minutes

TANF Advisory Council		
4.28.2016	1:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.	Holiday Inn Express, Helena
Attendees	See attached	
Housekeeping, Introductions, Consensus on Decision Making		
Discussion	Reviewed the consensus decision making process.	
Conclusions	All were in agreement	
TANF 101/Fiscal Overview of TANF		
30 min	Stephanie Wilkins (TANF Program Manager)/Candee Krantz (Human and Community Services Division Fiscal Bureau Chief)	
Discussion	Stephanie covered the four purposes of TANF, and the changes that took place due to Strategic Planning and action from HCSD. Click here for April 28 presentations Candee covered the general guidelines of the Fiscal impacts from TANF.	
Conclusions		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
none		
Strategic Plan		
45 min	Jamie Palagi, Human and Community Services Division Administrator	

Discussion	Click here for April 28 presentations Recommendation key-Green=complete; Yellow=in process/continual updating; Red=not started
	
	Following are some highlights of areas that are completed or in process resulting from Strategic Planning Recommendations:
	• We will not pilot a new Service Delivery Agreement (SDA) but will look forward to working together to refine a model for TANF
	• Participation rate-Pulled out 2 parent families with incapacity, or disability from the participation rate. Taking it out of the federal equation and we don't take a hit. We haven't changed our expectations, we understand there might be a reason you can't meet them. They are still sanctioned if they don't meet the requirements.
	• Rules related to post employment-they have to keep working, verify income at 6 months, with minimal payment and work pay incentive. More supports and less difficult to stay in the program.
	  ○ Are they closed due to income but not with full-time work?-*yes However, they will not have a time clock to limit them back on the post-employment program*.
	  ○ When does the clock stop? –*only if they're in the Presumptive Eligibility program*
	• We tried to pull out all the constraints that we legally could in supportive services.
	• Identified places we need to improve the system to get reports that are specific to TANF, which is part of the CHIMES dollars in budget.
	
	RFP for services is coming! To maintain integrity of that process, questions that are asked today may not be answered, but can be addressed in the RFP process. Transparency is the goal to remain in good relations.
	• **Contract extensions**: Second chance homes will be extended through 6/2017. All other contracts, 12/2016.
	• All that have been funded through TANF are very worthy groups. However, TANF dollars will be used to those that are TANF eligible, honoring the strategic plan, and federal rules for those that are subject to the 60 month limit.
	• Plan is to repurpose the existing funds-to stay solvent over the long term, to avoid cutting funds. Funding has been at 13 million, new proposed of 12 million
	• RFP is in the draft stages- changing policy, computer systems (See slide show for goals), driving program design with new model.
	• TANF regions remain the same level that we have been using.
	  ○ Only adjustment is combining Eastern side of Montana to one region
	• 30 days are required for responses, for service delivery needs to apply that start in January, even if they are extended.	

minutes

TANF Advisory Council	
	Questions * Mary Caferro-who are we talking about? *Families that need TANF, could be someone that needs a one-time cash assistance, etc* * Where does meeting the WPR fit into this? *We still have to meet our rates, what we are saying to people delivering services-that's not your worry, that is the state's problem to deal with. But I think we will see more success with this model. We will be looking at data to make sure our program is doing what we want it to do.* * Individual needs other services, walk through what the provider will be allowed to do. *If they're being recipients of services other than the case manager piece we'll have to work through that. They need to follow the rules if they are receiving benefits. Or work with other services might have more flexibility in what their needs are.*

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
ACEs training-invite Tribes that have TANF programs	Stephanie	

Break 2:35-2:55	
Reactions/Questions	
60 min	Public & Council
Discussion	• Presentation was well received and impressed with the work that has been done along with the undertaking of future improvements of the TANF program. Very progressive, innovative with thinking outside the box meeting federal criteria, and progress will be made with that. • The participation rate will only be an outcome of the quality of the program • To cut back on the nervousness, tell us what you want and what will be required. *Might also expect there might be a checkbox we agree to continue working with the State,, because we know we don't have it all figured out* • Suggestion of a Bidder's conference –*This is a procurement process. It will be one RFP, not multiple. A bidder's conference is an informal process to ask questions after reading the RFP. Sometimes things don't come out as clear as we like to think, and it might provide some clarity moving forward.* • Mary showed concern with Jefferson county region moving to being served by one region. Whitehall should stay in southern Jefferson County. Dynamic changes if the population changes regions. *Data & numbers- made more sense to combine the whole county in one region.TANF participant can go to any county to receive services. For instance, clients from Whitehall go to the OPA in Butte.* • Nanette expressed that change is very scary and a sense is here, but it is being done with such eloquence and everyone is willing to jump in and make the effort to serve the family. • Arlene asked about Felons and our ability to work specifically with Native Americans - how we can help as a board • Heather asked about the Regions also serving tribe areas. If it's one contract per region-what does that look like. *If they have their own tribal program NEW varies based on the region. In any region there is generally more than one county; part of their proposal might ask how they will provide quality and consistency to those areas. State rules are so very different than tribal rules.* • Will TANF participants have the ability to access education? *We will get to as flexible a place as we can get. With a complete assessment plan – 'Here's how we can support you, and all the other services that can help you meet your goals.'* • In some cases we can't offer cash assistance to those that are at 50%, but can still help through supportive services. Person is family centered; they have real needs we need to figure out a way to support them. Through brokering services, education & training, they may possibly get income into their household to help them meet their goals. Education is part of the pathways. • Within the RFP process, weight should be given to those that have been doing this for decades and local connections. How do we take what we know has worked and fit it in. *It is very valuable, hoping to get to it through questions with points assigned. May not be able to restrict Montana companies, but may be 'how do you know what is happening in these communities'. Agencies who respond to this proposal are responding to an integrated program 0-200% eligible. Whether it is one agency, subcontract, multiple agencies.*

