

Purpose of the CWAC Subcommittee:

The CWAC Subcommittee (hereinafter called the Subcommittee) discussed the purpose of this newly formed group and the CWAC's history of previous subcommittees. Clarification on the purpose and charter, as set out by the CWAC, of the previous Subcommittee was discussed. The purpose of the Subcommittee is to explore possible options for changes/modifications to the Child Welfare allocation. In addition, the Subcommittee will make recommendations regarding the implementation of HB 11-1196, the Core Services allocation, squeezes, and how the model "turned on" has affected Counties. The Subcommittee will make recommendations directly to the CWAC.

Subcommittee operational items:

The membership of the Subcommittee was discussed and will be inclusive, not exclusive, with its membership.

The Subcommittee discussed that attendance is not mandatory but will follow the precedence set forth by the Colorado Works Allocation Committee, which is for members that are unable to participate at the time a decision is made the group will not revisit items previously discussed.

The Subcommittee decided that ruling on an item will be done by consensus to start, but may need to move to a vote if consensus cannot be reached. In the event the Subcommittee moves to a vote, each County will have one vote. The State will also have one vote.

The Subcommittee discussed and set times, dates and location, for the meetings. The Subcommittee initially will meet the first Tuesday of every month, from 10 am – 4 pm at Colorado Counties, Inc. 5th floor, Denver Co 80203. Meetings may not require the entire time once the Subcommittee moves forward with discussion of the items.

The dates for the meetings are-

September 6, 2011

October 4, 2011

November 1, 2011

The Subcommittee discussed the necessity of having any recommendations set and brought before the CWAC by the end of the November meeting in order for the CWAC to approve any recommendations in December for items concerning the next year's allocation.

Prioritization of issues:

The Subcommittee was charged with addressing the issues put forth by Douglas County. The Subcommittee discussed and reviewed the items and determined eleven items needed

to be addressed. In addition to the initial Douglas County items, the implementation of HB 11-1196 was added, and the effects that current initiatives have on Child Welfare allocations. The priority was set for the first five items that the Subcommittee would address. The remaining six items will be addressed and prioritized after the completion of the first five items.

Priority One -

1. More clearly identify the 4% mitigation pool funds taken off the top of the BOS County allocations as part of each County's allocation. Should the funds be budgeted by BOS Counties? Otherwise it appears a County needs to "overspend" in order to access it. (CWAC Charge and Priority)

Discussion by the Subcommittee centered on the request to not require a mitigation pool of 4% for BOS Counties, so that they could budget this portion with the rest of their allocation. Most Counties already budget this portion during the fiscal year, as this portion of the allocation is returned first to the County. The Subcommittee voted to keep the mitigation pool, and BOS Counties can budget these funds during the fiscal year.

2. Explore the concept of Counties buying allocation from other counties that are not planning to spend all their CW allocation, which is an option with TANF and Child Care allocations. (CWAC Charge and Priority)

Discussion by the Subcommittee centered on the fact that this allocation does not have a maintenance-of-effort requirement similar to the TANF and Child Care allocations. The Subcommittee did not approve this recommendation.

3. Review both the proposed allocation and the numbers driving the model. The issues of the squeezes, poverty, and capped expenditures used within the model will be reviewed.

The State provided information on the numbers driving the model and the proposed allocations.

Consensus Items:

- Not everybody likes the model, and not everybody dislikes the model. Perhaps we keep using the model, with some minor adjustments.
- The Subcommittee still agrees that expenditures should not drive the model, but they are important.
- Poverty should be included in the model. The Subcommittee did not reach consensus on whether or not poverty was already factored in the model. The Subcommittee will continue to explore the poverty issue further.

Should the model be more predictable? It is a good question that needs further exploration. While the Counties prefer predictability, and need flexibility for various needs as they arise, these two factors are not related. Being able to predict the allocation does not reflect spending flexibility

Two sub-groups were formed - CW Services formula sub-group and the Core Allocation sub-group.

The consensus vote of the Sub-committee was to use the current formula for child welfare services with minor changes as demonstrated with Formula one (attached).

4. Request that the State Department of Human Services revisit the idea of, and incorporate funding, for a Child Welfare workload study. Once a workload study is completed, evaluate how the information will be factored into the allocation formula.

The Subcommittee decided that there would be no recommendation to the State Department of Human Services to revisit the idea of funding a workload study.

5. Discuss how funding shifts affect funding that is allocated for Subsidy Adoptions within the allocation model. Discuss how these shifts in funding create possible unfunded mandates within the Counties.

The Subcommittee discussed this item, it is beyond the scope of this Subcommittee, and agreed no recommendation was to come forward.

Priority Two -

6. The implementation of HB 11-1196.

This item was discussed in relation to item #9. Tabled for later discussion

7. Since Douglas County is a large population, can more money or a greater percentage of funds be added to the BOS allocation than is currently allowed for within the 18.2%?

The Subcommittee discussed this item and agreed to recommend no changes to the current distribution of funds between the BOS and TLC counties. (re-visit)

8. Work to end the notion of “have and have not” Counties.

The Subcommittee discussed this item and agreed no recommendation was to come forward.

9. Update the current Core Services allocation to reflect the current needs of the Counties.

Consensus items:

- The TLC and BOS (27%-73%) funding split remains the same for the initial stage of implementing an allocation formula for the distribution of CORE funds.
- The models maintain the separation between the CORE Services funding and the funding for the Child Welfare allocation.
- The models include funding for all counties at a minimum of \$25,000.
- The models use data that is used and commonly accepted in other allocations such as the Child Welfare and the CO WORKS allocations.

10. Review the current designation of which Counties are included in the TLC and the BOS.

The Subcommittee discussed this item and agreed to make no changes to the current designation. (re-visit)

11. Discussion of the Colorado Practice Model and the current initiatives within Child Welfare.

****Recommendation to the CWAC to keep a standing allocation methodologies Subcommittee. This Subcommittee would continually monitor the allocations to ensure they are doing what is intended.**

Invested in the success of all counties.