

GRANT COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD
June 16, 2020

The regular meeting of the Grant County Human Services Board was held June 16, 2020.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dwight Walvatne
Bill LaValley
Troy Johnson
Doyle Sperr
Keith Swanson

OTHERS PRESENT

Stacy Hennen, Social Services Director
Justin Anderson, Grant County Attorney
Jennifer Albjerg, Fiscal Manager

Doyle Sperr called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M.

Pledge of allegiance was done

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: The agenda was reviewed. After review, Keith Swanson made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Bill LaValley, MCU

MINUTES: The minutes of the May 19, 2020 meeting was reviewed. Keith Swanson made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Troy Johnson, MCU

BILLS: The Social Services Claims Abstract and Purchase of Service Bills were presented and reviewed. After questions Bill LaValley made a motion to approve the bills, seconded by Keith Swanson, MCU

BOARD REPORTS: Report from Board Appointments

Lakeland Mental Health..... Keith Swanson
Horizon Community Health Board..... Doyle Sperr, Dwight Walvatne
County Based Purchasing.....Keith Swanson/Troy Johnson
Grant County DAC..... Doyle Sperr
West Central Communities Action, Inc... Keith Swanson
Agency on Aging.....Bill LaValley
Child Protection Pre-Placement..... Troy Johnson
Rainbow Rider..... Bill LaValley/Dwight Walvatne
Adult Mental Health Team..... Troy Johnson

CONTRACTS

- A. Housing Support Application: REM
- B. Housing Support Application-Hoffman Living Center
- C. Housing Support Application: Ashby Living Center
- D. Housing Support Application: MSOCS
- E. Housing Support Agreement: Newberry
- F. Housing Support Agreement: Barrett Assisted Living:

After reviewing all of the applications it was agreed that one motion could approve them all. Grant County does not do a supplemental rate beyond what the State approves and pays so all agreements are the same. After review and discussion, Troy Johnson made a motion to approve agreements A-F on the agenda, seconded by Keith Swanson, MCU

OLD BUSINESS

- A. Case Counts:

The Director reviewed the case counts with the Board. Our child protection intake numbers are beginning to go back up, the adult protection intakes remain alarmingly low. We are busy in all program areas dealing with the changes that are occurring and trying to help the people we serve navigate through them as well. We continue to see our economic support programs trending up, which isn't surprising for us in times like this.

- B. Legislative Update:

The director reviewed the legislative update in detail with the board talking about how it impacts county human services agencies.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Tele-Commuters Recommendations:

The director talked with the board about her staff that remain tele commuting and gave them recommendations on how to manage that while we work towards a re-opening. Based on the face to face waivers we have it is unlikely we will be seeing many clients in person that we are not already so it would seem more appropriate to slowly and carefully bring tele commuters back in. The plan the director gave the board had different phases and considerations. The board reviewed it and agreed via consensus that they were ok with the director handling this in whatever manner makes the most sense in terms of customer service and safety and the safety of the staff.

- B. PSOP Allocation:

The director gave the board a copy of the additional allocation we got for 2020 for the Parent Support Outreach Program (PSOP). The director noted that this was due to COVID and based on a combination of previous use and number of cases.

- C. Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) numbers:

The director gave another update on this, the board has requested to be kept apprised of this every month since we are significantly over spending this State grant. The director noted that our numbers are still projected to be way over our allocation. We are projected to spend 198.4% of our allocation, which is \$44,401 over our allocation. This is largely due to the COVID waivers and increased time where kids were not in school. As of right now it appears that the State as a whole is not overspending. If that continues the State will pay the overage, so we will continue to watch it closely. We currently have 6 families on the waiting list.

D. Placement Data:

The director reviewed the out of home placements with the board. We have 18 children in placement, with 5 of them being on trial home visits. We are ready for permanency for seven of those children, but are waiting for DHS to get us the paperwork we need, for the court to schedule adoption hearings, and for the Interstate Compact Placement Agreement (ICPC) process for two kids who are supposed to go to Washington State to be adopted by their uncle. Our daily costs are \$1,65.48. Our monthly cost was \$29,295.50. Commissioner Johnson talked about the status of some of our cases, he sits on the preplacement committee and is aware of the work being done on the cases.

E. May Financial Report:

The director reviewed the financial report with the board. We are 42% of the way through the year and our revenues are at 32% and our expenses are at 43%. We are significantly over budget in out of home placements and the services that go alongside reunification. One issue is that we are having to use therapeutic foster homes because our local foster homes are full. This is raising the per child cost as well as having a higher number of kids in placement.

F. Senior Spotlight Report 6-09:

The director gave the board the senior spotlight review articles for review. They are completed by our senior coordinator.

G. Fiscal Presentation:

The director and fiscal manager reviewed the year end budget numbers for the past couple years and compared the cash and accrual basis for the board and explained the difference between them all.

H. Merge: Project Management:

The director and county attorney talked with the board about the proposal for project management. The proposal has been to allocate a portion of Pope County's Fiscal Officer's time to this. He has some experience in previous jobs in project management and has some of the traits that we have been looking for. The director indicated that he is asking for a base increase of approximately \$10,000 annually to his salary and half of that amount would be paid by Grant County. The director asked for the board's approval of that. There were questions regarding scope and job duties and verification that Pope County will continue to pay the remainder of his salary and Grant is only responsible for half of the extra amount, so around \$5,000. The director confirmed that was the proposal. With that, Keith Swanson made a motion to approve paying for half of the salary overage to have Duane be the project manager with the understanding the amount is approximately \$5,000 annually, seconded by Bill LaValley, MCU

I. Pope/Grant Merge Update:

The director and county attorney reviewed where we are in the process of the merge with Pope County and talked about what processes should be in place now and in the event that anyone else is interested in joining. The director indicated she had been approached by the director of the Traverse County Social Services Director inquiring about potentially joining our process or working out some kind of sharing agreement because she has announced her intention to retire in December of 2020. She indicates that she has recommended to her board that they continue this process with Grant County in part because of the substantial relationship we already have. The board discussed it and indicated that they would act only with some formal request from their board. In the discussion, it was agreed that the county attorney would contact the Traverse County Coordinator to let her know the stance of the board.

J. Regional Transportation Council:

The director shared with the board an e-mail that the regional directors sent to the project coordinator of the RTCC, or regional transportation coordination council. This is being led by West Central and they have long sought the joint support of the regional human services directors and we have been reluctant to give it because we felt there were too many unknowns and unanswered questions. We gathered all of our questions and sent them off and the document shared has the questions and the answers. The director reviewed the answers and indicated to the board that based on the answers she does not feel this fit within the human services realm. This appears to be aimed at the general public and not human services, and it will not provide any work relief or assistance to us in any manner. The director indicated that it would be her request that if the county decides to fund this they do so out of the general fund and not look to SS to fund this. Realistically, our budget is tight this year, but the main issue is that this does not seem to be a program aimed at our clients. The commissioners agreed and indicated that if they want money in the future they can come to a regular county board meeting. The director further asked if they wanted her staff to continue to engage in this and they said it would be up to us but they weren't going to require it.

K. Opiate Allocation Plan:

The director reviewed the opiate allocation plan with the board that we are required to submit for this new funding stream. The director also gave the board the information on the allocation that was received.

L. Private Client Data:

All pertinent data was discussed

Chairman Doyle Sperr adjourned the meeting at 12:03pm
