recommendations side-by-side?

**(Andrea LaFazia nodded yes, this request can be incorporated.)**

**Dwight Thompson:** Can't separate this amount. If we were to put that in, it would create more problems than leaving it out. The workgroup talked with the department, who added questions in the strategy guidelines for the sole purpose of finding some other way to cut rather than cut entire strategies. Remember the prioritization purpose was if you had to cut entire strategies, what are the high end ones, the middle and the bottom ones?

**Mike Heinisch:** Going forward, I don't think the prioritization thing is not going away. We're going to supplant 30% again next year. A year from now, we will have fully implemented strategies; some showing good results, some not so good. Some strategies will be put away and most likely delayed again next year. A lot of future issues to be thinking about: how things are going to be different next

year, legislative session, new tool maybe? It has to stay somewhere in our agenda and cannot be put away today.

**Sheriff Rahr:** We made the decision to sunset the current workgroup, but we know that there will be a need for another prioritization workgroup. When that time comes, we will create another prioritization workgroup again, whether it's the same members or different members. We want to make sure this board grows, the faces change and we have the opportunity at a future time and all the folks on the board have a chance to participate.

**Beth Goldberg:** I'd like to follow up about getting into next year. The way we designed this plan, we definitely have sustainability in mind. Assuming sales tax doesn't continue to deteriorate, the plan is designed in such a way to carry us through to 2011. In 2012, there might be more decision points and one of the rationales behind that was that it does give new programs time to be put in place and you can start evaluating effectiveness. We set up in a way so that we won't have to look at supplantation parameters each year.

**Mike Heinisch:** I appreciate that and thanks for reminding me of that spreadsheet. I'm just suggesting and recognizing that part of our tool talks about effectiveness. Perhaps it's simply evaluation that gets us the results.

**Bruce Knutson:** The minutes of the last meeting do reflect what I said accurately, and by the way I sat on the prioritization workgroup, and they say:

*"Extended high accolades to the workgroup co-chairs and staff for following through with what they were tasked to do. The prioritization workgroup is well worth more discussion and wants more advisement on what a \$13M reduction will mean to the MIDD strategies."*

I really feel bad having said that. Everything Amnon reported was an accurate reflection of all of the work that was done, I think it was excellent. I particularly appreciated the staff asking all the leads for their input. Having said that, I also believe that still, it is a human process. There are still limitations on our time in doing the assessments and prioritization. I frankly don't agree, I just want to get that on the plate too with the overall outcomes. I would have ranked them differently. I would have ranked youth programs higher, specifically for family treatment court and juvenile drug court. I would have ranked them higher on program evaluation. I think that their program evaluations are incredibly strong, both nationally and locally, using strong evaluations--particularly juvenile drug court, that show a clear substantial reduction. I would have ranked them differently, having a different outcome. So having said the process was outstanding and I think it was, I think we can do it better. In the future, we should spend more time looking at the evaluation outcomes.

**Sheriff Rahr:** I think that's a good point. I appreciate that.

**Ward Urion:** Would the same criteria, that were established for the prioritization tool, then be status quo or go into the next round with that? My thinking is that some of the cuts that are going to be implemented may affect program effectiveness and may affect some of the calculus's as to how effective those program will be. Is it open to be revisited?

**Sheriff Rahr:** I think that is the whole point of re-creating a new workgroup is that we can look at new data. Again, if we have new members on the committee, give them an opportunity to participate.

**David Hocraffer:** In the event that the sales tax revenue does increase, or sooner than anticipated, is the concept behind this to have reverse engineering, have money go back into these cut strategies first rather than new strategies, in reverse order than what is on this list? Or are we simply going to completely revisit this issue?

**Amnon Shoefeld:** We haven't even thought about it.

**Sheriff Rahr:** As this evolves, we would have to address that as a group. Common sense would say we would do it that way, however, we're going to have more and better data at a future time so that might be worthwhile to say lets do this again.

**Dwight Thompson:** The workgroup understood that the tool that was developed was a tool for this year. Most importantly, a year from now, we're going to have a whole new set of information from our programs, it's going to be a different environment. What worked in 2009 isn't necessarily going to work

in 2010 and we'll have to look at it all over again. Are the cuts only directly related to the number of clients served and current scope? The tool and our prioritization is strategy oriented, not program based. You can have one program fail and another succeed, which is a program problem and not part of the OC responsibilities.

**Darcy Jaffe:** Over the next 3 years with 30% supplantation, will we be looking every year at the strategies again.....

**Amnon Shoefeld:** What we did was look at what we needed to do to balance the MIDD budget through supplantations through 2011.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** This is just a recommendation.

**Sheriff Rahr:** We have to remind ourselves that we are advisory.

**Mike Heinisch:** Kelli, is the Council alright with this?

**Kelli Carroll:** It has been provided. I have not had a direct conversation with anyone but Councilmember Ferguson about it. There is a briefing on September 9 at the regional policy committee on prioritization and supplantation. I'm sure we'll be hearing from our city representatives and our regional partners as well as our councilmembers who are on the regional policy committee.

