

Early Intervention Planning Council  
January 9, 2008  
Minutes

**Members present:**

Rhonda Allen  
Doris Clark  
Taren Duncan  
Patricia Jones  
John Kennedy  
Brant Ping

**Members not present:**

Christina Ball  
John Brandon  
Judge Marilyn Moores  
Marilyn Pfisterer

**Staff present:**

Eric Wright  
Daniel Clendenning  
Lyndy Kouns  
Laura Littlepage  
Tom Stucky

The meeting was convened at 8:10 am.

Rhonda Allen: Let's go ahead and get started. The first item on the agenda, as usual, is the approval of the minutes, the minutes from the November meeting. Those were sent out in advance so hopefully you've had a chance to take a look at those. Are there any questions, amendments, changes, anything someone sees that is not accurate? If not, then I will assume that we can move forward with approving these minutes from November so we can move on with the rest of the agenda. The update on the analysis of the child welfare funding sources?

Eric Wright: I'm happy to present you with a draft. We're still waiting on one piece of information but we thought we would go ahead and actually have Daniel present and walk you through the report and get some feedback before we proceed with finalizing the report. We're waiting on one mental health center for fiscal information but we expect that to be forthcoming here any time. So, with that, Daniel would you like to walk us through the report?

Daniel Clendenning: I won't spend much time on the introduction, it's pretty straight forward. It just has the definition of purpose of Early Intervention Planning Council. If anyone has any issues with that, please e-mail me and we can adjust that appropriately.

Eric Wright: We will send an electronic copy out so you can see it too and mark up if they want to do that.

Daniel Clendenning: Then there is an overview of this report itself and one of the things I would like to point out is we were required by the statute to consider the following funding sources, Title IV-B, IV-E, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Abuse and Prevention Treatment Act, Community Corrections Program and Special Education Program. It continues, all programs designed to prevent child abuse, neglect, or delinquency or to enhance child welfare and family preservation administered by or through funding provided by the Division of Family and Children, County Offices, Prosecutors, or Juvenile Courts. So we did our best to identify all those funding sources. We were also supposed to consider probation users fees and the Child Advocacy fund. A brief overview of State and National issues, the punch line there is mainly that Indiana receives a lot less funding for child welfare services from federal sources than other states. So that is something to be aware of if that is something you would like to address. The federal funding sources, there is a description of each of these. Social security funding sources, the amount that is given for, we go ahead and describe that as well for social services block grants, child abuse prevention and treatment, and Medicaid. The one thing I want to point out here, too, is the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, there is apparently some money in the state level but none of that money makes it down to the local level. Also, with respect for probation users fees, these are used only for supplementing probation services to juveniles and supplementing the salaries of probation officers in accordance with the state salary schedule. I don't have a budget for that, so I'm not sure exactly what the amount is but talking with Brant Ping, that's a very small amount of money. And again, it is only used for those two purposes, so that's not discussed any further in the report either. The biggest single chunk of money is the County Family and Children Fund. They receive funding through taxes, property tax, vehicle excise tax, financial institutions tax, and commercial vehicle excise tax. And taxes represent the single largest source of funding for the County Family and Children Fund, correct me if I'm wrong, Rhonda. But of the taxes, the single largest source in 2006 was \$44.3 million in taxes collected in the County Family and Children Fund. And of those tax dollars, \$40.3 million were property taxes alone, so property taxes are providing the greatest chunk of the funds for that. There's also a fair amount of money coming from Title IV-E, that's reimbursements and in 2006 that was about \$27.8 million, so that's the second largest funding. Although if you'll look at the chart, you'll see that "Other" is actually larger than the total reimbursements but that is because of the temporary loan.

Eric Wright: Which chart is that?

Daniel Clendenning: Table 1 on page 14. And 2007 numbers, that is kind of a place holder for now. Those were complete up through September and I extrapolated those out for the entire year, so that's an estimate of what last years' numbers would have been. I'm hoping that before we produce the final version of this draft I can talk to you again Rhonda and get complete numbers for 2007.