minutes

TANF Advisory Council	

	• RFP-In serving American Indians-reaction to having separate regions for serving the same reservation area, do we think that would help provide better cultural services? *Government to government it does not have to be done through an RFP.*
	• Referring to the strategic plan and the needs the reservations have for service for those that don't have their own program. *Expect that there will be questions regarding that in the RFP*
	• Sanctions-the team will start looking at policy and what can be done so that is not as restrictive,
	• How will responses for Cash and non-cash be conducted?
	• HCSD is looking for people to review the RFP that is not involved in the process at all. Might be looking for RFP reviewer committee. Challenge is that it is super time consuming, with a minimum of 19 proposals. Will evaluate asking previous TANF clients to get involved. Check into state code if we can pay for RFP reviewing.
	• This creates greater collaboration within regions, a lot of examples of past TANF participants that had no idea they were available. It was mentioned collaboration is really important. Aside from the fact it is better in serving people, it is efficiency in state government for oversight, and consistency. At various times based on the region some are operating under different RFP, and need to focus on service delivery and get on the same schedule.
	• The carryover, the lowest it has gotten is 5mil-feels 13 million should be committed to the new RFP, and 1 million should be coming from the carryover.
	• The overall budget picture, most of the money benefits families. This proposal looks like it most of it benefits TANF families, but there are many things that will have to come from other areas. So much needs to be looked at.
	• Whatever we do here could be readjusted in legislation. Executive branch, legislation, pilot projects have funneled money into this.
	• Would like to see consistency with TANF contracting and are considering looking to seven year RFP with renewal each year. If a contractor is not showing results, there is monitoring issue language in contract.
	  ○ Concern comes from if services weren't being delivered.
	  ○ A seven year grant with yearly reviews. Where does the program change come in. *CAN extend, but there can be change within those seven years and will have to allow for that.*
	  ○ Organizational change-it does inspire collaboration and not competition. Feels these are really good programs. To allow for contract modification from either side while staying within scope. Are there other models in other states? *Bridge concept is not new, we're using pieces of areas that reflect what we are doing. Trying not to repeat mistakes, but know there will be some.*
	• I'd to hear reaction from clients/former clients.
	  ○ Sara, former TANF client-It's not that you know the inner workings of the program, you go through motions with the guidance. Like the holistic approach, she felt that she had an experience similar to the one proposed. Case manager was invested in her as a person.
	• Concern with how the bridge model will help tribal members. Can't see the connection, who could provide services to non-members.
	  ○ Put a question in RFP in how they plan to serve and partner with the reservation.
	  ○ monitoring
	  ○ Neighboring town gets contract, travels/drops in on the reservation. And it would make sense to have a subcontractor so the tribe is working with a neighbor. *In addition to regions, funding for contracts in different reservations*
	  ○ Some tribal members working in the Lame deer office, which helps with any barriers.
	
	Will schedule one more meeting in November or December for 2016
	Send out a survey on what would be on the agenda

Meeting ended at 4:30 p.m.	
Decisions Recommendations	
Mary made a recommendation for S Jefferson to stay the same which is regions 11 and 14. **All agreed to keep Jefferson county as it is	

minutes

TANF Advisory Council		
Mary-stated that the available amount for the RFP contract is 13 million. **Recommendation agreed upon.		
4p.m. extension of meeting till 4:30 agreed by Council		
Recommendations to continue the RFP design that has been taking place, to move forward with the RFP process knowing it's a work in progress. **Plan approved through consensus		
Action Items	**Person Responsible**	**Deadline**
Add tribal areas to region map	Ruby	Done
Tribal TANF, Tribal NEW put information in minutes how these programs work	Stephanie	5/16
Kelsen requested updated info as we move along about conversations with tribes	Jamie	Ongoing
Check into state code if we can pay for RFP reviewing of contracts.	Candee	8/30/16