**MEMBER:** When do the cuts take effect?

**Beth Goldberg:** It would be January assuming they are adopted by the council in most cases. Prior to this, if a cut is coming in 2010 and you have a contract in 2009 then those are going into effect now.

### *Operating Rules Discussion & possible revisions*

**Sheriff Rahr:** On a related topic, Co-Chair Havenga is going to talk about our operating rules. There was some discomfort with the process we used when we got a consensus vote for the prioritization list. I think it's wise to look back through the notes, as Amnon did, and talk about how we came to this decision, what were the agreements made ahead of time to ensure we can be more effective as committee members and to reiterate that members need to speak up when warranted even if it is uncomfortable.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** Reflected that in June 2008, a workgroup headed by Judge Linde put together the Operating Rules which were presented to the OC and adopted. She wanted to remind the OC of the built in process of the role call vote. In order to move a topic to a role call vote, a committee member would need to bring that topic to the attention of the OC, which would put that item on the agenda for the next meeting for everyone to have a chance to review materials.

**Ward Urion:** That would imply there would be an agenda item for the next meeting?

**Sheriff Rahr:** We reached a time crunch in this situation. We, as co-chairs, try to anticipate when a decision is going to be made and frontload the information so that members can come prepared. In retrospect, we would have done it a little differently.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** If a person does not agree, we want it to be a comfortable environment where you feel alright about stepping up to say something. Also, we want it to be a comfortable environment if we need to have a delay and take a vote, then that's what we should do.

**Nancy Dow-Witherbee:** What is the reason for the majority voting to be put off to the next meeting. If there's an issue of wanting to look at this further, but not wanting to hold up consensus, is there a reason why the vote can't take place then?

**Co-Chair Havenga:** A vote has to be on record and give an opportunity for all members to take that vote. Not everyone is here at every meeting, so that would give the opportunity to vote or send a designee to take that vote.

**Mike Heinisch:** Rules state proxy too?

**Co-Chair Havenga:** Yes

**Sheriff Rahr:** Once again, we're going to try to do a better job to ensure that members have lead time on these issues so that we are prepared to take a vote if we need to.

**Dwight Thompson:** Technical question. Who is non-King County vs. King County officially?

**Andrea LaFazia:** They had to be separated according to the Open Meeting Records Act in the King County ordinance that differentiates different members. King County members are separately elected

officials or King County agency directors only. The other half of our committee is made up of “non King County members” which are provider agency directors and local municipal leaders. These are the individuals where their designees will need to deliver an in-writing vote vs a King County member or separately elected official could have a designee to vote on their behalf without having to provide something in writing.

**Dwight Thompson:** I can see a situation where one or two of us may feel that we don’t want to hold up consensus, but we’d want to register a minority opinion. If there is a way we can state a position, but still want the process to move forward.

**Andrea LaFazia:** It’s in the rules under Section C, Decision Making:

*“If members have concerns but are willing to support the committee's position, consensus will be reached. The record will reflect any stated concerns.”*

This is the mechanism that would then allow members who don’t want to vote either way, but want their concerns registered and still want the process to move forward.

**Sheriff Rahr:** It would be reflected in the minutes that one would not want to stop consensus, but these are my concerns.

**David Hocraffer:** Had this been put in position and gone to a vote, under the rules it would be a straight up or down vote. If it’s a not, or there’s an alternative, what would have been the process to get the alternatives in there?

**Dwight Thompson:** You’re asking, ‘Would there have been room for amendments?’

**David Hocraffer:** To get the votes, have it to be one voting process, but as to alternatives.

**Bill Block:** In a consensus process, it’s open to anyone on a committee “I offer ‘X’, do I have a consensus?,” which is the way a consensus process operates.

**Darcy Jaffe:** In this particular situation, we didn’t ask the committee to come back with an alternative. We asked them to come back with a product.

**Sheriff Rahr:** I think that’s part of this front end work that we need to be sure and do in the future with these kinds of difficult decisions.

**Ward Urion:** I think it would be beneficial to have these rules available next time.

**Dwight Thompson:** Also perhaps a short, quick note system reference to refer to.

**Mike Heinisch:** Under conflict of interest. There was something we had to sign and are we doing that annually?

**Andrea LaFazia:** Yes.

### ***Public Comment Process***

**Co-Chair Havenga:** Again addressed and explained the new public comment process. Visitors will have a chance to address the OC during public comment time. Co-Chair Havenga instructed those who wish to do so, to sign in on the public comment sign in sheet and then wait to be called upon by the co-chairs during the public comment period. At that time, individuals are asked to state their name and organization for the record and that there will be a two minute limit for comment.

## **7. MIDD OC member check in**

OC Co-Chairs announced again this new and permanent agenda item added a month ago to give OC members the opportunity to voice concerns, ask questions and provide feedback in an open forum.

### **Member comments:**

**Nancy Dow-Witherbee:** In the last meeting, you talked about pursuing legal clarification of the role of the OC in the monies going to other programs to be supplanted and seek more expert advice on the direction as this was an area that hadn’t been considered and what is the role in that? I’m not seeing that’s happened.