Rhonda Allen: OK.

Daniel Clendenning: The Child Advocacy Fund, we were required to look at that, on page 16. And there has not been any appropriations from this fund in Marion County since 2002. So that's a source of funding that could be used that is not being used. I'm not sure why it's not being used, I just know the County Auditor does not show appropriations from that fund.

Rhonda Allen: What's the purpose of this fund? I'm looking through what you have here, but...

Daniel Clendenning: According to the code, it's a fund dedicated to the purpose of developing interdisciplinary response to child abuse and situations of neglect and it's administered by the County Auditor.

Rhonda Allen: Did you happen to talk to Mark Buzby at the Child Advocacy Center with regards to this fund?

Daniel Clendenning: I e-mailed him and he said he would get back to us with some numbers and I never got those so I should probably give a buzz again.

Rhonda Allen: OK.

Patricia Jones: Do you know if there's any balance in that fund?

Daniel Clendenning: I don't know.

Eric Wright: We should probably ask the auditor that.

Daniel Clendenning: Community Corrections Programs, again I looked at this, there's not a juvenile corrections program in Marion County so there's no funding down at the county level. The next section of the report we take a look at expenditures. The first section is looking at special education programs and there's several tables there showing some of the funding sources and the spending on special education programs. I'll just skim over that. It's a small amount. The County Family & Children Fund in 2004 there was, we estimated, a rough average of estimated expenditures per child. We don't have the exact number of children who were served, we had to do an estimate. And in 2004, CFCF was spending on that fund, were spending an average of \$26,000 per child, \$26,194 exactly and in 2006 that amount increased to \$35,081 per child.

Eric Wright: What table are you on?

Daniel Clendenning: Page 23, table 3. These average numbers are actually on page 25 at the top of the page. And figure 3 is a chart of the average annual CFCF expenditure per child served. On the page before that, figure 2, CFCF expenditures per child served broken down into categories. The bulk of money is spent on the care of wards in foster

homes and in institutions. The other two large expenditure areas are adoption services and preservation services. We also collected information from some of the mental health organizations in Marion County. There's four main organizations, Adult & Child Mental Health Center, Behavior Corp, Gallahue Mental Health Center, and Midtown Community Mental Health Center. We did not have numbers available yet from Adult & Child Mental Health Center and that's the one last piece we are waiting on for this report. But on pages 27-29, tables 5, 6 & 7 the number of children served, the expenditures, and the funding sources for each of the community mental health centers that collect data, I won't bore you with all the numbers but I'll describe the basic trends and the trend is that spending per child has been decreasing in all three of these community health centers. Not by a large amount but at least some. The other trend is that more children being served across all three, although that trend is not an upward trend at all three locations. But at one institution, at Midtown, the number of children has decreased ever so slightly from 3,056 in 2004 down to 2,918 in 2006. I think that's a smaller decrease. The general trend is an increase in the number of children served. And we're seeing the cost go down. I don't have solid answers for why the spending for child is going down. You would expect with inflation if nothing else it would be going up slightly. But my thought about that was that it may be limited funds. They're serving the children but there are more federal funds coming into the state, they've got to divvy those funds amongst more children. So I haven't gotten to the bottom of that.

Eric Wright: Just as an editorial note, we're actually meeting with the mental health center directors on Friday for this project too, so we're going to ask them specifically about that issue and capacity building which is part 3 of the plan.

