

**Harney County Commission on Children and Families
Minutes of December 13, 2011, Meeting**

Attending: Dan Nichols, Chair; Ramona Hofman; Dan Hoke;
Joyce Moser; Teri Cain, Director; Nancy Walker, Assistant.

Absent: Michelle Bradach, John Copenhaver, Jean Hurst, Pat Sharp, Ann Vloedman

Guests: Alicia Goodson, Kathy Rementeria, Donna Schnitker, Ashlee Voges.

Call to Order/Introductions: Dan called the Meeting to order at 2:10 p.m., noting the meeting lacked a sufficient number of members for a quorum and introduced Dan Hoke, new board member.

Public Comments: No public comments.

Approval of agenda and minutes: Current meeting agenda and minutes from November 8, 2011 HCCCCF Board meeting were reviewed by Board members and Director. Dan Nichols suggested approval of minutes be deferred to January's regular HCCCCF board meeting when a quorum would be present and indicated the majority of time for today's meeting would be focusing on HCCCCF preparation for an anticipated request for proposal (RFP) to be a hub service provider. The Early Learning Council (ELC) will be presenting their recommendations to the Oregon State legislative session scheduled in February, 2012.

Drug Free Community (DFC) Grant budget/MOU: Ashlee Voges, DFC Program Director, presented a [draft memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) between DFC and HCCCCF for Board consideration. The proposed MOU looks to the current and past MOU's with HCCCCF and the new DFC grant application for guidance. Mrs. Voges noticed two things. First, specific match percentages dedicated to the grant are not mentioned in any prior MOUs. Once the appropriate match percentage is agreed upon by the Commission, Voges will then make the necessary match changes in the Program Narrative, where all match and financial numbers are kept instead of this MOU. Second, DFC has been considering paying the Commission for extra work beyond committed match. The grant has always written a formal contract for paid duties outside of regular DFC objectives. In order to keep requirements within the grant, Voges indicated such a contractual arrangement would be a more proper way to proceed regarding payments to the Commission. Board members discussed possible match percentages (e.g., 35 down to 20 percent as the grant and the DFC program have matured), MOU duration dates (e.g., June 30, 2012 or August 31, 2012 rather than the federal DFC grant cycle dates) and asked DFC Director Voges to check the grant for types of work HCCCCF might be eligible to contract. Teri indicated that the DFC grant requirements include an expectation that community partners will match DFC grant funds (e.g., \$125,000 allocated to DFC) with equivalent dollars in service to "make the grant go," and HCCCCF is the fiscal agent for the Harney County DFC program. DFC Program Manager Alicia Goodson indicated volunteer match hours are accounted for outside the MOU parameters at \$17 per hour. DFC will present a revised draft for Board action at the January regular Board meeting when a quorum can be established.

Director's Report: *(In Italics) HCCCCF Director's Report 11-08-11*

General: *I thought it would be good to keep things simple this month and just list the things I've accomplished/focused on/learned in my two months in the position and those I need to focus on in the future.*

Accomplishments:

- *Data entered into state data system and money brought into county treasury, disbursed to providers.*
- *Bills paid accurately.*
- *DFC quarterly report complete and records being kept. Connections with staff and committee outlined and MOU reestablishment begun.*
- *Files maintained.*
- *Connections made in region and state.*
- *Keep abreast of the "moving target" of state commission transition possibilities.*
- *Keep commissioners informed of communications.*

- Asking Commission for direction in midst of change, taking stabs at what future may look like.
- Continue community connections, attending pertinent meetings, seeking connection to CCF.
- Visited with Donna Schnitker on 12/8 re: her take on the ELC report and possible “regionalization.” Donna plans to be at our meeting on Tuesday.
- Checking in with Nancy on the Children’s Trust Fund of Oregon Parenting Grant, making sure we’re in compliance, paying childcare providers and instructors and reimbursements for supplies.

