

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

April 17, 2024

Virtual via Microsoft Teams

Present Members: Anna Brawley (Assembly), Jennifer Veneklasen (Assembly staff), Trevor Storrs (Alaska Children’s Trust), Jen Griffis (Alaska Children’s Trust), Kim Rash (Anchorage Health Department), Dawn Skeete (Anchorage Health Department), Melinda Myers (thread), Jade Hayden (Hmoob Cultural Center of Alaska), Branwen Collier (Early Learning for Everyone), Nora Matell (parent), Jessica Simonsen (parent), Heather Weafer (Child and Youth Programs, U.S. Air Force), Katrina Ahlfield (Kids’ Corps., Inc.), Eric Croft (volunteer; campaign team); Carl Jacobs (ASD – School Board); Kathleen McArdle (Anchorage Chamber)

Absent Members: Kameron Perez-Verdia (Assembly); Ivy Spohnholz (volunteer; campaign team), Ethan Petticrew (Cook Inlet Native Head Start)

Staff: Austin Quinn-Davidson

Guests: n/a

Notes:

1. Finalize Agenda
 - a. Trevor moved to accept as drafted, Kathleen seconded. No changes made.
2. Updates
 - a. Legislative update: Jen Griffis
 - i. HB 89 passed out of HSS committee last week with some minor changes. Goes to Senate Finance next. The House budget includes the bill’s fiscal note, but not funding for additional grants.
 - b. Governor’s Task Force: Heather Weafer
 - i. The Task Force received a cost of care presentation from McKinley Research Group. They are in the process of creating a tool to calculate the true cost of care, which will be helpful for folks who want to be child care providers and those evaluating the sector. The tool will be completed by June.
 - ii. The Task Force also received a briefing from the UAA Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) on a recent market rate study. About half of licensed providers responded to ISER’s survey.

- iii. At its last meeting, the Task force worked on recommendations around quality and subsidies. Nine recommendations were evaluated, including those related to eligibility and graduated benefits supports (ensuring folks don't lose eligibility when they have a small change in income, like when they get a raise at work). They also discussed special populations who could possibly be eligible (including child care workers). Any additional subsidies would have to be funded by the State.
 - iv. They will receive an update on recommendations and what's been implemented soon.
 - c. Members share any other relevant updates
 - i. Melinda Myers: thread received some funding from the State and has been distributing that funding. Most of it will go out this month, with some next month. thread is also about to distribute its last bit of COVID funding.
- 3. Accountability Board ordinance: Anna Brawley
 - a. The plan is to discuss the initial draft today, take comments and create a final draft, share that draft with the IT, incorporate edits, and then bring the updated version to the full Assembly for consideration.
 - b. There are different types of Boards at the Muni level. The drafting team looked at the Trust Fund board as a similar example. Also looked at Naming Commission Board. Will follow up with attorneys to ensure the language is consistent with Muni Code after the discussion today.
 - c. Major discussion topics include who is on the Board (number of seats, what types of designated seats) and their role (what do they do once they get there).
 - i. Section A: comes from Charter language. No feedback.
 - ii. Section B: Types of seats. Drafted as requiring a certain profession or other status at the time of being seated, so board members don't have to leave the Board if their jobs change.
 - iii. Section C: lays out the Board's responsibilities
 - d. After significant discussion, the IT settled on the following edits to the existing draft:
 - i. At the top, include a general statement about diversity on the board. We'd like to see diversity in experiences in the sector as well as backgrounds that reflects the community we're in.
 - ii. Pay for the board: Board members shouldn't be paid a salary, but it would be nice for them to be able to seek reimbursement for any board-related needs, and perhaps a small stipend. Perhaps we add language that leaves payment to per diem and costs? Could include examples, such as if a member needs a cab for transportation to meetings, this should be paid for.
 - iii. We should make it clear that the board can hire its own staff (not just an Executive Director, which is included in the proposition language, but also additional staff as needed). Should clarify that the staff provided by a Muni department provides administrative support, whereas the board's

executive director and any additional staff are there to support the board in executing its substantive mission (putting together a budget, etc.).

- iv. We should also make it clear that the board can do studies as it needs to, or make grants as it deems appropriate, so long as it has the Mayor and Assembly approval for its annual budget. We don't want to limit the board.
 - v. There should be nine seats on the board. Some members advocated for seven, due to the challenges of filling the board and maintaining quorum, but the group felt most comfortable with nine.
 - vi. In terms of who should sit on the board, the board wanted to make it as broad and flexible as possible so that it is not overly cumbersome to fill the seats. We don't want to identify certain organizations or dictate too many categories of folks who should serve on the board.
 - 1. The IT decided to keep a child care and early education category (combine #1 and 2). Minimum of one member and maximum of four (?). The IT would also like to keep a parent category to ensure we have parents on the board who are there to provide the parent perspective (rather than just incidentally also parents). The IT would also like to maintain category #3, except remove the reference to health care specifically. Otherwise, no specific categories.
 - 2. The IT would like to remove maximums, except in the child care and education category.
 - vii. Terms. The next draft needs to make sure to account for staggered terms. Three-year terms, and can serve three terms before needing to be off the board. Can return after a full term period.
 - viii. The IT unanimously supported the edits described above.
4. Recommendation matrix: Austin Quinn-Davidson
- a. Austin reviewed the matrix and described how it was organized. She asked each IT member to budget at least half an hour to fully review the matrix and provide her with feedback, including what they need (more information, numbers, etc.) to make their recommendations by next Wednesday. She asked that everyone come to the May meeting ready to make decisions/rank the recommendations.
 - b. Discussion around our decision-making process for the next couple of months:
 - i. Trevor Storrs asked how the group wants to make its recommendation decisions (i.e., consensus, show of hands, voting, etc.). He asked what would be most helpful to the group – a proposal from the small strategy group, individual proposals from each person, etc. He reminded everyone that the goal is to get this work done in May/June.
 - 1. The IT would like to see a top 3/presented draft funding package from the small strategy group.
 - ii. Anna Brawley reminded everyone that all of the IT's work is moving towards giving recommendations to the Assembly and Mayor. She said it

would be helpful to have a shorter list of recommendations for the decision makers – maybe a top 3.

- iii. Austin offered that whatever the IT puts forward should ideally be turnkey (given timeline constraints, etc.) with specific recommendations and amounts.
 - iv. Trevor stated that he envisions the recommendations will relate to how to spend the money and the “why” behind those recommendations; it will be report of sorts to the Accountability Board. The report from the IT will be turned over to the board with the idea that they’ll build off it in coming years.
 1. He outlined an action plan for the decision-making process: the small strategy group will present a proposal to the IT at the May meeting. Instead of starting from scratch at the May meeting, IT members can use the proposal as a starting point and make changes. This will make time for vibrant discussion, so members don’t feel rushed. IT members were supportive and appreciative of this plan.
5. Conflicts Form: Turn in to Jenn
 6. Closing Comments: All
 - a. Ran out of time. Will endeavor to allow more time for next time!