

Block Grant Planning Committee
May 26, 2015
Administrative Annex

Attendance

Voting Committee	Staff	Public	Not Present
Manny Diaz	Shalom Black	Alicia Kanelopoulos	Doug Amsley
Karen Johnston	Christy Briggs	Karen Scott	Elizabeth Grant
Sheldon Schwartz	Steve Nevada		Jeff Hoose
Ann Spottswood	Stacy Rowe		Traci Kline
Megan Shreve	Cori Seilhamer		Jean Snyder
Kim Wertz	Quentin Helsel (intern)		Carrie Gray
Amy Hicks	Rick Wynn		Ann Larew
	Lori Young		
	April Rouzer		
	Erin Nye		

MINUTES

I. Welcome & Introductions

- Introductions were given. Rick provided a brief introduction to the new Drug & Alcohol Director, April Rouzer.
- Rick announced that the Block Grant Committee is looking to fulfill the following vacant positions:
 - Consumer representative from Homeless Assistance Program (HAP) as Jeff Hoose is no longer with the Committee.
 - Consumer representative for Drug & Alcohol.
 - If anyone knows of anyone interested in being a member, please pass this information onto Rick.

II. Approval of April 15, 2015 Minutes

- Sheldon moved to approve the minutes; Kim seconded the motion; Committee approved.

III. PNAO Committee

- The task of the PNAO Committee is to bring structure of where the Block Grant wants to go in the future, such as funding.
- PNAO Committee met last week to discuss data that was requested and what was presented at the last Block Grant meeting. The meeting reviewed the following:
 - Different outcomes provided by categoricals.
 - Extensive database of provider outcomes from MH/ID.
 - Statistical outcomes.
 - The fact that some outcomes are not providing explanation of numbers (increase or decrease) or utilization of services.
 - Committee would like providers under each categorical to turn in some outcomes to the Committee for review. The Committee will decide on three outcomes and indicators that would be a good starting point.
 - Plan is to send out general resources on outcomes to help providers try to develop meaningful outcomes. If they are unsure what to provide, technical assistance in a one-on-one setting can be done.

- Discussion has been held on looking at a data warehouse to collect data from providers and use the database to run comparisons.
 - This was previously done in Juvenile Probation Office (JPO). Shalom looked into this and the expenses for the database management system was \$8,800. JPO worked with Dr. Jim Griffith. The process involved a three phase plan, including identifying services, program indicators, assessing data collected, preparing a report, recommending indicators, conducting an evaluation on what was collected, etc.; which resulted in an additional \$17,600.
 - If this is something the Block Grant is interested in, it can be explored. Assistance will be needed from providers to obtain the information needed. The biggest downfall would be to provide training to the providers to use the systems. Shalom still receives reports from the system created for JPO; system has five years' worth of data. Dr. Griffith is working with another County currently in the Block Grant but would be willing to meet us and provide recommendations.
 - ◆ The data warehouse sounds like a possibility, but at this point it was decided to put this aside and see what information is received from providers.
 - Shalom explained the different levels of outcomes, such as outputs (general numbers of people served, outcomes that are easily measured after a couple months (quality assessment, surveys, etc.), mid-term outcomes (assessing after a program has been in place), long term outcomes. The Block Grant is at the beginning of receiving short term outcomes and will hopefully move onto long term
 - ◆ A bigger question is what the Block Grant does with the information after it is given or what they do if they do not receive the information they are asking for.
 - ◆ Further discussion was held on the learning curves for some providers and the fact that they have already provided goals before their contract could be put in place. Some providers may not be able to provide a big report due to seasonal issues or due to being an emergency funded service.
 - ◆ The Committee is not asking providers to change their current goals but is looking for ways to see the effectiveness in their programs through their goals.

IV. Fiscal Reports

- Human Services Block Grant Projections
 - The Human Services Block Grant Projections document is actual numbers through March. Using March numbers, programs projected out on where they would be in their budget until the end of the fiscal year (June 30th).
 - At this point, it looks like there will be \$58,000 to roll over into the next FY. If the Holy Spirit Extended Acute Care (EAC), a provider under mental health, does not utilize their funds, there will be an additional \$28,000. The EAC runs around \$475 a day; their encumbrance will be reduced proportionally each month. With that being said, there would be a total of about \$86,000 to roll over.
- Human Services Block Grant Historical Comparison
 - The document shows tracking of historical trends/changes since the beginning of the Block Grant.

- FY 13-14 is when the state decided to settle FY 12-13, therefore there was one time funding received in the amount of \$165,975.
- The Block Grant is a five year phasing plan; each year a percentage of funds is able to be carried over. Year 1: 20%, Year 2: 25%, Year 3: 50% (current FY we are in), Year 4: 75% and Year 5: 100%.
- Final numbers for FY 14-15 will be unknown until September - October.
- Requests for Funding
 - As a result of the dollars that may be carried over, HAP was asked the amount of money needed to fund their program through June; HAP needs \$5,000. Rick asked for consideration from the Committee to decrease the amount of dollars being rolled over by \$5,000 to fund HAP. Ann motioned to accept; Sheldon seconded the motion; Committee approved.
 - Healthy Communities Partnership sent a letter requesting funds for next FY. This request will be discussed with the Committee in October.

