

The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners met with the following members present: Carter, McDonough (late), Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman and Chair Parker – 6. Absent: - Bennett - 1. Also present were Julie Kleinschmidt, County Manager, and Darwin Lookingbill, Director, Civil Division, County Attorney's Office.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

Commissioner Ortega moved approval of the Agenda of the January 27, 2009, Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, Parker – 5. Nays – 0.

MINUTES

Commissioner Reinhardt moved approval of the Minutes of the January 20, 2009 Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Rettman. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, Parker – 5. Nays – 0.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Elderly Services – Long Term Care Consultation

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, Parker – 5. Nays – 0. (2009-047)

WHEREAS, Long Term Care Consultation services have been available to individuals considering nursing home placement for several years; and

WHEREAS, The 2007 Minnesota legislature expanded the service to individuals who are considering moving to assisted living programs; and

WHEREAS, The consultation service is provided when requested by an individual or family, not automatically to everyone who is moving into assisted living residences; and

WHEREAS, The service is provided partly by county staff and partly by Area Agencies on Aging; and

WHEREAS, The legislature appropriated \$600,000 annually to support this service expansion; and

WHEREAS, For Ramsey County, this funding will total \$58,717.07 in State Fiscal Year 2009; and

WHEREAS, The legislation also requires that half of the funding will be transferred to the relevant Area Agency on Aging for their activities in connection with this service; and

WHEREAS, The attached memorandum of understanding is required by the legislation to formalize this relationship between the Metropolitan Area Agency on Aging (MAAA) and Ramsey County; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, This memorandum outlines that the MAAA will be responsible for consumer materials and operation of the Senior LinkAge Line; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County Human Services will be responsible for face-to-face Long Term Care Consultation assessments and community support plans; and

WHEREAS, These are the same roles each agency has been responsible for in offering Long Term Care consultation services to individuals considering nursing home placement; and

WHEREAS, The funding will be provided by the state to each county; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County, in turn, passes the required 50% on to the Metropolitan Area Agency on Aging; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the proposed Memorandum of Understanding between Ramsey County and the Metropolitan Area Agency on Aging for the provision of Long Term Care Consultation Services to individuals considering Assisted Living Residences, effective October 1, 2008; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the Chair and Chief Clerk to sign the Memorandum of Understanding; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to receive the funds and make the necessary budget adjustment; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the Director of the Community Human Services Department to sign non-fiscal amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Outreach Workers for the Somali and Hmong Communities

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, Parker – 5. Nays – 0. (2009-048)

WHEREAS, Two outreach financial worker positions were approved by the County Board on August 22, 2006 (Resolution #2006-294); and

WHEREAS, This outreach service was primarily funded through a federal grant from the Office of Refugee Resettlement; and

WHEREAS, Current funding for these positions ran out on December 31, 2008; and

WHEREAS, With our support, Common Bond applied for two grants to continue these positions; and

WHEREAS, Common Bond recently received notice of awards from the St. Paul and Bigelow Foundations; and

WHEREAS, Each is for \$30,000; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, The total of \$60,000 will enable the Department to continue these outreach positions until June 30, 2009; and

WHEREAS, The Department will begin to train community peer mentors to continue the work if non-county funds are no longer available for this service; and

WHEREAS, Currently, the two workers have regular hours each week at several businesses and agencies utilized by Somali and Hmong families; and

WHEREAS, The focus is on explaining the existence and availability of services for those with serious needs; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners accepts the grants from the Bigelow and St. Paul Foundations in the amounts of \$30,000 each to continue the two outreach financial worker positions through June 30, 2009; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to make the necessary budget adjustments to continue the two positions providing outreach to the Somali and Hmong Communities.

[Commissioner McDonough arrived at this point in the meeting.]

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES/PUBLIC HEALTH/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS – Local Collaborative Time Study (LCTS) 2009 Spending Plan for Countywide Projects

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Ortega. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – Rettman - 1. (2009-049)

WHEREAS, The Local Collaborative Time Study (LCTS) enables local public agencies to earn federal reimbursement through the Title XIX Medical Assistance and Title IV-E Foster Care Out-of-Home Placement programs; and

WHEREAS, Federal law requires LCTS revenue to be used to expand prevention and early intervention services for at-risk children and families; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County LCTS Partnership Board was established by the partner collaboratives to coordinate distribution of funds; and

WHEREAS, The total amount dedicated to countywide programs, according to the 2008 allocation formula, is \$152,747; and

WHEREAS, The County's LCTS Leadership Team – composed of the directors of Community Corrections, Community Human Services, and Public Health – recommends that the 2008 LCTS funds be allocated entirely to the Ramsey County All Children Excel (ACE) program; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves Local Collaborative Time Study funding allocated for 2008 to support the All Children Excel program in the amount of \$152,747; and Be It Further

(Continued)

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to make the necessary budget adjustments and to enter into contracts necessary to implement the Countywide Plan for Local Collaborative Time Study dollars.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Detoxification Center – Agreement with Dakota County

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Carter.

