



*County of Santa Barbara*  
105 E. ANAPAMU, SANTA BARBARA  
**HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION**

---

**REGULAR MEETING - ACTION SUMMARY**

Date: Thursday, December 3, 2015

Time: 10:00 AM to Noon

Place: Parlor, St. Mark's Episcopal Church, 2901 Nojoqui Ave., Los Olivos, CA

**Call to Order:** Commission Chair Solomon called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**Roll Call**      **Members Present:** Chair Solomon, Commissioners Keator, Ramirez, Mickiewicz, Sepulveda, Tade, Aceves, Lindner, Jensen, Siegel

**Absent:** Commissioners Fairfield, Cawthon

**Staff Present:** Susan Foley

**Public Comment Period:** There was no public comment.

- I.      **Minutes to November 5, 2015 HSC Community Relations Committee meeting:**  
Commissioner Mickiewicz made a motion to accept the Committee meeting notes. This was seconded by Commissioner Allen and passed.
- II.     **Minutes to November 5, 2015 HSC Regular meeting:** Commissioner Allen made a motion to accept the meeting notes. This was seconded by Commissioner Jensen and passed. Commissioners Aceves and Lindner abstained.
- III.    **Chair Report –** Chair Solomon greeted everyone and thanked them for bringing cookies and other items to celebrate the holidays. She said that the Commission is in a great place now and stands to possibly increase its budget to assist the County with additional human services needs.

IV.    **Ad Hoc Committee update and discussion -** Ms. Foley informed the Commission that the original Ad Hoc meeting scheduled for November 20, 2015 had been re-scheduled for December 14, 2015 at the County Administration office at 2:00 p.m., fourth floor, CEO's conference room. She stated that Terri Nisich, Assistance CEO and Martin Erikson, Deputy CEO both wished to participate and that was the reason it was rescheduled. Ms. Foley said that Ms. Nisich is happy that the Commission has set up a committee to work with the CEO's office. The goal is to jointly prepare a response to the Board of Supervisors with regard to their request for options related to outside agency funding that comes in after the HSC process and during budget hearings. She added that Ms. Nisich feels the best option is to have the requests go through the Commission in some fashion since most are human services requests and the Commission was set up decades ago to advise the board on human services programs and funding. It was decided that the Ad Hoc Committee members (Commission Chair Solomon, Commissioners Mickiewicz, Cawthon and Ramirez. Other Commissioners are invited and encouraged to attend and observe.

There was a lengthy discussion about the BOS directive. Ms. Foley shared that one issue is timing. The budget process isn't really sorted out until the April budget workshops held each year. The fiscal year begins July 1st, leaving little time to implement a quality process. The regular HSC process requires agreement on priorities, developing a notice of funding, developing applications, reviewing, interviewing and deliberating; returning to the BOS for consideration of recommendations, and then developing scopes of service and contracts and returning to the Board. Another primary point of discussion was related to whether or not the "supplemental funding" if available annually, should be added to the Commission's existing budget (to increase it), or if it should be kept separate to ensure the autonomy and security of existing "line item" funding. Commission members brought up a number of issues to discuss at the meeting with the CEO staff. They are outlined below:

- a. There are mixed opinions among Supervisors about the value of outside funding requests that come in during budget hearings. Some see the value of involving the Commission due to the current disconnect between the HSC process and the budget process which doesn't allow for adequate review or oversight. However, there may be common agreement that the requests should be subjected to some kind of vetting process even if they continue to come in during budget hearings. Clearly going directly to the BOS for funding requests allows agencies to receive funding without having to go through the HSC's well thought out application, review and deliberation process and ongoing performance monitoring.
- b. The priority seems to be on having additional funding made available for basic services rather than best practices. That said all of the grants *are* basic services but not all utilize best practices. The amount of outside agency funding is nearly equal to the amount of funding that was set aside for best practices (\$450k). This is interesting given that the HSC, with the BOS blessing, moved to reduce the number of grants rather than increase them.
- c. Outside agency requests not only aren't vetted thoroughly, but they are not *required* to be a part of any review process or contract compliance procedures or monitoring once approved. Contracts are assigned to different county staff by the CEO's office. These staff utilize different contract management procedures ranging from very little oversight to adopting tools they use for other grants (i.e., HSC grants). Current outside agency grants do not go before any particular compliance committee.
- d. It might be useful, at a minimum, to provide the Board with background information about agencies that come in during budget hearings for outside funding; this could include information on funding history and reasons an agency wasn't recommended for funding, or information about agencies that were "runners up" in the HSC's regular grant review process.
- e. The BOS could institute a more formal "appeals process" where agencies not recommended for funding can appeal *after* going through HSC process. That is kind of what they do now at the Board hearing where HSC presents their recommendations. Some agencies that weren't recommended do attend and speak when HSC recommendations are presented generally in May.
- f. Options for managing the outside agency requests can include the HSC or be managed through a different body or through CEO staff utilizing HSC materials and procedures. If they are managed by the HSC (preferable), there are two primary possibilities for managing the outside agency requests: 1) increase the HSC budget by some amount and have all human services agencies go through the HSC, or 2) have two separate processes with two separate budgets; keep the primary \$1.2 million dollar program intact and ADD