V. Human Services Block Grant 15/16 Plan

- Categoricals did revisions based on last year's plan assuming it would be similar; which it was but a few minor changes. The next step will be to present the plan to the Commissioners on June 23rd and then move to vote on June 25th. If anyone would like to be part of the Commissioners Meetings they begin at 9:30 a.m. The plan presented during this meeting is a rough draft but representative of the plan intended to be submitted after minor changes and formatting are completed.
- The minor changes involved the following:
 - More clarification on charts and on individual categoricalals.
 - Cut down on the amount of information provided.
 - Reformatting on CYS services.
 - More justification on underutilizing dollars.
- The timeframe for the second draft (after changes are made) is as follows:
 - Take information from current draft and insert into the recently released template from the State.
 - Send to categoricalals by the end of this week, highlighting any places that need revisions or new information.
 - Shalom will then get a draft back to the categoricalals, posted on the website and sent to the Committee ten days before the Commissioners Meeting, which is June 23, 2015. This will allow opportunity for comments to be sent to Rick, Shalom or at the Public Meeting.
- Categoricalals were given time to discuss their changes/updates to the plan:
 - MH/ID
 - ◆ ID: the plan includes Quality Management Plan which is required by the state, increasing competitive employment, independent living apartments, the numbers of individuals served, individual to individual (I2I) abuse increase due to definition (which will continue to be monitored), etc.
 - ◆ MH: the plan includes information on CIT as it is a great asset to the County; currently trying to collect data in conjunction with the 911 center, MH first aid, leadership academy, the number of individuals served, etc.
 - ◆ Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CASSP) numbers for 2015 look low; however, CASSP is reported on calendar year and not FY. If continued at the same rate, the numbers project out to be greater than last calendar year.

- ◆ More outreach is needed on Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender/Questioning/Intersex (LGBTQI). There has not been a high demand but we need to continue to focus on this. On report template, the Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (OMHSAS) states this is an area that needs focused on.
- CYS
 - ◆ All money is being kept the same as last FY. CYS is anticipating they will utilize their allocation in one program; Family Group Decision Making.
 - ◆ Committee member questioned the number of referrals for next FY and the number of individuals successfully completing the program. More information and numbers are needed from CYS as this information was inserted from last FY due to staff being out of the office. CYS will coordinate with HCP on accurate numbers.
 - ◆ The grant that was given to CYS from the Block Grant to provide Children Advocacy Center (CAC) is not included in this budget. The grant was used for first year funding of the program. CYS's goal was to get CAC in state funding (which is not included in the Block Grant).
 - ◆ Committee members would like to see numbers in percentages; however, the charts cannot be changed due to CYS's state needs based plan.
- D&A
 - ◆ There were no changes made from last FY. If anyone has any questions, please contact Rick or April Rouzer.
- HSA
 - ◆ People who use Information & Referral find it to be very helpful. As things tie in 211, a United Way state project, HSA does not foresee this service going away. The Coordinator is looking at outcomes.
 - ◆ HSA coordinates a two-day training event called Training Days. The Coordinator is always looking for ideas for topics. If anyone has any, please contact Sandy Thomas at I&R.
- HAP
 - ◆ John reported that there are no changes being made to the rental portion of HAP. Numbers projected for FY 15-16 appear lower but this is due to lower funding. Previously, HAP had extra shelter support.
 - ◆ Depending on allocation, similar numbers of families are expected for the upcoming FY. The amount given to families is based upon allocation. Each time a family comes back for funding, the amount decreases as well. The numbers of individuals stays the same but the amount provided changes.
- Committee questions/comments:
 - Looking at Appendix C, there is no base to compare the estimated client numbers to. Was this done last year, year before and do we have actual numbers?
 - ◆ The year-end financial report submitted to the state includes that information, which is also provided to the Block Grant Committee. This year's report is not yet complete. Last year's report will be resent to the Committee for review.

- On page 1 under #2, it discusses having a small but active planning team. Do we ever take a hit because we are a small planning team? Are there thoughts of bringing on more members and the benefit of it? As a team we should think about growing. There are areas of expertise, such as Family Group Decision Making, that would be a great member to have. Member would like the Committee to make awareness of this and the enhancement it may have.
 - ◆ The Committee is still looking to fill two vacant positions (D&A and HAP). If the Committee felt strong about adding to the team, that request could be carried onto the Commissioners as they decide the composition of the team.

VI. Public Comments

- Alicia Kanelopoulos asked when the public is able to access the plan so they have time to review it before the Commissioners Meeting.
 - The plan will be on the website on June 10th and sent to the Committee as it has to be posted 10 days before the meeting on June 23rd.
 - This will be the final plan unless substantial changes are made during the Commissioners Meeting. Anyone has any questions or comments, please contact Rick or Shalom.
- Karen Scott questioned if there is anything the County can do to assist individuals in getting Suboxone instead of going to rehab.
 - In D&A, half the people feel you should not substitute one drug with another; while the other half feels it helps wean someone off the drug they are on. The County did support Suboxone at one point but has since stopped it. The MA program under Managed Care does provide this support but it does not come through the County. A grant was submitted requesting Recovery Support Specialist and medication support. However, the medication requested for support is Vivitrol. The grant will not be approved until the budget is passed.

VII. Next Block Grant Committee Meeting

- Tuesday, October 20, 2015 from 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. at the Administrative Annex.