Things to do/continue to work on:

- Further data entry and quarterly report gathering after Dec. 30.
- DFC Grant work/understanding/match; federal quarterly report due Jan. 30
- Upcoming county budget process
- State CCF Transition/info/legislation
- CADCA training in DC Feb. 6-9
- Visited with Grant County CCF acting program administrator to discuss possible collaboration. On December 13 they are interviewing four candidates for the Director position vacated by Dana Brooks in November. The main agencies supported by the Grant County CCF are Families First which provides Healthy Start-Families First and Bright Futures programs, the Healthy Smiles Dental service through the Health Department, Ready for Kindergarten program in Dayville and SMART Reading programs in all elementary schools except John Day. SMART Readers and Ready for Kindergarten are both run through the ESD. CCF also support a summer food program and CASA. I mention this in detail because of some logic in looking at, perhaps aligning with Grant County for “hub” positioning.

Drug Free Community Grant: The discussion of money the grant had paid to the Commission for evaluation and planning has been the source of much good discussion, a meeting with members of the DFC Committee, Program Director and Program Manager. The discussion clarified the need for a new Memorandum of Understanding between the Grant and the Commission. Ashlee Voges is working on a draft MOU to reflect the current understanding of the Commission’s role and should be available for the Commissioners to discuss/approve at the December meeting. (I will send this draft separately. The DFC committee will review it Monday and the Commission can discuss it on Tuesday.)

Parenting classes/CTFO Grant: Nancy Walker reported that all the classes were well attended and that the instructors were very engaged in the process and are all on board to teach the February classes. In addition, Nancy will be attending a day-long “Love and Logic” training in the Boise area on January 9 with the five teachers and Kathy Koch, an ESD employee who was on-site for the classes held at the ESD building, which allowed us to use the facility at no cost. Nancy said one of the trainers will be granted a complimentary admission, so we will train 6 folks for the cost of five (\$99 each.)

Commission vacancies: Welcome Dan Hoke to the Commission! We’re looking forward to hearing from him. Also, Vicky Clemons declined to take on membership at this time. Wendy Bull is interested but has conflicts with our meeting time if she is working. Dan felt comfortable with the commission’s membership as is, at least until, perhaps, further determination of the Commission’s future is made. All statutory requirements for commission membership have been abolished, I believe.

State Commission Transition: The Eastern Oregon Regional Directors meeting I attended on Thursday, December 1 in Pendleton with Iris Bell and Marilyn Miller was beneficial and more confusing. The two most clear pieces that came out of it was some information on language that addresses removing barriers to effective early childhood ed. that Iris shared. She recommends we use it in any RFP proposals. I will provide copies of this for the Commission. The other thing that was helpful, though Iris noted it can change completely, is a timeline she presented that is very similar to the timeline which is page 79 of the ELC final report.

Iris did talk about Commissions getting ready to determine whether we are going to compete for the hub RFP process or not. I think that the [\[HCCCF priority\] worksheet](#) I created for Commission consideration is what we need to review and attack, so in that regard, we’re on the right course!

“Emerging Issues” (OCCF transition): Teri turned the Board's attention to HCCCF Chair Dan Nichols' (Dan) meeting regarding implementation objectives contained in the Early Learning Council SB909 Report (i.e., [ELC report](#)) with ELC Chair Pam Curtis since the last HCCCF Board meeting. Dan summarized his meeting and indicated all funds to Harney County (HC) are being used effectively, also pointing out that SB909 will potentially impact 17 full-time equivalent (FTE) local jobs associated with programs serving the governor's early

learning goals in HC, which also translates to 1,568 FTE position affected in Portland (according to statistics provided by state statisticians' office). He also raised a concern that SB909 funding streams might become additionally linked with local Coordinated Care Organizations (CCO's), but ELC Chair Curtis indicated no association exists in the legislation. Then, Dan and Chair Curtis reviewed the 80 page [ELC report](#), which brought Dan back to his (and HCCCF Board's) current assessment, that is, it would be a good idea to get together to develop a plan for HC.