Commissioner Rettman said Agenda Item 10.6 talks about the possibility of a new detoxification center. She had asked staff how many beds we have capacity for, how full the beds are, etc. Ramsey County receives revenue from Dakota County for rental of the beds, yet at the same time, we are asking for the possibility of a new facility, and adding staff because of the revenue. There is a serious budget issue at this time that we may have issues with not being able to continue all of the rates. She does not see the wisdom in continuing this agreement. Ramsey County needs to take care of its own residents, and continuing this agreement may not be in our best interest, especially adding staff at the same time. She is very concerned about our staff.

Commissioner Reinhardt said it is her understanding that if there was an issue with needing the beds for our own residents that they would take precedence; this would not have been brought forward had it not been for the fact that it was a revenue contract and that we are utilizing facilities that otherwise we would have fixed costs sunk into them. This is actually a net gain for Ramsey County. If it gets to the point where it is not prudent for Ramsey County to continue this contract because of our needs, it would be discontinued. At this point, this is helping Ramsey County's budget, and not hindering it, which is why she would support this.

Monty Martin, Director, Community Human Services, said this request is the renewal of a contract; it has been bringing over \$1 million into Ramsey County's budget. Ramsey County has a 50-bed facility; this contract leases 15 beds. If this contract were not renewed, the budget would have to be reduced by more than \$1.25 million.

Commissioner Rettman said she is concerned about not exacerbating the expected cuts.

Commissioner Ortega said we could continue to look at the money piece, but this gives the opportunity because as we move into the future, there are some areas in mental health and chemical dependency, where we will have to partner with other counties to move forward in the delivery of services. Counties won't be able to independently contain these costs. It serves us well that we are moving forward with Dakota County on a contract to deliver these services in a more regional fashion, especially in the areas of mental health and chemical dependency. We often end up with the bill anyway because people are brought to our hospitals or for services in Ramsey County. This is a good step forward in that regard.

Chair Parker agreed that this is the direction that we need to be going and it is helping our budget. It is fiscally prudent for Ramsey County to work together with another county in helping to save costs.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 5. Nays – Rettman – 1. (2009-050)

WHEREAS, In April 2004, the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approved an agreement with Dakota County to purchase utilization of 15 beds in the Detoxification Center; and

WHEREAS, The attached agreement is for renewal and continuation of this purchase and utilization for the period January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2011; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, The daily payment rate will increase from \$205 per day to \$225 per day in 2009, \$230 per day in 2010, and \$235 per day in 2011; and

WHEREAS, With the additional revenue (\$109,500) from the rate increase, the Community Human Services Department is requesting an increase in the complement of 1 FTE Detox Aide and 1 FTE Social Worker; and

WHEREAS, The Aide will improve the ability to supervise and keep individuals using detoxification services safe. This is needed since the addition of Dakota County has increased the number of individuals in the Detoxification Center; and

WHEREAS, The Department is also requesting a Social Worker position. This position will be funded using the remainder of the additional revenue (\$59,000) from this contract, plus savings from intentionally under-filling an Account Clerk position in Adult Protection; and

WHEREAS, This combination of funding will save one of the 9 positions CHS will lose in the 2009 budget. The Social Worker position saved will be a case manager in Adult Protection – serving frail elderly, people with disabilities and vulnerable adults who are unable to care for themselves or who have been victims of maltreatment by others; and

WHEREAS, Saving this position will keep the AP case management complement at 3, still a reduction from the 4 positions CHS had in 2007; and

WHEREAS, It is projected that 25 clients at any point in time will continue to receive protective services from this position; and

WHEREAS, Case management is a critical safety net service for vulnerable adults; needed now more than ever due to demographic changes and difficult economic times; and

WHEREAS, No increase in county levy is needed to fund these two positions; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the extension of the Joint Powers Agreement with Dakota County for the purchase of 15 beds in the Ramsey County Detoxification Center for the period January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2011, at the rate of \$225 per bed per day for 2009, \$230 per bed per day for 2010, and \$235 per bed per day for 2011; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the Chair and Chief Clerk to sign the extension; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board approves the increase in the complement of the Community Human Services Department of 1 FTE Detox Aide and 1 FTE Social Worker III.