Daniel Clendenning: So the last section of the report, in conclusion, is titled Children in Need. And what we've done here is, an important part of the puzzle in predicting future spending is looking and trying to determine how many children in the future do you think will need to be served. One really rough indicator is the number of children in poverty, figure 4 & 5. Figure 4 shows the number of children in poverty. I normalized these levels so the number of children in poverty in 2000 equalized 100 so you can see the relative growth rates across the US, Indiana and Marion County. And we can see that Marion County, it's the top line, and the number of children in poverty is growing much faster in Marion County than in either Indiana or in the US and in fact has increased by 43% in four years. Now, that's the number of children in poverty, that doesn't tell us anything about the percentage of children in poverty because it doesn't tell us anything about the total number of children in the state, which is why there's figure 5. And this shows the percentage of children in poverty and again Indiana's the bottom line, Marion County is the middle line initially but then it eventually passes the US to have more children in poverty than the US population as a whole. So now not only is actual number of children in poverty increasing but the percentage of children in poverty is also increasing. Based on the fact that the absolute number of children in poverty is increasing you would expect, children in poverty to have a high number of risk factors needing early intervention so that's one indicator, a rough indicator, that you might see a rise in the children needing service. The other thing we've done, this is based on a report earlier for the Council, on risk factor prevalence in Marion County and we basically said estimates,

existing estimates of the prevalence of risk factors for difference problems: delayed graduation, children in poverty, there's a whole list of them on table 8 on page 39 and we applied these risk factors to the population, the current population to get an estimate of the number of children who have these problems but then I also applied these numbers to the estimated 2010 population forecast from the census and used that and then also assumed spending per child would not change. And based on that I find that out of the CFCF fund, \$101 million was spent in 2006 and our estimate was that \$105 million will be spent in 2010 but the key thing to point out here is that we have a forecast of the future population, we don't have a forecast of the future risk prevalence. We're basing this on current rates and if those change, that could cause the cost to go up or down. In my opinion, in looking solely at the fact that poverty rates are increasing, I would expect that most of those risk factors, the prevalence, would probably be increasing. So I suspect that this \$105 million in 2010 is a conservative estimate unless we can find efficiencies by working together to keep costs lower.

Eric Wright: Questions, comments? I know it's a lot to digest and a long report to take in at the moment. I guess the most important question for now as we move to finalize this is, are there large gaps or pieces of the puzzle you would like to see answered before, as this report starts to take a life of its own?

Brant Ping: Daniel, do you feel that you've capture the expenditures of Family and Children fund pretty accurately? I mean, do you know where that money's going?

Daniel Clendenning: Yes, fairly well, yes. Rhonda's been providing me with the monthly budgets and the monthly budget also has a yearly running total so I got those for December for the last four or five years and we do have a pretty, at least a bird's eye view, of where the money's going. I mean, I don't know exactly how money is being spent on care of wards, I don't know what portion of that is food, what portion is housing, questions like that. But we do know broadly speaking.

Brant Ping: OK. One of the concerns that I have is that just in recent months we've been hearing a lot of discussion about other programs, Medicaid coming up with policy decisions that they're no longer going to pay for services that are intrinsically child welfare, that's their definition, so they're going to start excluding things that previously we think were captured by Medicaid funding so that's going to add additional pressures on Family & Children's Fund. Additionally, we've had a number of requests from the school systems who prior to approaching the State Dept of Education for placement, they are now required to request the cost sharing from either Juvenile Court Probation or Dept of Child Services depending on whether the child is a ward or juvenile probationer for a cost share of that placement so that system too appears to be looking more at Family & Children's Fund. So I think if anything, your estimate is probably a little on the light side because I anticipate extraordinary pressures being put on this fund here in the next year.

Eric Wright: OK. Are there any other future things we should be looking at? Because we can add those to the report easily and discuss those a little more. We might even be able to estimate that, the impact, if we can figure out from Medicaid what, how much they're

spending now that won't be realized, anticipated short falls essentially is what that would be.

Brant Ping: Right.

Eric Wright: Are there other pressures that you're aware of? One of the things that we haven't yet done which is try to figure out – right now part of the whole logic of this has been to figure out the pie, if you will. If you look at that last table and you estimate between 193,000 and 38,000 roughly numbers of children who are at risk, these are our populations that we're most concerned of. We know that some of these predictors, probably the more risk factors you have the more likely you are to be in the juvenile justice system or child welfare system currently. So one of the questions would be is how much overlap. We've had a hard time pinning that down but I think we can at this point begin the process of saying well, given the numbers of kids in service now, subtract from that these gross estimates and figure out basically what kids are floating out there unattached to the system, if you will, and then begin the process of sort of fixing a dollar value on how much we would need to spend. That's another thing we're going to need to do to make the leap to figuring out what we need to spend to expand the prevention system generally. So that's the last piece of this that has to be done yet.

