

JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN
MINUTES FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SITE SELECTION AND TRANSITION
ISSUES
CONFERENCE CALL
August 19, 2010

Members Present: Nancy Sutton; Joe Mienko; Maureen McGrath; and Trudy Marcellay

Staff Present: Julie Dunnington, Melissa Takade, and Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; April Potts, DSHS Children's Administration; Andy Kramer, DSHS Central Contracts

Others: Stephanie Lee and Marna Miller, Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP)

Due to unresolved Phase I design issues that impede this committee's ability to continue working toward identifying Phase II pilot sites, the co-chairs agreed to host a conference call rather than meeting.

The Advisory Committee members who were able to make the call introduced themselves. After introductions, Julie Dunnington outlined the meeting's agenda.

Andy Kramer presented first about the current Phase I procurement progress and discussed some procurement options.

Maureen McGrath asked how other states have simultaneously approached procurement for both Master Contractors (MC) and case management. Julie Dunnington replied that there is very little precedent in other states for Washington State to examine. Maureen said she is concerned that while there may be many contractors interested in becoming a master contractor there are far fewer interested in case management. If this were, in fact, the situation, then the case management contracting procurement process would have to include other organizations not involved with Phase I contract procurement.

Nancy Sutton asked if there were a way to factor a decision not to participate in Phase II into the Phase I proposal weighting process. If this is a desired goal of the Phase I contracting process, this feature must be outlined to potential contracts.

Nancy reframed the discussion: Phase II Site Selection activities might best be incorporated into the Phase I contract procurement process. Andy agreed with this assessment and suggested that if this is the course of action, then this intention must be articulated in a short span of time. The Advisory Committee was a little concerned about the time allotted for organizations to prepare for Phase II activities. Julie Dunnington mentioned that there is a discussion on the agenda for the September Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee meeting regarding the Phase II timeline. She added that Representative Kagi and Senator Hargrove would welcome the committee's recommendations regarding the timeline. Andy Kramer said that he would ideally want more time to evaluate Phase I activities. Upon reflecting on what might be a reasonable schedule, he suggested that there would be at least a year for MC's to establish their Phase I activities and that there would be an evaluation of these activities after this period of time.

Marna Miller of the Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP) asked why the entity that successfully bids for a case management contract must also be a MC. Andy Kramer responded that it wouldn't make sense to remove a portion of the MC's service array under

Phase II (assuming that case management in Phase II is part of the service array) because MCs are responsible for all service array activities. The Advisory Committee members weren't sure whether the pool of Phase II applicants must be solely Phase I contract awardees. Julie Dunnington said that she would get some clarity on this issue.

Joe Mienko added that the Union would be interested in bidding for case management under Phase II. He also mentioned that if MC's are limited to Administrative Regions as pilot sites, the Site Selection Advisory Committee would be pushed toward selecting a site located wholly in a single region.

In light of the meeting's discussion, there may need to be some revision of the procurement plan for Phase II case management. There may need to be consideration of another option where an external entity performing only case management might come to the table to provide services. If this option were viable, what pilot site size would be necessary for a contractor to be successful?

Regardless of which plan is chosen, if anything is going to be included in the Phase I contracting process, the language must be completed by November.

The Advisory Committee also asked about the results from the Learning Lab that took place on the East side of the state.

The date for the next meeting is slated for Sept 16, 2010.