WORKFORCE SOLUTIONS – MFIP Employment Services Providers for Component 1 Services Commencing March 1, 2009

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the draft resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Ortega.

(Continued)

Commissioner Rettman said all of the Commissioners have received concerns from vendors. She believed the Request for Proposals (RFP) should be re-distributed. Instead, a new panel reviewed the responses to the RFP. She will not support this request.

Commissioner McDonough said he also would not support this request. It is a mess; the process needs to be straightened out. A good process had been in place and the Board allowed it to change, and he is not happy with how this is coming back.

Commissioner Reinhardt said she is not pleased with everything that has gone on with this particular RFP, but as far as she could tell from the last Board discussion, there was not a problem with the RFP. There was a perception of an issue with the first review panel and the County Board gave direction to staff to re-do it; look at the proposals; and to come back as if the first one had not taken place. She is not happy with the outcome, but said the process is not flawed; it was done correctly. She will be supporting this request.

Commissioner Reinhardt said she is reluctant because she did not care for the outcome; however, we can't keep sending it back until we get the answer that we want, which makes it political. That is why she would vote for this today, even though she is not pleased with the results. Her personal opinion does not have a place in this process, because if that is what we are going to do, then we should throw out the process, and the Commissioners should review all the proposals and decide who the money should go to. She said her comments are blunt, but this was a difficult decision to make because there are a couple vendors she likes; she would like to see them receive the money, but that is not what this process is about, and she would not be a party to politicizing it.

Commissioner Ortega agreed with Commissioner Reinhardt. He was ready to vote back in December but there were questions about the integrity of the panel, which he did not feel were justified, but we re-paneled. He has served on the board for several of these organizations; they are all good organizations, and this is not a reflection on them. But, if the County were to re-do this RFP, it would be politicized, and he guaranteed if it would become political, the results might end up very much the same, because the Commissioners would try to influence the process one way or the other. These panels were put together to be transparent. Given the fact that we have limited resources, we need to look as transparent as possible. That is how he is taking this, and how he would move forward. He doesn't question the integrity of the people on the panel. They came to their decision. It might not have been the same decision he would have made, but the panel was trusted with this process. He is ready to vote in the affirmative.

Commissioner Carter said she would vote for this today, acknowledging that any outcome would present concerns, given the number of organizations in our community who are engaged with this particular arena of services and want to work with us to provide services. The Commissioners will hear from any number of people in our community, regardless of the decisions made here. She trusts that we have commissioned a group of people to make the recommendation to the Board, based on their knowledge of this arena of services of needs in our community and that we have been very careful to ensure a process that considers all of the above. There were concerns about the first panel; a second panel was put in place so that those concerns were addressed. We now have this recommendation before us and were we to pull it apart, we would be doing so because we are second-guessing the recommendations of the panel. We would need to be clear about our reasons for doing so. There are criteria within the process that have been utilized, and carefully assessed by this panel. She is not happy that particular organizations are not being recommended. She wants to carefully watch the process by which we select organizations, and we have done that here, to ensure that it has had integrity. She would vote for the recommendations coming forth today.

Commissioner McDonough said he agreed entirely. When we have an RFP of this or any nature, there are going to be people who get contracts, people who don't, and people who will not be happy about that. He has always supported that the process has to be pure, it has to have integrity,

(Continued)

and we have to keep the politics out of it. We tainted the process when not accepting the original panel's recommendation. He was ready to support that, and felt a message was sent from the very beginning that we didn't have confidence in that process. He wanted to know if this panel's recommendation is different from the first panel's recommendation. That is exactly what is happening here. As soon as we did not accept the first panel's recommendations, we were saying we did not have confidence in our process and did politicize it when we stepped in and said, no, we are going to throw that panel out and bring in a new panel. We are losing confidence in our community every step we have taken in this process, and need to pull this back and make it right.

Chair Parker said the recommendation is different.

Patricia Brady, Director, Workforce Solutions, said in some areas, this panel's recommendation is exactly the same as the first panel. Some of the organizations that were not considered to come forward to be recommended to this Board are still not being recommended to come forward. However, this panel has made a different recommendation for some of the organizations that are being brought forth. She did not know how much to say because we are now talking about a process that is open again. There are some differences, and some of those are in the fact that the panel, having received all the information and moved through the process exactly as the previous panel moved through, decided they had enough information and did not need to hold interviews. That is probably the only difference. Staff believe that if another panel is pulled together, a different recommendation may come again, because there are different people with different perspectives and different insights and there is no way to tell exactly what they would bring forward.