Dan asked for HC Early Childhood program director Donna Schnitker's perspective. Donna indicated Oregon Head Start Association (OHSA) is launching statewide campaign to slow down the SB909 implementation process because the current plan is "much like a box with no content." OHSA suggests a pilot model instead, citing a Central Oregon effort to propose a pilot program to see where gaps in services exist. She pointed to federal grant stipulation waivers as SB909 assumptions that might be unavailable to the state, and therefore might impact some funding streams. Schnitker recommends, "as a county, we need to be prepared with a plan by developing relationships with counties like Grant rather than being told how to proceed. She and her counterpart in Grant County have been exploring ways some resources could be pooled to save money and optimize program outcomes with the early childhood program Healthy Start, for example. ELC's finding to regionalize services infers a need for HC to be prepared with a plan that includes a partner, especially if OHSA's pilot program efforts are not successful. Director Schnitker indicated the Governor's vision for pre-natal to post-secondary services is already working in Harney County, but if the SB909 framework is implemented, HCCCF should be ready with a plan of how and what we would do as a partner with another county. A proposal should include descriptions of how we would work with our partners to deliver services, but we would want to be the lead, the fiscal agent.

Chair Nichols indicated SB909 intended to let communities decide what they want to do. The resources will come (although cost savings seemed to be the initial driver for SB909), including another \$7million above the \$380 million available biannually for programs. At Chair Nichols' meeting with ELC, it was also mentioned that HC and other eastern Oregon counties were doing a good job with resources, and he was left with the impression that things would not change much in EO; rather, a few unnamed counties were the source of state frustration and needed reform. Regardless of the legislation's impetus, it was emphasized that it was critically important that a plan be submitted for HC to develop a hub. During the same ELC meeting, Dan posed the possibility that HC function on its own, but ELC answered "you have to come up with a hub, a FRM [Family Resource Manager], and then there will be a two year transition with full implementation afterwards in fiscal biennium 2013. Dan needs to sit down with the [ELC report](#) and anyone who is already dealing with these programs knows the acronyms, funding streams, etc., (e.g., Copenhaver, Bradach, Rementeria, Schnitker, et al.), explaining to state "what we have been doing in the past, how we want the hub to be established, and how we propose the FRM positions will be filled." In all, Dan pointed out, "it will take a concerted effort, a lot of meetings with a few individuals to develop a hub plan that correlates with the legislation's intent to be presented directly to the ELC."

Regarding the possibility that HC become its own hub, Donna added to the discussion with ESD's successful effort to become a regional hub 10 years ago. That particular proposal was accepted somewhat because of HC's geographic isolation and relatively small impact on state funds. On the other hand, the state might want greater influence on how SB909 resources are used. Hubs do add a layer of bureaucracy that take away from serving families, yet a reason to be proactive and develop partnerships with other counties might include Umatilla-Morrow ESD's recent name change to Intermountain ESD after absorbing Union ESD. Intermountain ESD is working on a plan to be an Eastern Oregon hub for ESDs, which might be a model for that county to serve a wider area in ELC's domain. It might be prudent for HCCCF to develop its own hub plan to better serve children and families in our widely dispersed population throughout Harney County's 8,000 square miles.

The Board discussion about both Dan's ELC meeting and Donna's perspective included HC strengths, feasible partners, and questions about the timeline for a hub plan. Donna indicated the governor might already have legislation ready for February 2012 legislative session. Although specific plan parameters to construct a proposal are not currently available, she recommended a hub proposal be developed in January with modification to meet specifications as they become available, and it should be ready for presentation to the ELC before the legislative session begins. Donna indicated ELC recommendations have been evolving and now include a requirement for

hubs to meet Head Start performance standards by partnering with local Head Start early childhood programs, for example, possibly because Oregon might be pursuing a federal "Race to the Top" grant. Dan also noted, HC agencies and non-profit organizations already meet ELC's Recommendation 8, integrating and aligning local services for children and families, and a hub plan would need to emphasize HC strengths. Dan cited [ELC report](#) recommendation eight's Key Implementation Step A, i.e., "Engage stakeholders in envisioning a system centered on child/family rather than program/organization" to describe his recommendation for the Board's next project (ELC report, 2011, p. 16). Teri indicated ELC's recommended timeline for SB909 implementation could be found on page 79 of the [ELC report](#) and suggested using the [HCCCCF priority worksheet](#) as a guide. Director Schnitker also suggested a hub proposal framework should correlate with Governor's vision based on a continuum of services from pre-natal thru post-secondary years. Dan and Teri recommended forming a working group consisting of key individuals Dan mentioned earlier, HCCCCF Board members, and a few community members to develop a hub plan. After a short list and timeline emerged for the Board's hub plan working group, Teri offered to get invitations out for a first scheduled weekly meeting January 5, 2012.

