



MINUTES- Governance Meeting
Monday, May 22, 2006 8:30 am
Health & Human Services Conference Room
1351 Rocking W. Dr Bishop, Ca 93514

1. Call to order, Establish Quorum, Public Comment

Commissioner Griffiths called meeting to order at 8:40am

A quorum was present with Commissioners Harrison, Anderson, Dossey, Griffiths, Dickinson and Cash in attendance. Also in attendance were ICOE Representative, Margaret Peterson; IMACA Representative, Daniel Steinhagen; Inyo HHS Evaluation Director, Mike Finney and First 5 Inyo staff, Jara Halfen and Karey Poole.

Table opened to public comment. No public comment was received.

2. Review Policies and Procedures

Conflict of Interest and Contracting and Procurement Policies were reviewed.

Commissioner Cash made a motion to approve policies.

Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

Motion approved unanimously.

3. Commission Cost Structure

The Commission reviewed a cost structure comparison between HHS and ICOE as provided by ICOE and based on numbers provided by Commission staff. Comparison showed that if Commission were housed under ICOE, there would be a \$12,566 savings on employee salaries and benefits and a \$16,199 savings on Administrative and Operational costs.

The Commission reviewed the benefits under ICOE as compared to HHS. The medical benefits would pay for family coverage; however, it was unclear about the comparison between the ICOE Evidence of Coverage and the HHS Evidence of Coverage. Savings between the two benefits plans occur because ICOE does not pay onto FICA/SSI or State disability. ICOE does contribute to PERS but does not pay the employee contribution.

Jara Halfen expressed concern about the change in benefits structure in relation to the retirement plans. Jara requested the Commission consider making salary adjustments (increasing) for the ED and HHS Specialist salaries so that they remain whole if the Commission moves from HHS to ICOE.

Jara also stated that the Commission would need to confirm with Superintendent Lozito that the salaries could be adjusted accordingly due to Union regulations and potential equity issues within ICOE.

There was also discussion about legal counsel coverage. Under HHS, County Counsel services are not charged to First 5, but under ICOE, there would be free service up to 10 hours but after that, there would be a charge of \$180/hour.

The Commission also reviewed the Evaluation and Fiscal support it currently receives under HHS. It was determined that this is probably more extensive than it would be under the ICOE umbrella.

Commissioner Cash advised that the request to take the \$12,566 out of the equation was understandable. She stated that the Commission needs to consider that if the \$12,566 is taken out of the equation, would \$16,166 in savings be worthy of moving to a different infrastructure that would have limited legal counsel and evaluation support.

4. Discussion of Pros and Cons of the two organizations and the Effect of Current Operating Structure on Strategic Plan Implementation

Under ICOE, the Commissioners discussed the benefits of limits on indirect costs, greater flexibility in contracting and a less conservative more flexible structure in which to get contracts approved or changed and to have decisions made with less beurocracy.

The Commission also reviewed that under HHS, the legal counsel services are very beneficial and provide the Commissioners with a sense of security. Commissioners talked about the difference in size of the County's infrastructure as compared to ICOE that can lend itself to more beurocratic hurdles but also more support.

The Commission also discussed the pros and cons of becoming a stand-alone entity. All agreed that this is something that could be researched in the future. Over the course of the next year or two, the Commission may do some scenario analysis and planning around developing an independent structure.

The process and timeline was discussed regarding the need to put the decision to a vote due to measure A. The cost would be \$8000-\$10,000 and would need to be put on the ballot for the November election. The Commission discussed language that could be used to explain the ballot initiative to voters.

The Commission did not make a decision to change the infrastructure at this time.

Commissioner Cash requested staff provide feedback from County Counsel about how performance evaluations of Commission staff should be handled. Staff will provide information in the June Commission meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:10 a.m.