Rhonda Allen: A key piece to that is, what is the assumption of the overlap. Does anybody have any sense of that?

Eric Wright: Right, because one of the things we've been trying to figure out if you remember back along when we were looking at the data from each of the systems, we were trying to figure out how many DCS kids are also involved in mental health, are also involved in juvenile justice.

Patricia Jones: Or Special Ed.

Eric Wright: Or special ed. Special ed and the mental health ones were the ones that were a little more difficult to get a handle on, where we don't have really good overlap information. But we can probably figure out ways to guesstimate that. But if you have some thoughts about how to do that, that would be helpful. Recognizing that we're going to have to do this, it's going to be a crude estimate.

Brant Ping: Do you track them?

Rhonda Allen: Well, special education is certainly something that would be, I think, easiest for us to obtain from our DCS case load. You know, looking at the kids that have IEP's in place, things of that nature, should be easy. Now the mental health piece I think is a little fuzzier. Because not all, I mean a lot of the kids that are in our care are serviced by non-traditional providers, so not the natural support providers, like mental health centers are to the rest of the community. I think that might be more difficult for us to get that number, but I'm sure we could. Special education I think is very simple for us to get a hold of.

Eric Wright: Now when we started this conversation a long time ago we had talked about perhaps accessing the data set and then perhaps looking at service codes in terms of what service. If we could actually get at that that way it might be something we could do relatively easily, sort of along the lines you were talking about, who the traditional and non-traditional provider codes are.

Rhonda Allen: I don't know through iqws if that would be our best database for tracking services. I'm just thinking out loud here but I don't – iqws is a good database, it's a nice management tool but I'm not quite sure you're going to get a specific enough count for mental health purposes related to that. I think probably through our accounting department, I mean those are the folks that can pull what kids are serviced by Adult & Child. I mean that might be the best way.

Eric Wright: Which is a non-computerized database? Right. I remember why we ran into this. Flashbacks. Yes, OK. Well the other possibility which we did not actually ask the mental health centers, it might be possible to go the other direction and at least ask the mental health centers how many of them, because they would probably know who is on some sort of juvenile procedure.

Doris Clark: They should.

Eric Wright: They might have some sense about special education, how easily they can get that. Well, we'll explore those options. Because I think that basically what we can do is figure out, get a range perhaps by getting ballpark guesstimates from the different perspectives and then figure out a way to estimate that.

Rhonda Allen: OK.

Eric Wright: John, you are looking very perplexed.

John Kennedy: I was just trying to see if there was a way to pull all this information together by way of schools but it's not that easy. Because in a lot of the IEP's there will be a reference made to services the kids get to support them in their school because there are caseworkers in the schools but I don't know if that's recording where that is. Best bet is to go straight to the provider.

Rhonda Allen: I would agree.

Eric Wright: Do you have a sense about how many non-traditional providers are the providers for the DCS kids compared to the traditional mental health centers?

Rhonda Allen: The majority of our services are through non-traditional.

Eric Wright: OK.

John Kennedy: And those aren't represented in iqws by code?

Rhonda Allen: You know, I guess I would be happy to sit down and show somebody what that looks like in iqws to see if you think that would be helpful but I'm just thinking from what I know about how our services are captured in that database I don't think it would be helpful. Am I wrong, Taren?

Taren Duncan: No, I don't think so. The financial piece is not tied into iqws and so if you really want to know what the amount of money spent is, you would have to look at just the accounting records.