Commission Worksheet: Director Cain will work with Chair Nichols, Director Schnitker, etc. to gather pertinent information prior to the meeting, using the [HCCCCF priority worksheet](#) as a guide.

Budget Reduction Survey: Director Cain brought the Board's attention to a survey regarding impacts of possible budget reductions possible budget reductions for three of state funding streams. The Director and Board to discuss a possible reduction in the Basic Capacity allocation by these 3.5% increments at the December meeting so I can more accurately answer the survey questions. Director Cain and Chair Nichols will complete the budget reduction survey by its deadline to satisfy capacity requirements for state funding streams.

Membership (One Vacancy): Currently, one vacancy remains on the HCCCCF Board for the upcoming seat in January.

Late Items: Nancy updated Board members regarding the completion of the Fall Parenting Series. She will present data and recommendations to the Director and Board at the next regular board meeting, if time permits.

Next Meeting: Tuesday January 10th, 2012 at Hines City Hall Council Room, 2:00 p.m.

Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted (with attachments),

Nancy Walker, assistant to Teri Cain (HCCCCF Director)

Minutes approved 02/14/2012

**Memorandum of Understanding
Harney County Drug Free Community
Harney County Commission on Children and Families
2012-2013**

This agreement between Harney Partners for Kids and Families/Drug Free Communities (DFC) Grant serves in lieu of the original MOU signed and dated by Carol Sawyer and Mary P. Dorroh on March 8, 2008. This MOU is to be effective beginning January 1, 2012 until the end of the grant period on September 30, 2013.

The Harney County Commission on Children and Families has agreed to provide the following support to the DFC Grant:

- Serve as Fiscal Agent
- Capacity Building
- Attend Training Opportunities
- Grant Development Projects
- Data Collection and Analysis
- DFC Grant Reapplication

The support committed by Harney County Commission on Children and Families can be provided by the Commission Director and/or the Director's Assistant.

The MOU between Harney Partners for Kids and Families and Harney County Commission on Children and Families as the Fiscal Agent dated February 27, 2008 remains relevant. A copy of this MOU can be found in the Harney County DFC Grant Application – March 2008 Binder.

This agreement shall be effective from January 1, 2012 and will continue until either of the two parties terminates this agreement, or until September 30, 2013 – whichever comes first.

Michelle Bradach, President
Harney Partners for Kids and Families

Teri Cain, Director HCCCF

Date: _____

Date: _____

HCCCF Priority worksheet

As the Commission looks toward probable changes in the structure/funding/purpose of its existence and work, I thought it would be good to examine the Commission's stated priorities and focus issue (below) as well as the Commission's vision and mission....perhaps some of this will guide us toward a solid method of coping and thriving with the implied upcoming changes, and set part of the agenda for the December 13 meeting.

One thing our three neighboring county directors said they are doing is getting their providers to look at self-sufficiency, and to get them thinking about operating without commission support/funding. Is this commission prepared to consider that? I may be pushing the envelope a little here; think we need to discuss the "worst case scenario."

Here are some questions I have:

What would this commission look like without state funding?

Is it not probable that Early Childhood funding/system changes will be taken out of the Commission's purview? If so, what is left? (CASA, Kids Club, Community Stewardship Corps) and other organizations/programs.

Would/could the Commission/County still support the programs of the Early Childhood Center financially?

What funds/programs does HCCCF see as in most need of funding/seeking grants for?