Commissioner McDonough said that is exactly his point. The first panel was a panel of people with integrity and they did the same thing – this could be done five times. As soon as the Board decided to throw that out, we tainted that process. What are the differences between this panel's recommendation and the last panel's recommendation?

Joan Truhler, Manager, Employment Services, Workforce Solutions, said the first panel did not actually make final recommendations to the Board. They got through the piece where they had selected five agencies for interviews, which was the point at which the process was stopped for the re-review. During this process, all the same proposals were reviewed and ranked, and the panel chose not to interview. They made recommendations based only on the written proposals. The interviews are an option for panels.

Commissioner McDonough recommended starting all over again with a new RFP. Interviews should be made a requirement in this process. These are big contracts. When people are hired, there is a process, and the interview is always the last piece of any process to work through the final nuances about what is going on. An interview piece of this is critical to any of our processes. He agreed with Commissioner Ortega that these are all quality organizations. These are large contracts and they do great work in our community. To leave out the interview process is the panel's choice, but that needs to be made a part of the process, and not make that a choice anymore. We need to start all over on this, extend the contracts, and live with the end result on the next one. As soon the first panel's recommendations were thrown out, we did what everybody is saying we don't want to do right now.

Commissioner Ortega reiterated that he had been ready to vote on this previously. Five panels could be empowered resulting in five different outcomes – where do we stop – where do we make a decision. He has heard from several organizations, and spoke with as many individuals as he could, explaining to them the position of this Board. He felt the first panel had integrity, and he was ready to vote. Now we have a second panel, the process is over, and we need to move on, otherwise, we are setting ourselves up down the road in terms of our processes where there are organizations, and justly so, advocating for their position. The Board has to make a decision on how

(Continued)

to move forward. The argument could continue with even more panels, and he would still meet with organizations that are not going to like the results of the next panel. There is nothing to taint the decision-making that was made. He would not argue whether the interviews should be made part of the process or not. There are folks who felt they did not need to do that; they were entrusted under this criteria; and now it seems we are changing the criteria for the RFP process. He felt that makes this look messier. He would call the question, but the way to do this is to move ahead, take the vote, and if any adjustments are needed in the future as to the process, then we would do that.

Chair Parker said she did not return the phone calls and emails she got from many of the people. We have to stay with the process that has been set up, respect the evaluators who were asked to spend a lot of time doing this work. There are many excellent organizations that provide services in the community. We must abide by the process that has been set up. She was disappointed to hear that there was no interview portion. Last time this came to the Board that was important – there were changes made in the interview portion – there are clarifications; issues that are different once there is that face-to-face. It was her understanding that the interview portion is a normal part of our process. Because of that she would not vote in favor of this. She would agree that we need to start all over with a new RFP. She does not understand how the decision was made not to interview the applicants. This is such a big thing; about millions of dollars. She could see where the vote would go on this, and said the Board may choose to bring this back next week when Commissioner Bennett is present.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the Board needs to know what this means as far as the federal money. Doing a new RFP costs a lot of money, and if we jeopardize any of this so that no one gets anything, we need to know that. She is disappointed that no interviews were done, but it was made clear that it is the prerogative of the panel members, which they stated in December. The Board should have made that requirement then, but didn't -- to let the process go forward the way it would normally go forward, without Board interference. Now the Board is going back again. At no point in this process was she told the RFP was wrong – the same RFP would probably be reissued. It is the outcomes people were upset about. The first time, the Board was told there was a question about the panel, so it was done over again. They did interview, but did not interview everybody. Not all the applicants for the County Manager position were interviewed. To put in a requirement that everybody to apply is to be interviewed needs to be done up-front, not after the fact. The most important question for her is whether the money to be brought into Ramsey County is being jeopardized.

Ms. Truhler said she did not believe the money would be jeopardized. If the existing contract were continued the money would be used for that purpose. The Board approved components 2 through 3d in a previous Board meeting so some cases have already been transferred out to another agency; there would be a shifting of dollars, and we would not be able to allocate them the way they were intended to be allocated in the RFP – some changes would need to be made.

Commissioner Ortega said if we don't follow through now, we are politicizing the process. There will be a lot of interest in what happens here, both inside and outside the County. He is also thinking in terms of the delivery of services. The contracts would be extended to the current vendors, but they would not be permanent extensions -- up to and through the RFP process. He doesn't know why, if at the end, they don't get the contract. Rather than organizations moving on and adjusting, they would be in limbo for another two-three months. He has talked to the staff and has heard their concerns. It is not an environment to continue to deliver services, and he is thinking of this in that aspect, also. Rather than just making a decision now, because at this point, regardless of the rhetoric, this is now strike three. He said the Commissioners would get a lot of emails and phone calls, and it will go on for several months. These are all good organizations, and he didn't think the Workforce Solutions Department has done anything wrong. He agreed with Commissioner

(Continued)

McDonough. He was ready to vote the first time around, but the Board became too sensitive to try to make sure we were transparent, and now, it is getting messy, no matter what is done at this point by starting the process over.