Eric Wright: Well we might be able to get around that if we could figure out in iqws how many kids are getting some sort of mental health services, just the percentage. Then we could apply the average number that's being spent per child and come up with an estimate that way, so we wouldn't necessarily have to do an actual calculation, we'll have to caveat it because it's an estimate but we have now, which we didn't have before, kind of a rough ballpark estimate about how much we're spending per child in mental health services. Now granted, its community mental health services which is going to be different than some of the non-traditional providers but that I think is a reasonable estimate from a public point of view because more public dollars are probably going into that side of the fence than non-traditional. Maybe I shouldn't say that. I'll think about that a little more. But we can still come up with an estimate if we can just figure out roughly a percentage of kids in DCS who are getting mental health services. Because the idea is looking at these diagrams and trying to figure out how many of them overlap.

Rhonda Allen: The problem with our iqws database frankly is the information is only as good as it's input and I guess I can't guarantee that in all 2,700 of the kids that are in the that system if the case managers – I mean it is a very complex system. There are probably at least a million fields in that system and so my guess would be that case managers, that's not a high priority area to enter information into. They're more worried about some other permanency and safety issues that are captured in other fields and so I would anticipate that there's not a whole lot of information entered into that area in iqws. And again, if I'm wrong about that Taren, but that's just my assumption from the cases that I've seen.

Eric Wright: OK, we'll look for some estimates about – I think there have been several studies that have shown or estimate the percent of kids in child welfare generally in the US that are in mental health services or receiving different levels of mental health services. What we could do is as a proxy, use that as an estimate and extrapolate that to Marion County. It would be a weakness of the analysis but may be the thing we can do. What we're trying to do is get a handle on where the money is being spent and where the potential growth is so we can get to this estimate of the kids who are currently not in the system. So, we'll work on that.

Rhonda Allen: OK.



Eric Wright: Any other comments or questions?

Rhonda Allen: I assume, Eric, that we'll have an opportunity to continue to digest this information?

Eric Wright: Yes, actually what we'll do is after this meeting we can send out another electronic copy and then if you want to send it to your friends and colleagues who might have a specific interest in this, I think the more feedback we get the more valuable it will be. So each of you have fiscal persons, so that's the kind of people we want to have looking at this, so if you wouldn't mind asking your fiscal person to take a really close look at this and give us feedback, we're anxious to finalize this as soon as possible but I'll talk more about that when I get to the Other Business, about our timeline.

Rhonda Allen: OK.

Eric Wright: Update on the survey – I'm just going to charge through the agenda if that's ok?

Rhonda Allen: Yes, please.

Eric Wright: On the survey, we did have some delays in terms of IRB approval, unfortunately life is that way sometimes but we are now in the field and I'll let Professor Stucky give us an update on where we are. He is actually serving as the survey director in managing that for us.

Tom Stucky: With any survey there are always some anticipated delays and not surprisingly there are some unanticipated delays. The IRB moved with titanic speed and so unfortunately that put us a little behind the eight ball as far as getting things out before the holiday. Thanks to some incredibly dedicated efforts on the parts of some Center staff we were actually able to field the survey before Christmas. Somehow we managed to get past the – we got to the point where we weren't sure what else could go wrong but we were pretty sure something else that we hadn't thought of was going to be a problem, it just got to actually sort of comical, that really had nothing to do with the survey itself, it was just the logistics of trying to do something in the week before the holiday but we did have results. We have out of 149 surveys that were sent out we had responses, four responses on the web, so there is a web component to the survey for those agencies, and we had one mailed response at this point. It's still really early given the holiday and given the time frames that it's going to take for people to get to these. What we are going to start doing really soon, probably within the next week or so, is following up with people. Generally, the results that we see so far of the first few look pretty good. There are some gaps that we are going to need to address. One of the, just to catch everybody up, there's a two stage process here, what we are wanting to do is initially identify from the agencies the key piece is what are your programs that you are currently running and then the second stage would be to go out once we've identified those programs to them, go to the program level and talk to those folks. We're in the process of finalizing the program level survey which will also have a web component as well. So that as soon as we get the