Teri's Comments on priorities below: Is the listing below incongruous with the statement on underage drinking? Does increasing parenting skills address reducing underage drinking? Or do we just need to state the connection more clearly? Does the list of priorities need to be reordered/reworked?

HCCCF Community Focus Issue 2008-2014

Reducing Underage Substance Abuse

(To me, this necessarily implies the Commission's commitment to the DFC grant and to reapplying for another five year cycle since it is the biggest single effort toward reducing underage substance abuse and community change around substance abuse issues.)

Community Priorities

1. Increase Parenting Skills.
2. Increase the quantity and quality of childcare options for families in Harney County.
3. Continue support to expand and improve the operations of the Kids Club of Harney County.
4. Reduce juvenile crime through prevention efforts and provide treatment to youth already in the system.
5. Provide intervention to middle and high school students that are identified as "acting out" by school counselors, juvenile department and other local sources.
6. Increase access to a variety of after school activities.

Attachment 2 of 3:

7. Increase funding opportunities to support implementation of HCCCF priorities.

The Commission's mission, from Bylaws:

To provide comprehensive planning, coordination, and advocacy for the wellness of children in Harney County and to engage State government in a discussion of how to best provide prevention services to children and families in the County.

Here is a short one I came up with:

Providing advocacy for families through prevention and support.

What is the Commission's vision?

Groups in Harney County that serve Families/Children/Youth (11/11)***= Providers of services via current HCCCF/state or federal funding**

<u>Name of Group</u>	<u>Type of Group/Target Population</u>	<u>Programs</u>	<u>Currently receive CCF/state Funding?</u>	<u>Collaborate with HCCCF? (1-5 scale with 5 highest)</u>
Harney Partners	Volunteer Community Coalition	Supports various programs and grants, DFC and Parenting grant with HCCCF	No	
Community Action Team	Community/agency Information sharing	Professionals in community service	No	
Symmetry Care	Mental Health and Referral, Supports Courts	D&A counseling/groups, mental health screenings,	No	
*Kids Club	Children/young adults 0-18	After school and vacation activities/safety	Yes	
*ESD: Healthy Start	Professional educators/parents & newborns	Home visiting, first time parent support	Yes	
*ESD: Great Start	Professional educators/preschool	Preschool programs	Yes	
*CASA: Court Appointed Special Advocates	Paid director supporting trained volunteer advocates	Volunteers support children in court for abuse/neglect/abandonment	Yes	
*TEC/Community Stewardship Corps	Paid director supporting h.s. youth in alternative school work program	Employment and job skills as training and incentive for students at Alternative school to get good grades and pay.	Yes	
Head Start	Director/staff	3-5	No	
EI/ECSE (Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Ed	Director/staff	0-5	No	

OSU Extension 4-H	Paid director with volunteers	4-H, etc	No	
Dept. Human Services	Professionals serving families needing safety & basic support	Adoption/foster care/advocacy for minors/custody/child support (?)	No	
HHOPE	Support for abused women and children	Temporary shelter, food, safety	No	
Harney County Public Health	Professional Health support	Immunizations, health info for kids and families	No	
Burns Dental Group	Professional Dentistry	Support to Great Start families	No	
High Desert Medical	Medical Care	Clinic/health services for families/individuals	No	
<u>Name of Group</u>	<u>Type of Group/Target Population</u>	<u>Programs</u>	<u>Currently receive CCF/state Funding?</u>	<u>Collaborate with HCCCF? (1-5 scale with 5 highest)</u>
<i>Mountain Sage Medical Rural Health</i>	Dr. Tom Fitzpatrick			
<u>Eyecare Providers (2)</u>	Professionals in Eye Care	Vision care services for families/individuals	No	
High Desert Physical Therapy	Physical Therapy Professionals/all ages	Free sports injury clinic for m.s./h.s. athletes	No	
Harney District Hospital	Medical for families/individuals	Emergency, specialized medical and hospitalization services	No	