**Sheriff Rahr:** This is not the type of thing that we would seek a specific legal opinion on because this is not case law. We had to look at what was the intent when the Council created this. The intent of the OC to give advice or input on the MIDD strategies rather than programs that existed prior to MIDD.

This is tricky because they're so intertwined and independent. However, it's not the role of this committee to make decisions about a program that existed before.

**Mike Heinisch:** I've been involved in juvenile court and out in the community as a community based provider for many years, across many systems, things that are working well for kids in King County and named several successful projects. However, he pointed out youth homelessness isn't being addressed. The youth are our future who are causing serious concerns in the community.

**Dwight Thompson:** Within the scope of the OC to consider the policy implications of implementing strategies with regard to the massive changes in the budget with only three OC meetings left before the budget is submitted. I find it very difficult for this size of a group to address the complexities such as the prioritization. I think that somehow, we need to seriously consider some ongoing group in light of the crisis we're in and the effect on our strategies we care about, to gather information with the aid and support of the department and anyone else who would like to contribute so we can give info back to the OC regarding policy and direction. I don't think this can be done in time.

**Sheriff Rahr:** The dilemma we find ourselves in is that MHCADSD doesn't have unlimited resources to provide information to us, packaged in different ways and with different frequency. I think we have to be realistic about where the Council is going to go to seek advice. Frankly, I don't think that the people of the OC can meet more than once a month and be effective. I think that at some point we have to rely on the advice of MHCADSD as they're managing these programs. Again, we're Oversight, and I feel pretty comfortable with the information from MHCADSD to be an effective oversight body.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** I think that when the programs are being implemented, some already are and are ready to start and be evaluated, I know there's a whole other evaluation instrument and tool in place and another role of our OC will be to hear about and review those evaluations. I think there are a lot of things we'll do in the future, specifically around those strategies that are funded by MIDD dollars.

**Sheriff Rahr:** I just don't know what the mechanism would be for us to get more involved and in more detail. I don't think MHCADSD has the capacity to continue providing more and more information to us and I don't know about members' ability to meet on a more frequent basis. I think we have to rely on the professionalism and the ethics of MHCADSD to provide information to Council as Council staff will ask questions.

**Kelli Carroll:** Yes, that is our process. The Council members will ask questions in the public meetings that will occur. I will get in touch with the budget office, Beth and Cindy. We'll work with MHCADSD to get the answers to these questions. The questions that the members may have or questions the analysts on the budget team come up with in reviewing the budget; not only for MIDD, but for all the criminal justice and human service agencies that will be coming forward to the Council so there is a well established process. We have the recommendations, and we know what a 10% reduction could be in terms of fewer people, fewer sites, a delay. I'm not sure what more we would need for the Executive's spending plan.

**Dwight Thompson:** So what do we do if one of us has a question, or someone has a concern about a particular strategy, what would we need? We have no mechanism at this level to be asking that kind of detailed question at this meeting, to get to what might be more of a strategy issue, a policy issue than meets the eye. You just can't get into that understanding of the entire MIDD project by sitting here and receiving these reports. From an SCA perspective, I'm not here to delegate my responsibilities to the Council.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** Kurt was very generous in his invitation to any one of us to work with him, to share our concerns with him. For me, that will be my avenue.

## 8. New Business

No Comments

## 9. Public Comment

**Eleanor Owen:** I really want to say we really do appreciate what I consider a very careful attempt of everyone to do what seems to be the most effective and efficient way to us the funds. Having said that, in terms of prioritizing how the cuts were made I do believe that the entire committee must have suspended the major priorities that have been set for the entire nation and this state as to how we're going to transform a system that's broken, that has been identified as broken by the President's commission, by the Governor, by dozens of researchers and I feel that was suspended in prioritizing here. I also look at the composition of the committee, the President's commission downtown has said, we are transforming the system to the family and consumer driven and in the composition of this group and that does not reflect that. I look at the percentages that have been identified, and that not only goes in the exact opposite direction, 52% of the President's top priority is at the bottom of the list. So my concern is, my concern and Amnon I resent that! I resent your turning away from my attempt to make some sense of what is going on. I also object to what I consider to be an overly polite group. We have a major problem here and I feel everywhere the word "family" or "youth," we see the biggest cuts. Everywhere we see employment, a top priority, we see the biggest cut of all.

**Amnon Shoenfeld:** You weren't here early on, you missed a comment...

**Eleanor Owen:** I heard Joyce. I agree with her, but she does not sit on this committee. Family members sit on this committee.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** Thank you Eleanor.

**Eleanor Owen:** Thank you.

**Co-Chair Havenga:** Any other comments?  
Thank you all for coming.

**ADJOURN 1:37p.m.**

**Next Meeting**

**October 1, 2009**

**King County Chinook Building  
401 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104**

**11:45 a.m.– 12:15 p.m. ~ Networking Lunch**

**12:15 p.m.– 2:15 p.m. ~ Meeting**

**Room 121**