

Karen James - Sioux Rivers 28e and proposed changes.

#6b

From: Ed Gilliland
To: James, Karen; Satterwhite, Heather
Date: 3/27/2015 3:17 PM
Subject: Sioux Rivers 28e and proposed changes.
Attachments: 3.24.15 Regional Governance Board Agenda and Part 1 Attachments .pdf; M507067.pdf; Service Coordinator Contract.docx; Service Coordinator Job Description.docx; 2015-01-12 Amended and signed M507811.pdf; Sioux Rivers 28E Agreement.pdf; 20150327 Proposed language changes to 28e.pdf

The discussion centers around the content of the 28e agreement and 2 new Documents that were introduced.

We have two 28e agreements.

One is signed by George Boykin in May of 2014

One is signed by Mark Monson in January of 2015

Two diverse points of view, both in agreement on the language.

The language in the signed agreements is identical. Exception: Cherokee County chose to leave this and go to another region and leave this one behind.

Now just 2 months later we are seeing an introduction of new language to the 28e agreement.

The new language for the 28e alters the contract substantially.

The new language for 28e was introduced at the last minute and there was little or no time to discuss.

It is my job to ask questions about these changes and to bring these questions and documents to you.

There were two new documents presented for approval at the meeting:

1) A Service Coordinator Contract

2) A Service Coordinator Job Description

these were not approved by the Governance Board.

and then there was the

3) New Language PROPOSED for the 28e.

we believe this language to be even more concerning.

this was not approved by the Governance Board.

Here are some basic questions:

The duties of the Coordinators are quite different from County to County so why would there be only one job description?

Why are these (the contract and the job description) necessary in addition to the 28e?

Why would we completely abdicate the Coordinator to Sioux Rivers Region? Some percentage of the duties have to remain with the County.

Who chose the number of employees and the percentages and why were these not discussed with HR, the liaison to the Board, the Budget Analyst, or Anyone at Woodbury County?

What is this WORKING Mechanism (referred to in 1. of the **SERVICE COORDINATION CONTRACT**)? Is this not the purpose of the 28e?

It makes no sense to have these contracts in place when the 28e is to address these issues.

Sioux Rivers Region clearly should **NOT** be contracting with the coordinators directly. The contract is with the County to provide a service coordinator per the 28e agreement.

What is the real purpose of this, what is the end goal, why is this necessary outside the 28e? This is not logical, it is redundant, one part is in conflict with the other so why are we doing this?

Respectfully,

Ed G.

Edward S. Gilliland
Director Human Resources
Woodbury County
620 Douglas Street, Room 701
Sioux City, Ia 51101
[712-279-6480](tel:712-279-6480)