Chair Parker asked why the interview process was not done. Was there was a dramatic difference between the applicant organizations, that it was so clear-cut that they didn't need to – was there not enough time – what was the rationale?

Ms. Truhler said the panel may have felt that all the organizations had a basic level of skills and ability and could deliver services. There wasn't a huge spread in points although there were clear differences in the proposals. They felt they did not need any additional information. There was a difference in how well proposals were written, how much detail was provided, and they made those types of comments. Staff offered the option to interview twice, and the panel decided they did not need to exercise that option.

Chair Parker asked if the panel felt all the applicants were well qualified and could provide the services.

Ms. Truhler responded affirmatively. The panel felt everybody had the basic level to provide services. From there, there are differences in how the staffing is arranged and what their emphasis is on, what internal resources are available to help with the program, and they made their decision based on the ranking.

Commissioner McDonough said it was mentioned that some of the proposals were better written than others. They all hire professional grant writers. In the end, it shouldn't be who writes the best proposals. That is why an interview process is so important because there are different strengths in different organizations about how you present what you are doing, and it shouldn't be who hired the best grant writer to make their proposal look the best.

Commissioner Carter asked for clarification on what staff had said. There were comments made about the difference in the writing, but were those decisions delineated away from that in particular?

Ms. Truhler said there were differences in how well they were written, and she doesn't mean grammar or structure. There were differences in the amount of explanation and detail provided. In some proposals, the reviewers were very clear about who was doing services and how, and to what extent, and in other proposals, they said they didn't have that level of detail. The RFP was published and said that interviewing was an option. Staff discussed that and felt very uncomfortable over-riding that option to the panel and they chose not to take that option, twice.

Commissioner McDonough said he was ready to vote.

Commissioner Carter agreed that it is disappointing that no interviews were done during this process, in particular given that the care the Board took to go back to ensure that a new panel would do another review. It would be comforting, hopeful, to know that those interviews were done. At the same time, the Board has been presented with concerns about the outcome that will exist, regardless of the outcome. It is her opinion that the Board's concern, where there could have been any at all, and working back through it, was to re-commission a full panel. One of the issues about the panel was that in the end there were three people on the panel, and that was not the normal number of people that the Board would want reviewing such a process as this, with as an important an allocation as the Board is making. But, that was redone to be certain to have the full panel to present the diversity of opinion that would give the Board a result we felt would have an assurance of integrity. We did not have concerns about the RFP and its issuance, or about the criteria or the process for response and review. We gave the panel the option to interview or not. There is nothing in the process that she has disagreement with; she agrees that unless she is making the decision she is not going to like everything in the outcome, but feels it is necessary to move forward today. Otherwise, everything the Board does and every step it takes has the potential to be questioned and pulled apart,

(Continued)

even when there is no concern for the manner in which the decision has been made. She feels it is necessary to move forward today. The vote will determine what is done, and she is willing to go back through everything if that is necessary. However, it appears that the Board is putting people, including vendors, through some additional uncertain agony, and that it would be a disruption to their ability to move forward.

Chair Parker asked if there was a middle ground. If it were to be done over, it would likely be the same RFP and proposals received in response. One of her concerns is that this is a great deal of money. We have just heard that all of the organizations are well qualified. Why not just split it into nine parts? Why four, not two, or six? How did four come out as the magic number?

Ms. Truhler said it was based on the number of slots that were included in the RFP. For agencies that wanted to serve the entire MFIP population they needed to propose to serve between 800 and 825 slots. For the specialized proposals they had to serve at least 500 people. When it was split, there was only enough money to fund two of the general proposals and two of the specialized proposals or three larger ones and one specialized. There are only so many ways the money could be split. During both reviews the panel chose to exercise the option in the RFP to fund general and specialized organizations, so they ranked them in those categories.

Ms. Brady added that about five years ago, when the MFIP RFP was done, previous to that they had been experiencing a decline in funding, and had to make decisions to go from fifteen vendors down to five vendors. There was a great deal of discussion in the community and with the Board. There were concerns on the part of staff that we keep the number of supported vendors to something that could be managed and sustained ongoing so that we did not get back into a situation where we were growing a vendor community that we might not be able to sustain. That was part of the issue – looking at the dollars and what we felt we could sustain over time and what fits for our clients.

