

**Human Services Council Meeting**  
**Monday, March 1, 2010**  
**Government Center, Conference Rooms 4 & 5**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>		<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	
<b>Kevin H. Bell, Chairman</b>	<i>Excused</i>	<b>Tom Grodek</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>Colonel Marion Barnwell</b>	<i>Present</i>	<b>Carol Hawn</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>Richard P. Berger</b>	<i>Present</i>	<b>Bill Kogler</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>Wendy Breseman</b>	<i>Present</i>	<b>Herk Latimer</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>John Byers</b>	<i>Present</i>	<b>Laura I. McDowall</b>	<i>Excused</i>
<b>Robert L. Faherty</b>	<i>Excused</i>	<b>Stephanie Mensh</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>Donna J. Fleming</b>	<i>Present</i>	<b>Kathleen Murphy</b>	<i>Excused</i>
<b>Baba Freeman</b>	<i>Present</i>	<b>Dr. Virginia P. Norton</b>	<i>Excused</i>
<b>Robert Gaudian</b>	<i>Excused</i>	<b>Herbert James Smith</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>Richard Gonzalez</b>	<i>Excused</i>	<b>Henry Wulf</b>	<i>Present</i>
<b>Staff:</b>			
<b>Patricia Harrison, Deputy County Executive</b>			<i>Present</i>
<b>Gail Ledford, Department of Administration for Human Services (DAHS)</b>			<i>Present</i>
<b>Ron McDevitt, Department of Administration for Human Services (DAHS)</b>			<i>Present</i>
<b>Ken Disselkoen, Department of Systems Management for Human Services (DSMHS)</b>			<i>Present</i>
<b>Chip Gertzog, Department of Systems Management for Human Services (DSMHS)</b>			<i>Present</i>
<b>Deborah H. Gutierrez, Department of Systems Management for Human Services (DSMHS)</b>			<i>Present</i>

**Guests and Other Attendees:** Dean Klein, Toya Taylor, Nannette Bowler, George Braunstein, Marlene Bluhm; Diane Hoyer, Glynda May Hall, Michelle Jones, Ina Fernandez, John Dargle, Chris Leonard, Marijke Hannam, Barbara Antley, Grace Starbird, Thomas Golian, Barney, and Chuck Pappato.

**7:35 PM**

**Call to Order**

Henry Wulf called the meeting to order at 7:35 PM.

Pat Harrison made opening remarks about the agenda order for this evening's meeting and reviewed FY 2011 Budget related handouts that would be covered. She made special note of the initial DRAFT Strategic Framework for System-wide Resource and Service Planning presentation that she would review with the Council in advance of budget discussions.

**7:40-8:40 PM**

**Overview of Human Services Reductions**

Pat Harrison reviewed the Human Services FY 2011 Budget Presentation, "A Framework for System-wide Resource and Service Planning" and noted FY2011 was an historical Human Services budget reduction when put in perspective to previous budget years.

She highlighted the following regarding the FY 2011 Human Services Budget:

- ◆ contains restructuring/redesign/realignment initiatives which will result in approximately \$6.6M in savings,

**Human Services Council Meeting**  
**Monday, March 1, 2010**  
**Government Center, Conference Rooms 4 & 5**

- ◆ includes total associated reductions from other county agencies that affect human service delivery,
- ◆ incorporates revenue initiatives which focus on right-sizing the budget,
- ◆ includes 14 new staff positions to staff new facilities and fill critical needs,
- ◆ takes into account the accumulative affect on indirect and direct service provision,
- ◆ state budget reductions will directly impact county's budget and additional state budget reductions are expected and county will continue to look for ways to best leverage all state and federal stimulus funds received,
- ◆ incorporates shifts in the way we do business and partners with Faith-based organizations and community-based organizations to design a new way of doing business at reduced costs, in accordance with best practices, while maintaining core mandated services,
- ◆ contains funding included for baseline spending requirements with special focus on cross-system impacts,
- ◆ identifies five cross-systems strategic focus areas and related key initiatives prioritized for the next two years with an emphasis on how to institutionalize good outcomes for individuals and families.
- ◆ incorporates the overall goal of greater united service delivery by identifying desired outcomes and measures and communicates them to the communities served, and
- ◆ embraces the opportunity to look at the way we are currently doing business and leveraging existing funding and resources to include the non-profits and community and faith based organizations.

