



Minutes of the Pre-Consultation Meeting

Date: May 8th, 2007

In attendance:

Name	Tribe/Organization
Carmelita Adkins	DSHS, IPSS Regions 4
Daryl Toulou	Colville Confederated Tribes
Andrew Joseph	Colville Confederated Tribes, Tribal Council
Willie Wolf	United Indians of All Tribes
Kaye Brisbios	Spokane Tribe
Jim Sherrill	Cowlitz Tribe
Tracy Bray	Chehalis Tribe
Ronda Metcalf	Sauk-Suiattle Tribe
Ann Reading	Lummi Tribe
Felice Keegahn	Lummi Tribe
Garnett Charles	DSHS, IPSS, Region 6 North
Doug Meyer	Makah Nation
Nancy Dufraime	CA-HQ, Lead ICW PM
Betsy Tulee	CA-HQ
Trudy Marcellay	DSHS, IPSS Region 6 South
Toni Lodge	Native Project
Lawrence Hall	Quinault Nation
Pamela Hammond	Squaxin Island Tribe
Doug Meyer	Makah Nation
Pat Gans	Stilliguamish Tribe
Kathy Picard	Region 1 ICW Program Manager
Kim Thomas	Shoalwater Tribe
Sophie Tonasket	American Indian Community Center (AICC)
Colleen Cawston	IPSS, HQ
Linda Lauch	AICC
Belle Innes	AICC
Janice W. Mabee	Sauk Suiattle, Chair
Janice Banning	Region 3, ICW Program Manager

Cheryl Miller	Skokomish Tribe
LouAnn Carter	Region 3, CA (by phone)
Gwen Gua	SPIPA (by phone)
Whitney Jones	Squaxin Island Tribe (by phone)
Sheila Huber	AAG, Representing CA
Gina Beckwith	Port Gamble Tribe
Liz Mueller	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, Vice Chair
Marilyn Scott	Upper Skagit Tribe, Chair

Next Meeting May 14th, 10:00 to 1:00
DSHS,
OB-2, SL03 (basement floor, near cafeteria)
1115 Washington St SE
Olympia, WA. 98504

Consultation Meeting: May 30th, 2007
Little Creek Casino
Squaxin Island Tribe

MINUTES:

Agenda Item	Discussion	Disposition
Overview of Consultation Process	<p>Nancy Dufraine provided overview of Process; This meeting is a series of workgroup meetings that are preparation for the Consultation meeting scheduled for May 30th 2007. The two issues on the table for the Consultation Process are the CA ICW funding distribution and the development of a template for the CA-Tribal Local Agreements. The request for this came from tribal Leaders at IPAC and at the Centennial Accord meeting. It is expected that those attending the meeting participate in developing options for Tribal leaders and the Secretary of DSHS to discuss and choose from at the May 30th meeting. Colleen Cawston noted that in a previous Consultation process (with DASA funding) that the time was given beyond the actual Consultation for Tribal leaders to provide their feedback and positions to the issues at hand and she expects that this will occur again.</p>	
CA Funding distribution	<p>Nancy Dufraine led discussion on the funding distribution of CA ICW funds that are contracted out to Tribes and Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIO's). Nancy also shared the different proposed funding distributions formulas. Some of the different options for funding distribution include using a 30/70 split (30 base funding and 70 distribution based on population) and 50/50 split, or equal distribution. The population options on the table to choose from include the BIA</p>	<p>Three questions will be asked at the Consultation are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which methodology should be used (30/70, 50/50, equal distribution etc.) • Which population base

count, the IHS count.

Another question to discuss and present as options to choose from is whether to look at the entire CA ICW budget, or just the increased funds approved by the legislators and Governor this year. (The ICW funds are State dollars only).

The question was asked how to conduct population count for the Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIO's) and how to factor them into the funding distribution.

Toni Lodge suggested using census numbers.

Ann Reading asked how IHS user numbers are calculated.