Bodywise Sports Center	Family athletic training/exercise center	Exercise equipment, classes, facilities	No	
Sr. Center: Food bank	Director/staff/volunteers	Food bank, Dial-a-Ride, energy assistance	No	
Educational Service District		GED programs	No	
OYA			No	
County Juvenile Department	John Copenhaver	Support to juveniles on probation, needing direction; counseling/triage to unadjudicated youth & families	JCP via county, not Commission	
Paiute Tribe			No	
Library	Community Library	Teen Nights, safety, education, Reading club, storytime, toddler time	No	
Recreation Department	Paid Director	Youth baseball, soccer, football, basketball, youth wrestling, swimming programs	No	
TEC: Childcare Resource and Referral Center	Paid Director	Referrals to child care in area	No	
Schools	Traditional Basic Education, extracurricular activities/clubs & sports k-12	Gwen Haigh/Special programs to Native Americans & homeless students	No	
Nadzitsaga Lacrosse	Volunteer/6-18	Lacrosse sport & etiquette instruction, safety education	No	
Martial Arts America	Private Business. Pre-K-adult		No	

Harney Arts in Education		Fundraising for arts programs in H.C. schools	No	
Harney Arts Coalition		Distributes state money for arts	No	
Community in Action		Mortgage payment assistance through Or. Homeowner Stabilization Initiative	No	
All American Boxing				
Young Life				

GAPS/NEEDS in H.C.

Rural: ?

Youth Activities/Arts Center

Bowling Center

Non Sports After school enrichment

LCCF December Survey information and Instructions

In November 2011, OCCF surveyed Local Commissions for impacts of state General Fund reductions up to 10.5% in 3.5% increments. The high-level summary of the November survey results was emailed to all Local Commission and program directors/managers.

This new survey requests more detailed responses regarding the impact of reductions at each 3.5% increment. Please review each question carefully and respond to all questions for each reduction level. Where narrative responses are permitted, please be as concise as possible when responding.

This survey has been sent specifically to you, the director or manager of the county's Local Commission, and is specific to your email address. This survey may not be forwarded to others. Only one response per county per Local Commission will be accepted.

This survey opens Friday, December 2, 2012, and will close at midnight, Friday, January 13, 2012, allowing time for convening Local Commissions and/or partners prior to submitting responses to the survey questions.

The information gathered from this survey will be used to further inform the Governor's Office, Legislative Fiscal and the Ways and Means Human Services Subcommittee during the February 2012 Legislative Session.

Thank you for your participation.

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

*1. Select the Local Commission county.

Baker

Harney

Morrow

Benton

Hood River

Multnomah

Clackamas

Jackson

Polk

Clatsop

Jefferson

Sherman

Columbia

Josephine

Tillamook

Coos

Klamath

Umatilla

Crook

Lake

Union

Curry

Lane

Wallowa

Deschutes

Lincoln

Wasco

Douglas

Linn

Washington

Gilliam

Malhuer

Wheeler

Grant

Marion

Yamhill

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

Basic Capacity Grant Stream

The following questions, 2 through 10, are specific to the Basic Capacity Grant Stream. Please limit your responses to questions in this section to the BASIC CAPACITY grant gream ONLY.

***2.** Fifty-two percent (52%) of Local Commissions responding to previous survey indicated a negative impact to county staffing at the 3.5% reduction level.

Select the estimated Local Commission FTE that may be reduced at the 3.5% level.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >1.5 - 2.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >3.5 - 4.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >0 up to .5 | <input type="checkbox"/> >2.0 - 2.5 | <input type="checkbox"/> >4.5 - 5.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >.5 - 1.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >2.5 - 3.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5.0+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >1.0 - 1.5 | <input type="checkbox"/> >3.0 - 3.5 | |

Comments

***3.** Sixty-four percent (64%) of Local Commissions responding to previous survey indicated a negative impact to county staffing at the 7% level.