Ultimately the county can no longer be the sole source provider of services nor should it be expected to be the sole source provider. This budget encourages us to reorient with an emphasis on community partnering and involvement to meet community needs.

**Tom Grodek**: What is the total impact of reductions? Will money be left over or will there be big holes and additional money needed from FY11 to cover? Have the shortfalls from FY10 been identified? **Response**: We are still waiting on 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter results. The snow storms reduced \$6M of reserves; however, all agencies submitted their 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter budgets and all seems well.

**Stephanie Mensh**: What are the cross-cutting assessments around certain populations like disabilities and non-profits? **Response**: This is the first draft from the Disabilities Services Board and focuses on older persons' long-term care needs and includes the community funding pool, which continues emergency funding for non-profits.

Transportation remains a cross-section which more analysis is to come and more from CSB on those with disabilities. Note the 5 areas and Ron McDevitt is looking by service area at the cross budget reductions.

**Henry Wulf**: You mentioned 4/5 strategic focus areas. What didn't make the cut? What others are there that we are not looking at? **Response**: Specifically, disproportionality and capacity building because they cross-cut all of the focus areas and need to be imbedded like transportation issues.

**Tom Grodek**: These initiatives, has the School based its budget reductions on this model? In whose budget should these services reside – school or county? Does this not set us up for

**Human Services Council Meeting**  
**Monday, March 1, 2010**  
**Government Center, Conference Rooms 4 & 5**

challenges for years to come? **Response:** We are piloting how to put together teams (i.e. an insurance agent) and for the county to help schools, who have children & families with needs. For example, the SMART committee is joint schools and county working on their own initiatives and yet when new schools are being planned the question to be asked is how do we build in human services needs into the model? (i.e. The Park Authority has been looking to coordinate with schools for years.)

**8:40-8:55 PM**

**Office for Women & Domestic and Sexual Violence Services**

Ina Fernandez and Diane Hoyer, with the Commission for Women, presented which is the first of several co-presentations of county agencies and their related BAC.

Last year the Office for Women and Domestic and Sexual Violence Services was held uncut because it had just gone through a redesign and reorganization effort. However, for FY 2011, the agency has to offer cuts of one Management Analyst position which supports the Commission for Women. Unfortunately it is currently a filled position and an additional cut of one ½ full time administrative support position. Additionally, interpretation and translation services will be greatly impacted because the DSVS shelter will be impacted. Overall this is a huge impact on small agency.

**Henry Wulf:** In percentage what is the proposed reduction in dollars and in people? **Response:** Out of an agency of 28-30 people to lose 1 & 1/2 positions is a sizeable cut and impact.

**Carol Hawn:** This means no county staff support for the Commission – not anyone at meetings? The Commission will be solely on their own and Commission volunteers will be relied upon so how can the Commission serve the county and BOS properly? **Response:** Correct, the Commission will not have any staff support.

**Carol Hawn:** I am just clarifying that numbers 7, 11, & 13 on the budget summary are the reductions you described? **Response:** Yes; however the limited term position is not recorded in summary on page 4 because it is not a full time merit position. Nor is it the 35 position count. We are looking at staff support for BACs and how it is a multi-year endeavor. Apparently, staff support for 2 BACs are up for now from HS budget this first year.

**Stephanie Mensh:** Does the Commission follow a state/ federal mandate? **Response:** The Commission is policy forming and works with issues that impact (i.e. girl softball equity issue) girls and women. It is a part of the national commission group.

**8:55-9:30 PM**

**Review Older Adult Services Consolidated Budget and Reductions**

Chip Gertzog reviewed the process began last summer. The Deputy County Executive wanted to look at a consolidated Human Services budget and make it a collaborative effort. Fiscal and programmatic integrity was of utmost importance and representatives from CRS, DFS, DFS-AAA, HD, DAHS, and DSMHS. The group was faced with the challenge of a budget reduction goal of \$1.5M.