Commissioner Reinhardt believes that either the Board goes forward with this or the RFP be reissued. If we were to again go into this one it would make it worse. As far as she is concerned, whatever is done, it should be all or nothing. She is fine either way.

Commissioner Ortega suggested voting on the motion on the floor. It will be a tie vote, after which the item could be laid over until all members of the Board are present.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Carter – 3. Nays – Rettman, McDonough, Parker – 3. Motion failed.

Commissioner Ortega moved to lay the item over to the next meeting, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Commissioner McDonough said the motion to bring it back would have to come from someone who voted 'no'.

Commissioner McDonough moved to bring the item back to the next meeting so that Commissioner Bennett can vote on the issue, seconded by Commissioner Ortega.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. This item will appear on the February 3, 2009 Board Agenda.

COUNTY MANAGER – Federal Legislative Items/Appropriations Requests

Commissioner Ortega introduced the draft resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Commissioner Rettman requested that the resolution be bifurcated so that she would not have to vote in the negative on all the requests. That request was a friendly amendment. Items on pages 11, 14, 16 and 17 were removed to become a separate resolution.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2009-051)

(Continued)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners has reviewed proposals and initiatives for inclusion in its federal legislative package for the 111th Congress; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes inclusion of the following appropriations requests in its federal legislative package for the 111th Congress:

I. TRANSPORTATION, TRANSIT and TRAILS

Transportation Reauthorization Projects

- Trunk Highway 36 Interchange at Rice Street (CSAH 49)
- Interstate 694 Interchange at Rice Street (CSAH 49)
- Interstate 694 Interchange at White Bear Avenue (CSAH 65)
- Interstate 94 Interchange at Dale Street (CSAH 53)
- Interstate 35W Interchange at County Road H

Regional Rail Projects

- Union Depot

Trails

- Regional Trail Network

II. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT and COMMUNITY STABILIZATION

Jobs

- Health Care Worker English Proficiency Project

Health Care and Correctional Interventions

- Mothers First

Basic Supports

- Food Support
- Hmong-Somali Outreach Program
- Community Development Block Grant Funding

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The County Board further authorizes its representatives to work with members of the Congressional Delegation and other interested parties to seek the necessary legislation for these proposals.

COUNTY MANAGER – Federal Legislative Items/Appropriations Requests

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Ortega. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 5. Nays – Rettman - 1. (2009-052)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners has reviewed proposals and initiatives for inclusion in its federal legislative package for the 111th Congress; Now, Therefore, Be It

(Continued)

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes inclusion of the following appropriations requests in its federal legislative package for the 111th Congress:

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT and COMMUNITY STABILIZATION

Jobs

- Employment Services for Felons in the Community

Health Care and Correctional Interventions

- Multi-Jurisdictional Mental Health / Chemical Dependency Facility and Services
- All Children Excel (ACE)
- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative(JDAI)

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The County Board further authorizes its representatives to work with members of the Congressional Delegation and other interested parties to seek the necessary legislation for these proposals.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – First Reading of the Proposed 2009 Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance

Commissioner McDonough introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Ortega. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2009-053)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Home Rule Charter states that every proposed Ordinance shall receive two readings; first at the time it is presented, and second, at the time of the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, The full reading of the proposed Ordinance may be waived if a copy of the proposed Ordinance is supplied to each member of the County Board prior to its introduction; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby waives the first reading of the proposed 2009 Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Set Public Hearing date for the 2009 Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Carter. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2009-054)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County will be issuing bonds in accordance with provisions of Ordinance No. 93-292, adopted on July 29, 1993, which sets forth a procedure for issuing bonds in compliance with the Home Rule Charter of Ramsey County; and

WHEREAS, The ordinance process requires setting the date for the public hearing, publishing the notice of public hearing at least 10 days in advance, official publication of the ordinance, and a 30 day waiting period after passage before the ordinance becomes effective; Now, Therefore, Be It

(Continued)

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby establishes a public hearing on February 17, 2009, to be held in the Council Chambers, 3rd floor of the Ramsey County Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard, St. Paul, MN, at 9:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as possible, to afford an opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed 2009 Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – First Reading of the Proposed 2009 Library Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Carter. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2009-055)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Home Rule Charter states that every proposed Ordinance shall receive two readings; first at the time it is presented, and second, at the time of the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, The full reading of the proposed Ordinance may be waived if a copy of the proposed Ordinance is supplied to each member of the County Board prior to its introduction; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby waives the first reading of the proposed 2009 Library Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Set Public Hearing date for the 2009 Library Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2009-056)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County will be issuing bonds in accordance with provisions of Ordinance No. 93-292, adopted on July 29, 1993, which sets forth a procedure for issuing bonds in compliance with the Home Rule Charter of Ramsey County; and