Select the estimated Local Commission FTE staff that may be reduced at a 7.0% reduction level.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >1.5 - 2.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >3.5 - 4.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >0 - .5 | <input type="checkbox"/> >2.0 - 2.5 | <input type="checkbox"/> >4.5 - 5.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >.5 - 1.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >2.5 - 3.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5.0+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >1.0 - 1.5 | <input type="checkbox"/> >3.0 - 3.5 | |

Other (please specify)

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

*** 4.** Sixty-four percent (64%) of Local Commissions responding to previous survey indicated a negative impact to county staffing at the 10.5% level,

Select the estimated Local Commission FTE staff that may be reduced at a 10.5% reduction level.

0

>1.5 - 2.0

>3.5 - 4.0

>0 - .5

>2.0 - 2.5

>4.5 - 5.0

>.5 - 1.0

>2.5 - 3.0

5.0+

>1. - 1.5

>3.0 - 3.5

Other (please specify)

*** 5.** Forty-three percent (43%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that Leveraged Funds would be negatively impacted at a 3.5% reduction level.

Insert theestimated dollar amount of cash and in-kind leverage generated by the Local Commission BASIC CAPACITY funds only for this response.

Cash

In-Kind

*** 6.** Sixty percent (60%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that Leveraged Funds would be negatively impacted at a 7.0% reduction level.

Insert the estimated dollar amount of cash and in-kind leverage generated by the Local Commission BASIC CAPACITY funds only for this response.

Cash

In-Kind

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

*7. Eight-three percent (83%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that Leveraged Funds would be negatively impacted at a 10.5% reduction level.

Insert the estimated dollar amount of cash and in-kind leverage generated by the Local Commission BASIC CAPACITY funds only for this response.

Cash

In-Kind

*8. Is it anticipated that the Local Commission will cease to function, be absorbed by another county agency, or be tranferred to a private non-profit as a result of a 3.5% reduction?

- Cease to function
- Absorbed by another county agency
- Transfer to private, non-profit
- Not known
- Other (please specify)

*9. Is it anticipated that the Local Commission will cease to function, be absorbed by another county agency, or be tranferred to a private non-profit as a result of a 7.0% reduction?

- Cease to function
- Absorbed by another county agency
- Transfer to private, non-profit
- Not known
- Other (please specify)

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

*10. Is it anticipated that the Local Commission will cease to function, be absorbed by another county agency, or be tranferred to a private non-profit as a result of a 10.50% reduction?

Cease to function

Absorbed by another county agency

Transfer to private, non-profit

Not known

Other (please specify)

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

Local Flexible General Fund Grant Streams

Respond to the questions in this section about local flexible investments of state General Fund...CHILDREN YOUTH AND FAMILIES (CYF), and GREAT START (GS)funds ONLY.

*** 11.** Forty-three (43%) of Local Commissions responding to previous survey indicated a negative impact to program staffing at the 3.5% reduction level.

Select the estimated Local Commission FTE that may be reduced at the 3.5% level.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >15.0 - 20.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >35.0 - 40.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >0 - 5.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >20.0 - 25.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >40.0 - 45.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >5.0 - 10.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >25.0 - 30.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >45.0+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >10.0 - 15.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >35.0 - 40.0 | |

Comments (If Program Staff are County staff, please indicate the number of County FTE in the Comments)

*** 12.** Sixty-four percent (64%) of Local Commissions responding to previous survey indicated a negative impact to program staffing at the 7.0% reduction level.

Select the estimated Local Commission FTE that may be reduced at the 7.0% level.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >15.0 - 20.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >35.0 - 40.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >0 - 5.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >20.0 - 25.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >40.0 - 45.0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >5. - 10.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >25.0 - 30.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >45.0+ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> >10.0 - 15.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> >30.0 - 35.0 | |

Comments (If Program Staff are County staff, please indicate the number of County FTE in the Comments)

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

* 13. Eight-eight percent (88%) of Local Commissions responding to previous survey indicated a negative impact to program staffing at the 10.5% reduction level.

Select the estimated Local Commission FTE that may be reduced at the 10.5% level.

0

>15.0 - 20.0

>40.0 - 45.0

>0 - 5.0

>20.0 - 25.0

>45.0+

>5.0 - 10.0

>25.0 - 30.0

>10.0 - 15.0

>35.0 - 40.0

Comments (If Program Staff are County staff, please indicate the number of County FTE in the Comments)

* 14. Forty-three percent (43%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that Leveraged Funds would be negatively impacted at a 3.5% reduction level.