agency responses back we'll be able to field the program survey. And that will be an ongoing rolling process so I anticipate with those first five that we've got that as soon as we get the program level survey finished up and just got a few minor things that we've got to finalize on that and we'll be able to do that so we won't have to wait until the agency survey is finished to field the program survey. But one of the key pieces that is necessary to field the program survey is information specifically about the programs and we've had not as great a response rate in terms of the specific information about the programs as we'd like. So we're going to have to do some follow-up phone calls which will involve some significant center staff time but we've got good people in place to take care of that. The good news is we're in the field and we're dealing with the typical issues that survey's deal with and so I think we're in good shape to be on track to get some good information from the surveys.

Eric Wright: So the more you can talk about it with your colleagues and contacts and any of your contracting providers, the helpful to spread the word that this is happening and we were able to get the letter signed by the various Councilors and Judge Moores and Rhonda – I can't remember who else, we had a long list – but we know there's been a change of administration so a lot of change going on so we suspect people might be a little slower to respond that we were anticipating but we're on track and we'll have results for you perhaps, we're hoping by Spring for sure but a lot will depend on the process and how quickly people respond to the survey. We have our best, I love to refer to her as our junkyard dog, who is a very good field person who will nag people until they fill it out so we'll get a good response rate. She's our preeminent field researcher so we're excited about that and I think things will happen and we'll have a lot of good data for us to continue the planning process.

Brant Ping: So Eric, did the survey go out under cover of this letter?

Eric Wright: Yes.

Brant Ping: And did it go to the CEO's or Execs of the various agencies in our first wave?

Eric Wright: Yes.

Brant Ping: To identify the programs and there'll be a second wave going to the program people?

Eric Wright: Most survey designs, if you're doing a mail survey, the rule of thumb is you send the first survey and then you send two reminders and then you send the survey again. And the first batch you usually get a 40% response rate and then with each additional mailing you get a 5-10% increase. The goal would be to get as close to 60-70% as we can get. I think our hope would be to get even more than that because we are trying to take a census approach to this and I think as we discussed the last couple of meetings, part of the purpose of this data is to build a database so the strategic planning process has a knowledge base for the future. But we are doing a combination of mail, we find that

actually offering mail, web, and then face to face interviews is a killer combination because people then have a preference about how they like to give information. Some people feel it's more onerous to write it, some other people feel, prefer to fill it out on the web, so it's an interesting time to be doing survey research but I think at least our initial response has been relatively positive and I think people see the potential value in this.

Rhonda Allen: Brant, there's probably a way that either Kelly or Pat or maybe even Amy with DCS with the distribution list we have, if we can't just send out an e-mail reminding folks that this went out. That would just be an added incentive to complete this as timely as possible.

Brant Ping: The only problem I see with that, Rhonda, is it won't capture those that are the highly non-traditional providers to our families and children. I mean, I would expect anybody who is on contract with us is going to respond to this survey so you're going to get a very concrete set there. But the people that are being served in their neighborhoods, I don't know what we could do to urge those responses.

Eric Wright: I'm less worried about those folks because in most surveys you kind of assume there's going to be a group of people for whom you have to do a lot of extra footwork so I think the more we can, it sounds terrible, but knock off the easy cases quickly and that might be these groups because they're used to doing this kind of contribution then Lyndy and the team of folks we've hired can actually spend their time on those folks and actually go to meet them. Because I think non-traditional providers tend to be a little more suspicious of the system, for good reason, so it might require some more rapport building with them which is what Lyndy and her team will do very well.

Brant Ping: OK.

Eric Wright: But if there's other venues or listservs that you're aware of that we could add to this, that'd be great. I mean, actually Doris, given your connections outside the mental health, traditional mental health system, I wonder if there's a listserv or community group that we could reach out to in terms of listservs or advertising this and try to build some rapport with those folks? Do you have any thoughts about that?

Doris Clark: I'll think about that.