WHEREAS, The ordinance process requires setting the date for the public hearing, publishing the notice of public hearing at least 10 days in advance, official publication of the ordinance, and a 30 day waiting period after passage before the ordinance becomes effective; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby establishes a public hearing on February 17, 2009, to be held in the Council Chambers, 3rd floor of the Ramsey County Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard, St. Paul, MN, at 9:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as possible, to afford an opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed 2009 Library Capital Improvement Program Bond Ordinance.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Terry Speiker, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, and Nick Riley, Intergovernmental Relations were present to discuss current legislative items.

Mr. Riley said a meeting will be held this coming Friday with Congresswomen Betty McCollum. She has requested this meeting so she has a better understanding of Ramsey County's needs.

(Continued)

There will be separate meetings in the areas of health care, human services, public safety and justice, and multi-modal transit and transportation, which includes trails. She will also meet with the Board to discuss the stimulus package, and the committees on which she serves. Also joining us will be Senator Moua and Representative Sheldon Johnson.

Mr. Riley distributed information received from the American Public Human Services Association, which is what they have gleaned from the federal stimulus bill.

Ms. Speiker said many of the specific items are things the Board has either taken a position on, or are included in the stimulus package.

Mr. Riley said this could change because neither the President nor the Senate have reviewed it, so we don't know where they will come down on these issues. This is the House version.

Ms. Speiker said the Governor's budget will be released today. She distributed information that included a comparison between the 2008-2009 State budget and the County budget; the portion of the budget dedicated to health and human services at the State and the portion of the County budget where the funds come in and where they are used for health and human service type programs. One of the things understood, is that to maintain current health and human services funding at the State level there would have to be a 19% increase for 2010-2011. The Governor is proposing a 4% increase. That would be one of the largest areas of decreased funding in the Governor's budget. It will take staff a while to assess the budget. County Manager Kleinschmidt has already put a group in place to begin looking at the budget.

Chair Parker said that it sounds like we are requesting a 20% increase, but the status quo is 19%, and means more people are eligible for services.

Ms. Speiker said it is two things: an increase in the cost of care and an increase especially in long-term care programs. The majority of the increase that we are seeing in Minnesota has to do with health care costs. Part of what the Governor is proposing will be changes in the types of benefits that people might be eligible for. There will probably also be a removal of some programs from state funding or removing peoples' eligibility. In the Governor's State of the State address, he said he would maintain funding for children's health care. Staff will need to look at what it means in terms of health care programs for residents of this community.

Commissioner Carter requested clarification on the long-term care programs.

Ms. Speiker said it is both the number of people coming into the system and the general increase in cost of benefits – not an expansion of the services.

Ms. Speiker spoke of the budget trends report. A group of House, Senate and gubernatorial appointees released a report to the House and Senate. It talks about the structural budget deficit and the imbalance in the State's budget. This gives staff a better sense of what we need to think about as we make our plans for service delivery, and as the County Manager works with departments to make their plans on how they are going to respond in this and future years. The report can be printed from the Finance Department website at www.finance.state.MN.us. The title is the Minnesota Budget Trends Study Commission.

Commissioner McDonough said AMC compared the current fiscal crisis to that of 2003. In 2003, the general consensus was that about 50% of that fiscal crisis was structural; in this budget it is about 80% structural. The need to deal with the structural problem is so much greater because this will continue to be ongoing.

Mr. Riley said the Commission established, made the recommendation that the State should have between \$1.5-2 billion in a reserve fund. Without inflation, that would bring the deficit to about \$7 billion if the State would be restored in a sound financial way. The problem is worse than what was first perceived to be.

Ms. Speiker said the next forecast is being talked about, which could add another \$1-2 billion.

(Continued)

Ms. Speiker distributed information on the AMC re-design proposal. This was an excellent editorial that talked about the proposal and an item from *Politics in Minnesota* with some good quotes from leaders at AMC talking about the proposal. Lobbyists working on county issues were briefed on this and were told the next steps in the process. At this point, the plan is for staff from the AMC to present to the Legislative Steering Committee a list of maintenance of effort (MOE) and mandate ideas to be drafted into a bill. They are conceiving the bill as having articles around the various areas. They have sought out Legislators in both the House and Senate who are past county commissioners to act as authors of the bill. They have found enough interest on the part of legislators that if the executive committee and leadership at AMC gives them the authority to go ahead with moving this bill forward, they will be able to get the bill introduced that will look at some of these re-design ideas and some of the MOE issue and some of the mandate issues. Their plan is to have this bill ready and out within the next four weeks.

