

MINUTES

Lane County Commission for Children and Families
Serbu Youth Campus – 2727 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard
Eugene, Oregon

April 22, 2009
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Judith Hampton, Chair; Elizabeth Clewett, Rich Cook, Sharri Da Silva, Debi Farr, Karen Hamilton, Liane Lucas, Kevin Maloney, Ryan Stroup, John Radich, Commission members; Diana Avery, Serafina Clarke, Alicia Hays, Robin Schaefer, DCF staff; Peggy Lintula, A Primary Connection, South Lane Family Resource Center; Heather Murphy, Cottage Grove Family Relief Nursery; Sue Norton and Jennifer Slater, Family Connections of Lane and Douglas Counties

ABSENT: Marty Beyer, Chuck Boyer, Abigail Fender, Gail Parr, Kitty Piercy, Joachim Schulz, Phil Walker, Commission members.

I. WELCOME, ANNOUNCEMENTS, PUBLIC COMMENT

- **WELCOME**

Ms. Hampton convened the meeting of the Lane County Commission on Children and Families (LCCCF) at 5:38 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

- **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Lintula started by thanking Marty Beyer for spending an afternoon at the South Lane Family Resource Center. She explained that she felt as though she had not done an inadequate job explaining the Center's measurement tools at the March 18, 2009 meeting. She shared a binder with the Commission that contained the Center's outcomes and measurement tools.

She explained that the measurement tools were created for the South Lane County Family Resource Center by a graduate student at OSU who worked closely with the Center to establish measurements that he felt would capture what needed to be measured. She encouraged Commission members to contact her if they wanted more information or their own copy of the binder.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

Ms. Hampton announced that Item number II on the agenda would be skipped.

III. CHILD CARE COMMUNITY FOCUS AREA UPDATE

Ms. Norton thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present information on the state of child care in Lane County, specifically infant and toddler (I/T) care. She presented a PowerPoint entitled *Early Childhood Planning Team Child Care Subcommittee Report: Community Priority: To Increase quality child care for children aged zero to three.*

She noted the new name for Family Connections, is now “Family Connections of Lane and Douglas Counties.” During her presentation, she referred to the document: *Family Connections of Lane and Douglas Counties: Child Care Supply and Demand Report*, for specific statistics about local child care needs.

Ms. Slater continued to present the PowerPoint, at the section entitled *Infant/Toddler Network*. She explained that she had been running the Infant/Toddler Network at Family Connections for the past year and a half. She thanked the Commission for their funding of the program.

Ms. Norton presented the last parts of the PowerPoint, starting with Next Steps. She asked for Commissioners’ comments and opinions on the subcommittee and its activities. She explained that systemic change would take time and presented the next steps the subcommittee would take. She directed Commissioners’ attention to the document *The Child Care Quality Indicators Project: An Information System about Child Care Quality in Oregon*, which illustrated the ways in which child care quality was measured. She stated that Family Connections was working with the community to increase both the quality and capacity of Oregon child care.

Ms. Hamilton described the Early Head Start dollars available in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). She stated that CCF and Family Connections were working together to access those dollars, with a goal of adding 150 I/T child care slots to the number currently available.

In response to a question from Mr. Radich, Ms. Norton explained that the economic crisis had the potential to increase the need for child care and or funding for child care. She stated that Family Connections had not observed a decrease in child care businesses because of the economic crisis. She stated that some parents experienced difficulty paying for child care, and that in the long-term this could affect I/T businesses in the area.

Ms. Norton explained that many families could resort to leaving their infants and toddlers with family, friends or neighbors (FFN). She expressed a desire to be able to properly train these providers in infant and toddler care.

IV. RELIEF NURSERIES STATEWIDE OUTCOMES

Ms. Murphy directed the Commission’s attention to the Executive Summary of the Oregon Relief Nursery evaluation, completed by NPC Research and entitled *Oregon Relief Nursery FY 2008 Key Findings*, and presented the data therein. She explained that while the local Relief Nurseries had gathered some of the same data, NPC Research extrapolated interesting findings based on the research and data.

Ms. Da Silva explained her excitement about the findings. She explained that they were good findings for children and families in Oregon, and explained that some of the strategies outlined could be implemented if funding was found. She described the 11 Relief Nurseries in Oregon, which range from very rural environments to very urban environments, which meant that the programs and services provided by each, as well as the needs and gaps in the services of each, varied widely. She explained that each Relief

Nursery in the state were separate non-profits with their own boards of directors.

Ms. Murphy explained that the researchers felt the need to check their data and findings repeatedly, because they had never observed such significant impacts taking place in such a short period of time. She stated that all of the Relief Nursery data was now online, and was more user-friendly and reliable. She explained that, therefore, the data included in the research was very solid.

Ms. Da Silva stated that the data reflected a large reduction of reported child abuse among families enrolled in Relief Nursery programs (“Two percent of Relief Nursery children had a founded abuse report subsequent to enrollment, compared to 13% prior to enrollment.”) In addition, “100% of children placed in foster care while involved with the Relief Nurseries were reunified” with their families, compared to 64% statewide.

In response to a question from Mr. Cook, Ms. Murphy explained that when a family was first evaluated, not all risk factors were immediately apparent. She explained that this could be a reason why the data showed higher success rates after six months of Relief Nursery involvement rather than after one year of involvement. Ms. Da Silva explained that some families were included at six months but not at 12 months, as they had found enough success after six months to leave the program.

V. KIDS IN COMMON AT THE CAPITOL AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms. Hays directed the Commission’s attention to the schedule and messages for Kids in Common Day at the capitol on April 21 (titled *Kids in Common Day*). She stated that the work was important and expressed her desire to expand the Kids in Common Day activities, which were sponsored by the Oregon Commission on Children and Families.