Eric Wright: OK, great. Any other questions or comments about the survey? OK. Update on the Draft Plan, Component 2. I already mentioned we have the focus group scheduled this Friday with the mental health center children services directors. The conversation will focus as we've been discussing before on capacity building and expanding service. Now that we have some of these financial data we'll probably ask them about that but the focus is going to be trying to help think through what are some of the strategies that they would propose that we would then use to expand access to mental health services. So that was what we had agreed to do. Doris, I don't know if you want to come to that or not but you're welcome to come as our mental health representative. I didn't think about that

until now but I apologize for that. But you're welcome to come and represent the other non-traditional mental health, non-traditional services. We'll bring the preliminary findings back for that next month just to reflect back what the ideas were because that'll be the foundation of the recommendation. We have a framework that we laid out initially in term of the first draft we had a very large component on mental health, we're trying to use this opportunity to flush that out a little more.

Eric Wright: So, discussion of vacancies then I'll jump into a couple of other issues. I did meet with Councilors Cockrum and Pfisterer about the transition process. We had a very productive and very positive meeting and it sounds to me like despite the change in administration that there will be continued support of the EIPC concept and I think there's clear interest, continuing interest in this. The structural changes in terms of Councilor Cockrum becoming the Chair of the Council, he actually recommended that Councilor Pfisterer serve as our liaison whereas Councilor Boyd had served that in the previous administration. Councilor Pfisterer who is also a member of EIPC will be basically our point person so I'm working with her to develop a one page, cheat sheet if you will, on EIPC to share with other Councilors as they go through the organization process and get things moving. I know with the state legislature focusing on property taxes, everybody is focused on that issue so I'm not sure how high on the agenda we'll be for the next couple of months but I think there is still some significant support and very much concern and I think Mayor Ballard is very committed to the whole issue of public safety and we're trying, I think Councilor Cockrum was very interested in the idea that we connect this conversation about prevention/early intervention with the issues around public safety so I think that process is happening so I just wanted to update you on that. And we've actually mentioned the issues around vacancies on the EIPC and that process we had been working with Jean Milharcic about that so there's a transition there too, so there's an approval process that has to go along but we're in the process of getting the current vacancies filled. So I'm not exactly sure when that'll happen but it'll happen. I'm just happy to report there's continuing support and I will continue to work on that.

Eric Wright: Having said that, our contract technically ends in April of 2008. OK, so that means four months from now. Since we have not spent all the money, we've been trying to save it for, at least the money we have received so far, for the survey. What we're going to do is propose that we actually add a no-cost extension to our contract to continue our role until the end of the year. So that would basically be at no additional cost of the city and so that would allow us to continue to play our role and we can discuss after the draft plan has been finalized and become the political process about whether or not there would be interest in continuing our role after that but we'll propose to the city that we would extend unless there's other suggestions from the Council, of course we're your servants here. But the idea would be is that we would do this at a no cost basis which I think hopefully would be appealing to the city. We are going to cut back on the budget. You'll notice we didn't have any food this morning so sorry about that. So we are still working through some of the budgetary issues but we want to make sure we have enough resources to finish the survey and basically if we're going to step away from this process hand it over to somebody so it's in good shape. So that's our focus here.

Rhonda Allen: I think we're willing to make the breakfast sacrifice. Appreciate that.

Brant Ping: Is there anything we need to do as the Council to support your actions to the larger Council? Does this committee need any kind of statement of support or request to continue work or anything like that?

Eric Wright: Let me – maybe, I don't know. I can't answer that for sure. This is something I was thinking about for the last couple of weeks. After our meeting with Councilor Pfisterer and I haven't had chance to talk to her about that so I now that she and others are extremely busy trying to get organized, get off the ground quickly. There's a lot of issues that sort of exploded onto the scene at the same time so I'll come back to you with an answer.

Brant Ping: OK.

Rhonda Allen: Alright, we're at the end of the agenda. Are there other issues to fall under Other Business? Nothing? Wow, we made that through in record time. We are officially adjourned. Thank you everyone.

Eric Wright; Next meeting is 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday in February, February 13<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 am.