Chip presented an overview of the process:

**Human Services Council Meeting**  
**Monday, March 1, 2010**  
**Government Center, Conference Rooms 4 & 5**

- ◆ It is a comprehensive planning initiative from a cross-system perspective.
- ◆ The framework's primary focus is to be an education and communication tool.
- ◆ The framework outlines the plan for current and future performance outcomes and measures against past performance and allows for monitoring with a look to the future.
- ◆ The framework allows for unified and comprehensive budget and resource planning.
- ◆ The comprehensive budget plan focused on five areas of county spending:
  - Services to older and active adults
  - Services to older adults in need of additional help
  - Services to vulnerable and incapacitate adults in need of protection
  - System-wide planning and community capacity building and engagement
  - System-wide transportation supporting older adult services.
- ◆ The framework is a living and breathing tool to catalog current services and recipients; service delivery trends; analysis of unmet needs; current initiatives; and future strategies, including FY 2011 budget reductions.
- ◆ The comprehensive budget plan will use spreadsheet format tool to highlight by focus area the programs, their respective agency/fund, as well as data from:
  - the FY 2009 Actual budget,
  - the FY 2010 Adopted Budget Plan,
  - the FY 2010 County Net Cost,
  - the FY 2010 Merit position count,
  - the proposed expenditure reductions and related position count, and
  - the FY 2011 projected net costs with cuts.
- ◆ The overall proposed expenditure reductions have a ripple impact and most visibly on the long-term care services provision because it is the most well integrated of services.

In summary, the comprehensive budget reductions to programs for older adults and younger adults with disabilities, as proposed, were crafted under the premise of lower costs without lower service levels and significant harm to the programs; looking for service efficiencies and not reductions nor pure cuts of programs.

**Donna Fleming:** What entails the FY2010 county net cost? Is it just what the county net expends? **Response:** It is the county impact on the General Fund.

**Donna Fleming:** In looking at number 8 on the last page of the presentation and considering the potential impact through tasks based service delivery, how will the possible reduction of the number of tasks the county be willing to pay for impact the budget. I will look to Barbara to explain further at the appropriate presentation. **Response:** Also looming large is the significant reduction of state funding, which is a greater impact when we have created level funding based programs.

**Stephanie Mensh:** Where does the level happen to fall, when an individual goes into nursing home care because home care needs can't be met?

**Tom Grodek:** Please explain number 3 and number 8. **Response:** Combined 12 and 50 from Ron McDevitt's spreadsheet, basically 15% of the budget went to younger adults with disabilities and 85% went to older adults.

**Human Services Council Meeting**  
**Monday, March 1, 2010**  
**Government Center, Conference Rooms 4 & 5**

**Baba Freeman**: What does the red ink on the chart mean? **Response**: Revenue, a little money above and Lincolnia is good because it is zero.

**Henry Wulf**: Is this planning process applicable to other areas? Will this model be applied to other areas? **Response**: Yes, we would like work on children's services next because it is a much larger system. We would like to make this model work and would like to roll out to other areas. Initially we started with staff to build the model and need to fold in a community to this process.

**Stephanie Mensh**: 5 focus areas and 4 categories? Is this correct? **Response**: This will be fixed for the next time. In the slides, I apparently left out one category.

**Henry Wulf**: Seniors on the go is this taxi services? The Library reductions are not cataloged here? **Response**: Yes. This project was started back in July and initially the Library reductions were included and then pulled out; however, we would like to work with Sam Clay to include.

**9:30 PM**

**Other Business**

**Approval of Minutes**: The February 23, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with corrections as Baba Freeman noted.

The Council was reminded that March 8<sup>th</sup> is the next meeting date. Chip reviewed schedule

**9:35 PM**

**Adjournment**

**Staff Support Information (also included on updated roster):**

1. **Chip Gertzog**: 703-324-7959 Fax 703-324-7572 E-mail: [Cgertz@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:Cgertz@fairfaxcounty.gov)
2. **Judy Greene**: 703-324-5640 Fax 703-324-7572 E-mail: [Jgreen@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:Jgreen@fairfaxcounty.gov)
3. **Deborah Gutierrez**: 703-324-7132 Fax 703-324-7572 E-mail: [Dgutie@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:Dgutie@fairfaxcounty.gov)