Jim Sherrill responded that the count is based on anyone using the IHS clinic during the previous 3 years at least one time and with Native American documentation.

Nancy distributed handouts; the one dated 4/11/07 has the distribution break out of the new dollars and the newer one has the full ICW broken out with the different distribution methods.

Nancy also shared a document that John George had faxed to her that spoke to how the funds were originally distributed.

IPSS typed up the fax (it was sent with meeting attachments).

The numbers were originally based on juvenile populations but IPAC has determined that we will include adult and child populations.

Three questions will be asked at the Consultation are;

- Which methodology should be used (30/70, 50/50, equal distribution etc.)
- Which population base should be used (IHS, BIA, census etc),
- Should we consider the distribution for the entire ICW budget or only the new funds?

Jim Sherrill asked what the historical and current purposes that these funds are intended for.

Toni Lodge stated that she recalls the original intent was to provide active efforts to keep children in their own families and/or communities.

Don Milligan also noted that they were intended as research and demonstration grants to 5 entities to support them to become child placing agencies and beyond that it was pretty open ended.

The funds were also intended to assist in infrastructure development.

Nancy said she recalled in the early 1990's having to identify what services would be performed with the funds.

It was noted that it is currently fairly open ended how the funds will be used as long as it is ICW related; the funding could be used for staff salary, concrete services, indirect costs etc.

should be used (IHS, BIA, census etc),

- **Should we consider the distribution for the entire ICW budget or only the new funds?**

Nancy noted that the some of the basis for the requests for additional funding this year was based on the expected increased caseloads due to the Neglect legislation, as well as the highly disproportionate number of Indian children and families involved in child welfare and the disparity of services available to Indian children and families.

Nancy stressed the importance of keeping data by both tribes and the State as data drives everything (including budgets).

Jim S asked what active efforts RAIO's provide.

Toni Lodge stated some of the things the Spokane Indian Center use these funds for include assisting with enrollment, LICWAC participation, CPT participation, advocacy in court including experts witness testimony, working with families to keep families intact. She said there are 127 different tribal affiliations represented in the Spokane area. She also noted that there are 660 foster children placed in Spokane county and they are predominantly in non Indian homes. She said her agency has a contract to conduct sex abuse exams; it is paid out of another budget but the ICW budget pays for court testimony of the medical staff and social work staff as needed. They have also conducted training for judges, foster parents.

Sophie Tonasket stated the Native Project conducts home studies upon requests by Tribes, and provides support to Indian children and families throughout the county, including visitation services, advocacy etc.

Don Milligan said the dollars also pay for assistance in the development of case plans for the tribes he serves, attendance at court hearings, advocacy including at LICWAC and CPT, foster home referrals, child/adult cultural groups and activities, and prevention activities.

Jim Sherrill asked if the legislature expects these funds to only be spent on Washington State Indian children-Nancy said no, it is not that restrictive.

Ronda Metcalf asked what the specific definition is for ICW that went to the legislature and the Governor.

Nancy said it was not detailed down.

Liz Mueller noted that this current group is to come up with options and gather information to share with tribal leaders and the Secretary of DSHS; the Secretary and tribal leaders will make the final decisions.

Gina Beckworth noted that each of the tribes will do their own analysis. Port Gamble has submitted a proposal and she asked that it be distributed with other proposals (it was agreed this would be done).

Jim S. said he is still struggling with how to do population counts for RAIO's.