Insert the estimated dollar amount of reduced cash and in-kind leverage generated by CYF and GS funds only for this response.

Cash

In-Kind

* 15. Sixty percent (60%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that Leveraged Funds would be negatively impacted at a 7.0% reduction level.

Insert the estimated dollar amount of reduced cash and in-kind leverage generated by CYF, GS and JCP (if applicable) funds only for this response.

Cash

In-Kind

* 16. Eight-three percent (83%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that Leveraged Funds would be negatively impacted at a 10.5% reduction level.

Insert the estimated dollar amount of reduced cash and in-kind leverage generated by CYF and GS funds only for this response.

Cash

In-kind

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

*** 17.** Fifty percent (50%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated a negative impact to numbers of children and families served would occur at the 3.5% reduction level. Insert your response in the box below that best describes which population (children, families or both) will lose service.

Estimate how many fewer children and families will receive program service funded by CYF and GS funds at the 3.5% reduction level. Do not include assumed numbers served in a Community Mobilization activity UNLESS there is a measurable and direct impact on individual children and families.

Children

Families

Both Children and Families

*** 18.** Sixty-four percent (64%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated a negative impact to numbers of children and families served would occur at the 7.0% reduction level. Insert your response in the box below that best describes which population (children, families or both) will lose service.

Estimate how many fewer children and families will receive program service funded by CYF and GS funds at the 7.0% reduction level. Do not include assumed numbers served in a Community Mobilization activity UNLESS there is a measurable and direct impact on individual children and families.

Children

Families

Both Children and Families

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

*19. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated a negative impact to numbers of children and families served would occur at the 10.5% reduction level. Insert your response in the box below that best describes which population (children, families or both) will lose service.

Estimate how many fewer children and families will receive program service funded by CYF and GS funds at the 10.5% reduction level. Do not include assumed numbers served in a Community Mobilization activity UNLESS there is a measurable and direct impact on individual children and families.

Children	<input type="text"/>
Families	<input type="text"/>
Both Children and Families	<input type="text"/>

*20. Twenty-five 25% of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that programs will close or be defunded at a 3.5% reduction level.

Estimate how many programs will close or be defunded as a result of a 3.5% reduction.

Closed	<input type="text"/>
Defunded	<input type="text"/>

*21. If you answered 1 or more to question #20, please indicate which or what types of programs are considered for closing or defunding. If you answered 0 in the previous question, please enter the text "N/A" in the following comment box.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

*22. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that programs will close or be defunded at a 7.0% reduction level.

Estimate how many programs will close or be defunded as a result of a 7.0% reduction.

Closed	<input type="text"/>
Defunded	<input type="text"/>

*23. If you answered 1 or more to question #22, please indicate which or what types of programs are considered for closing or defunding. If you answered 0 in the previous question, please enter the text "N/A" in the following comment box.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

* 24. Fifty (50%) of Local Commissions responding to the previous survey indicated that programs will close or be defunded at a 10.5% reduction level.

Estimate how many programs will close or be defunded as a result of a 10.5% reduction.

Closed

Defunded

* 25. If you answered 1 or more to question #24, please indicate which or what types of programs are considered for closing or defunding. If you answered 0 in the previous question, please enter the text "N/A" in the following comment box.

* 26. What percentage of the CYF and GS funds allocated to the Local Commission are allocated to Community Mobilizaton strategies?

Percentage:

* 27. How many Local Commission or other county staff positions are funded all or in part with CYF and GS funds for Community Mobilization activities?

Number of county FTE:

* 28. How many county FTE will be reduced as a result of reductions to CYF and GS funds?

FTE at 3.5%:

FTE at 7.0%:

FTE at 10.5%:

11-13 Reducton Options - December Survey

29. Responses to this question are optional. Use the following text box to enter any additional information regarding the three reduction levels that may be helpful to decision makers.

6