Chair Parker said that Commissioner McDonough is President of the AMC and is carrying a lot of this initiative from AMC. It has caught on as one of the hot topics.

Mr. Riley said the re-design project is a five-year project and is not something that will fix the woes of the State overnight. It is something that would be phased in over a long period of time.

Mr. Speiker said it fits with the recommendation from that budget commission because it looks at how you deal with a structural deficit.

Chair Parker asked Commissioner McDonough to help Ramsey County figure out the role it could play to move this along.

Mr. Riley said much more information should be available next week. This is only the Governor's proposal; the Legislature will work on it for several months.

Commissioner McDonough reiterated that the re-design would be a five-year plan; AMC started working on it about 1½ years ago. There will be a tremendous amount of pain to go along with these budget issues. This plan is not a panacea that would solve everything. AMC is trying to offer solutions to get to a structural point that we can sustain. The relationship between the State and counties; how things are funded and measured, are a big part of the structural problem. AMC is trying to offer solutions and create an opportunity to have a dialogue. We have major budget problems. He met with Senator Dick Cohen who said that if the Governor and Legislature hold true to protecting K-12, veteran's services and public safety, that is \$16 billion out of the \$37 billion budget. That means a \$5-6 billion deficit gets solved on a \$21 billion budget.

OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair Parker reported:

- There has been a statewide task force on poverty; they released their recommendations last week. This is something that is at the crux of what the county does and what we are responsible for, and is something that points out the disconnect between the federal economic stimulus movement and the state deficit and cutting the services that are affecting the people who are on the edge.

Commissioner Reinhardt:

- Reported that she was appointed by the Governor to the Clean Water Council to represent metropolitan counties as part of the Clean Water Legacy Act; she was elected Vice-Chair of the Council.
- Spoke of product stewardship and said that one main purpose of product stewardship is not just the manufacturer's responsibility side of the cost and not having it be on local government, but it is really about toxicity reduction and what it does to the water, the air and the ground and

(Continued)

the pollution prevention we are trying to deal with. One of the concerns for counties is that it doesn't happen on the property tax payers dime, but rather that the manufacturers are taking responsibility.

- Said she and Commissioner Parker attended the *Reducing Energy Costs to Local Government* forum held in St. Cloud. There are many innovative and creative things that people have done, such as replacing lights with LED lights, where a tremendous amount of money can be saved. State Auditor Rebecca Otto was present; many of these examples and case studies are located on the State Auditor's website.

Chair Parker added that it was a great conference; she was very impressed with the State Auditor's presentation about the work being done in looking for best practices around the State.

- Attended the Ramsey County League of Local Governments annual meeting with Legislators.
- Attended a meeting in Dakota County with Secretary of State Ritchie, where election officials from across the state met to talk about what went right and what went not so right. They zeroed in on making changes that will improve the process. It was felt that there was not anything flawed with either the recount or the absentee ballots, but rather they discussed how to make this so there are not as many errors regarding the wrongly rejected ballots; it came down to making simple changes in the process. One thing discussed was the fact that Ramsey County had absentee voting without having to check off one of the reasons, which has been done for approximately four to six years. We have a good case study on how that could work well if it was done statewide, and the reduction in potential human error because of that change. Data exists that talks about the fact that there was not fraud. In the end, we talked about what we are trying to do is make certain that anyone eligible to vote, gets to vote; that it is made as convenient as possible; and that the integrity of the system is retained.

Commissioner Reinhardt sat in on the trial beginning in the Supreme Court. Joe Mansky's name was brought up several times as being one of the most highly respected election officials, not only in the State of Minnesota but in the country. We should be very proud of Mr. Mansky and the integrity of the system within Ramsey County. She was very impressed with the respect shown to Ramsey County and Joe Mansky.

Chair Parker:

- Mentioned a workshop that was held with the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB), Metro Council and the University of Minnesota. Experts from Salt Lake City and Denver talked about how they were able to accelerate the development of transitways. The main focus was that if only federal funding is relied on, it will take a long time to build a system. It is important to look for alternative funding sources. Salt Lake City is doing approximately 70 miles – five lines -- of rail development all at one time.

Commissioner Carter:

- Spoke of her trip to Washington D.C. to watch the inauguration of President Obama. It was a phenomenal experience; she was thankful for the opportunity to have been present.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Parker declared the meeting adjourned.