Ms. Avery explained that the domestic violence bill had been voted out of committee, which was good news. She stated that the language of the bill had changed, however, making collocated domestic violence advocates voluntary rather than mandatory.

VI. TRANSITION AGE YOUTH UPDATE

Ms. Clarke presented three documents related to the Transition Age Youth subcommittee, entitled: *Transition Aged Youth Pilot Project – 3/12/09 Draft, TAY Task Force Alternatives Subcommittee Activities Report and Work plan* and *SAMHSA Releases 2009 Healthy Transitions Initiative RFA*. She expressed that Lane County’s proposal for the Healthy Transitions RFA would stand out because of the peer support initiatives the subcommittee was formulating, including the Transition Aged Youth Pilot Project.

Ms. Hays and Ms. Hampton expressed their support of the Transition Age Youth subcommittee’s activities. Ms. Hampton mentioned other activities of the LCCCF and expressed her gratitude to CCF staff members.

VII. CCF DISCRETIONARY FUNDS BUDGET RECOMMENDATION

Ms. Hays directed the group’s attention to two documents, entitled *Options for Oregon’s 2009-11 State*

Budget and **Budget Workgroup recommendation 4/7/09**. She expressed her desire to illustrate the state budget situation to the Commission.

Ms. Hays explained the **Budget Workgroup recommendation 4/7/09**. She stated that the document explained the workings of the Budget Workgroup at the state level. She said that the Budget Workgroup included representatives from each commission program, including CASA, Relief Nurseries and others. She explained that the process of coming up with the budget was not easy, and that the Workgroup came up with guiding principles for budget reductions at 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30%.

In response to a question from Mr. Radich, Ms. Hays explained that Healthy Start was one of the largest pieces of the budget, and that the program would be redesigned at the state level to remain efficient despite the proposed cuts. She explained that the goal of the Healthy Start Redesign Team is to present the State Commission with a plan to serve the greatest number of children and families with highest quality and cost-effective Healthy Start services by their meeting on July 9, 2009.

In response to a question from Ms. Farr, Ms. Hays explained that Healthy Start generates Medicaid funds, and could potentially lose \$1,000,000 in Medicaid if Healthy Start is reduced at the levels proposed. She stated that the CCF had to look carefully at who generates Medicaid in Lane County, and do what could be done to maintain the system of care.

Ms. Hays explained that the Legislative Fiscal Office's Joint Ways and Means Committee was in the process of visiting each county to discuss the state budget situation, and would be in Lane County on May 1.

Ms. Hays explained that the CCF did not know what their budget would be, but that the economic forecast that the budget would be based on would be released on May 15. She explained that the CCF would look carefully at the implications of a 30% cut. She stated that she needed direction from the LCCCF regarding flexible funds budget priorities so that she could start working with partners on implementing the potential cuts. She directed the Commission's attention to the document titled **Lane County Commission on Children and Families Flexible funds budget priorities 09/11**.

Ms. Farr expressed her support for a strategic approach to deciding on the options presented. Ms. Hays explained that maintaining the viability of all programs was a strategy that the CCF supported.

Mr. Cook reiterated his support for option 3. In response to a question from Ms. Farr, Ms. Hays explained that the CCF would work closely with their partners to maintain viability for all programs, and that this could mean selective budget cuts.

Mr. Radich expressed his appreciation to the Executive Committee for revisiting the discussion on budget priorities, and explained that he was concerned about the loss of child abuse prevention as a Commission priority. He stated that he believed that Children and Families Commissions were the only entities in the state that addressed child abuse prevention, and stated that he could live with option 3 but preferred option 2.

In response to a question from Ms. Hamilton, Ms. Hays explained that the CCF was aware that their funding could significantly impact programs running out of school districts, for example, and that the direction she would receive from the LCCCF would help CCF in its detailed budget discussions with school district partners. She stated that once the budget numbers were released, she would bring the

discussion back to the LCCCF in June in order to provide detailed information to Commission members.

Ms. Hampton stated that it seemed as though the majority of Commission members preferred option 3, and presented it to Ms. Hays as a direction for the time being.

Ms. Hays stated that the CCF would put together their budget the best way they could once they had their budget numbers, and that the issue would be discussed again at a future board meeting. She also mentioned that the U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, had mentioned community schools several times at the National School Boards Association Annual Conference in San Diego. She stated that Family Resource Centers (FRCs) are community schools, and that she believed that federal money would be available for FRCs in the near future.

VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Hays explained that there was a new county budget process in place, and included more work session time than had previously been included. She reminded the Commission that in the county budget, CCF currently had 0.5 FTE for a development position. She stated that Lane County Administrator Jeff Spartz had put the 0.5 FTE in the upcoming budget. She explained that the CCF was still hoping to get the funding for the position back to full-time.

Ms. Hays expressed her excitement about attending a Positive Youth Development committee meeting and affecting all of the partners in the children's collaborative personally. She expressed her desire to hear youth voices at the table.

In response to a question from Ms. Hays related to ideas around early intervention for families in crisis, Mr. Cook explained his belief that it was not always wise to target available dollars towards a specific need, since the needs of individuals and individual families across a community could vary. He explained his desire to examine individual circumstances in order to develop a flexible plan to address specific individual needs. Ms. Farr agreed. Mr. Radich mentioned United Way's matching funds program, which could address specific community needs.

Ms. Hays explained that because of the economic crisis, many agencies were seeing people access services who had never done so before. Ms. Hampton expressed a desire for a one-stop service where community members could access assistance for a variety of needs. Ms. Lucas and Mr. Stroup expressed interest in assisting families with utility bills.

Ms. Hays thanked the Commission for their assistance and talked about working with existing agencies on these potential activities.

Ms. Hampton, noting no further business to be discussed, adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

(Recorded by Katie Dettman)