	<p>Nancy noted that using census figures was recommended. Jim noted this would be problematic for tribes. Nancy agreed, especially as some tribes straddle county lines. Marilyn Scott also noted that the census is problematic as the multi race questions can skew that data. Nancy suggested that it just be used for RAIO's. Marilyn agreed. Toni Lodge noted that she hopes that no tribe or RAIO takes a cut in light of the budget increase. Ronda Metcalf noted that she has concerns with using census for urban children; there are about 4-5 Sauk- Suiattle families in King county and no organization has been providing services to them. Andy Joseph noted that if we had enough people working on ICW issues then we would not have so highly disproportionate statistics for Indian children and families. The funding is clearly inadequate. He noted he would not like to see Indian Organizations take a cut and would like to see them get an increase. He noted that an option he would like to put forth is to use option one for the existing funds and include Indian Organizations and use option two for the new funds for tribes, using the BIA population with a 30/70 split. This would allow an increase for all contracts.</p>	
<p>Local Agreements</p>	<p>Nancy Dufraime and Sheila Huber lead discussion on the development of a template for Local Agreements. Nancy noted that Tribal leaders had voiced concern at IPAC and the Centennial Accord meeting about the disparity of services for Indian children and families and disproportionate number of Indian children and families involved in the child welfare system. Local agreements can provide a means to communicate to tribes and the State how to best access services for tribal programs that serve Indian children and families.</p> <p>There are also issues of concern with the Local Agreements across the State; some are signed some are not, some are signed by social work staff but not by leadership at both the Tribal and State level, there is a lack of consistency in how they are developed, many people are not aware of these agreements.</p> <p>It was decided it would be helpful to develop a template that would be flexible enough to meet the unique needs of different tribes but consistent enough to provide guidance and support.</p> <p>CA is still in the process of developing a list of services available and how to access that will be an attachment to the agreements.</p>	<p>The group made further recommendations; the new draft will be sent out at latest Monday 5/14/07.</p> <p>Two questions put forth for the Consultation meeting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the issues related to moving forward with a baseline local ICW agreement individualized to meet each Tribe's needs and is their agreement to

This has been an issue of concern in his area.

Kaye Brisbois noted that often times the Spokane tribe will call to request services and be turned down and be told that since Spokane is a tribe they should have and utilize their own services. She suggests the Agreement speak to contracting and subcontracting. This has been more pronounced in requests for psychological/psychiatric services.

Colleen C. noted that the Agreements can have a list of services, how to access them and how to contact if there are obstacles and also noted that these templates can be tailored to each tribe.

Nancy encouraged tribal attorneys to be involved in review of the template.

Ronda said the Sauk-Suiattle tribes has spent a great deal of time on their Local Agreement but it is still not being followed; for example background checks are part of the Agreement (to be done by CA for the Tribe) but they are still not being completed.

Nancy noted other tribes have shared this concern. She recommended that Tribal Liaisons be contacted and/or Regional ICW Liaison's.

Hopefully getting these Agreements done and then putting them online will help as well.

Ann Reading noted that page two of the draft regarding exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction would not fit with Lummi's tribal codes. Sheila agreed the language may be problematic and is planning to consult with legal expert.

Issue to address is who should have the authority to negotiate and sign the Agreements.

Ann Reading followed up with suggestion to develop a protocol to develop the Agreements.

Daryl suggested that signatures start at the bottom level and work its way up the chain of command so that all levels of staff are aware of the Agreement. He also suggested that under '10' 'Collaborative Action' that a piece be included allowing Tribes equal opportunity to attend trainings.

Kathy Picard noted that we have a communication protocol now in place that should assist with barriers to services and communication breakdowns.

Sheila noted it will be referenced as an attachment.

Carmelita noted it will be helpful to have them posted on line so they can be accessed statewide and also it will be helpful with the high staff turnover.

Toni said that there has been concern about policies and protocols around confidentiality and release of information.

Sheila noted that she and others are now in the process of developing a reference guide for this issue.

Daryl suggested a signature line be included for AAG's.

- move forward?**
- **Who will have the authority to negotiate and approve the Local ICW Agreement from the Tribal governments and the State government**

HB 1201	<p>Colleen Cawston shared that HB 1201 has passed that allows foster children (State or tribal) to continue to receive Medicaid until age 21. This includes children in relative care.</p> <p>Roger Gantz, of HRSA is planning to come to the June meeting to figure out how to capture the numbers including tribal youth/children.</p>	
---------	--	--