a second supplemental process later in the fiscal year to accommodate additional annual requests that come in. Both processes would go through the Commission and be thoroughly vetted and recommendations provided to the Board. One advantage to #2 is to maintain the core funding and not have it mixed up in this “outside” process where it could be jeopardized. Non-Human Services requests may or may not fit within the Commissions duties. More information is needed on this from Ms. Nisich. The preference at this time is that the additional funding (if available) would go directly to basic services programs.

- g. If the requests go before the Commission, the next two years would be annual grants until the new 3-year cycle begins again. This provides an opportunity to see how this will work out before the next cycle begins. The timelines for each are not currently in sync (HSC in February and out of cycle requests June).
- h. The timeline for the annual funding that may be made available is very tight; there are budget workshops in April and the budget hearings are the first week of June. This leaves little time for applications, reviews, interviews, deliberations, and returning to the Board with recommendations. Furthermore, contracts take time to prepare and process through County Counsel and other agencies and some have to go through the Board (if they receive > \$100k in the aggregate Countywide). All of these agencies would have later fiscal year contracts.
- i. Staffing concerns will need to be addressed; increased funding might mean shifting some of the HSC Administrators duties to other CEO office staff to be able to take on the additional load.
- j. Decisions would need to be made about utilizing the electronic grants management tool for the outside agency requests if they were separated from the regular HS budget.

Ms. Foley agreed to prepare an updated briefing paper with bullet points to assist the Ad Hoc Committee and CEO’s office at the meeting. She offered to add the points above to the original BOS briefing points for the one-on-one meetings Commissioners had with Supervisors about this issue.

**V. Other items from Ms. Foley:**

- With two exceptions all 2015-16 quarter one reports and invoices have been processed and that all agencies look on target to meet their performance measures. She added that she is putting more time in with Best Practices grantees to ensure that when they report, they tie the outcomes to their standards and measurement tools they listed in their original applications.
- She handed out an updated NOFA schedule with the February 5, 2016 meeting date added to the schedule.
- She handed out the draft mini grant scoring sheet prepared by Chrissy Allen and asked Commissioners to review and provide feedback via email before the next meeting.
- The Allocation Committee members are going to have ZoomGrants training. The training will be at the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting, January 7, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. for one half hour before the 10:00 a.m. regular Commission meeting.
- The Community Relations Committee agreed to meet from noon – 1:00 p.m. January 7, 2016 after the regular Commission meeting. The purpose of that meeting is to develop an agenda of items to work on for the coming year.

- A number of Commissioners ethics certificates are either due or will be in January and February 2016.
- Commissioners to get their mileage submitted before January 30, 2016.

**VI. What's Happening in the Community:**

- a. Commissioner Mickiewicz mentioned that Supervisor Wolf hosted a breakfast that morning that she and Commissioners Ramirez and Siegel attended to thank all District 2 Commissioners. She mentioned that the Library Commission provided an update on services and new hours. There was mention of a program being piloted about a new MTV system that will show where buses are to assist riders in tracking their bus.
- b. Commissioner Keator noted that the new County Children's Library is worth a visit. She is also noted that at some point the Clerk of the Board will advertise the County Commission vacancies on their website and people can apply directly. She noted that the Commission on Women did a gender study and the County is in pretty good shape in terms of gender balance.
- c. Commissioner Sepulveda shared that he is seeing an increase in domestic violence and housing issues in his work with Legal Aid. He said there will be an event to highlight elder abuse at some point in the near future. He also noted that vetting agencies is critical to recommending for funding like Legal Aid.
- d. Commissioner Ramirez praised Commission Tade's work on the recent press release announcing new Commissioners. She has been approached by people who saw it in NoozHawk. In addition, Commissioner Ramirez said that she recommends that anyone who can should visit an exhibit about Isolation in the Juvenile Justice System.
- e. Commissioner Jensen shared that the department of Emergency Preparedness is tracking the forecast for El Nino which is expected to start in about 3 weeks. She encouraged everyone to get prepared. A list of recommended items can be found on the Emergency Preparedness website. She said there could be unusual flooding due to surface runoff that will be worse due to few lawns. Commissioner Allen noted that having the water soak in to the ground is better than having it run off in to the ocean. December 12, 2015 is the date it is expected to begin according to Commissioner Allen.

- VII. Next Meetings:** January 7, 2016 Allocations ZoomGrants training at 9:30 a.m.; Regular Commission meeting 10:00 – Noon; Community Relations Committee meeting noon-1:00 p.m.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned just before noon