LENAWEE-LIVINGSTON-MONROE-WASHTENAW OVERSIGHT POLICY BOARD

Summary of May 28, 2015 meeting 705 N. Zeeb Road Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Members Present: David Oblak, Tom Waldecker, Dianne McCormick, Charles Coleman, Kim

Comerzan, Sheila Little, Mac Marr, Amy Fullerton, William Green, Cletus

Smith

Members Absent: Melnee McPherson, Ralph Tillotson, Dave DeLano, Cheryl Davis

Guests:

Staff Present: Stephannie Weary, Marci Scalera, Marie Irwin, Jane Goerge, Katie

Postmus, Suzanne Gondek, Michael Palmer, Teresa Sharp

OPB Chair D. Oblak called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. Introductions

2. Approval of April minutes

Motion by C. Coleman, supported by A. Fullerton, to approve the April minutes Motion carried

- 3. Audience Participation
 - None
- 4. Old Business
 - a. Provider Monitoring Template Review
 - M. Scalera presented the monitoring tool.
 - So far staff has monitored 6 agencies.
 - Results will be posted on the CMHPSM web site, per state requirements.
 - b. CMHPSM Regional SUD Finance Report
 - M. Irwin provided an overview of revenue and expenses.
 - Thus far the WCHO's financial situation has no impact on SUD services.
 - The block grant is currently underspent. Staff will request to shift block grant dollars to prevention allocation, which in turn will "save" PA2 dollars. Healthy Michigan use has exploded, which directly causes the under-utilization of block grant dollars. This is a statewide occurrence.
 - C. Smith expressed concern that block grant funds may be diverted to other uses in the future.
 - C. Coleman requested that staff think creatively and think ahead to come up with some innovative programs in anticipation of financial issues that may come (Healthy Michigan going away, block grant funds being diminished, etc.).

5. New Business

- a. PA2 Changes
 - Michigan Association of Counties (MAC)
 - M. Scalera presented a copy of the MAC report regarding PA2 dollars.

- PA2 dollars are liquor tax dollars. The PA2 bill will sunset 9/30/15. Oakland, Wayne, and Macomb County will be made whole, which will change the formula for distribution across the state. PA2 revenue will decrease.
- Staff has been in discussions to shift programs from PA2 to other funding where possible in anticipation of these changes.

b. RFP Updates

- M. Scalera shared a summary of the 18 proposals received.
- Recommendations will be presented to OPB in July.
- A. Fullerton reported that some in Lenawee didn't know about the RFP, didn't know how to negotiate the process, or felt rushed to complete the process.
- M. Scalera advised that the RFP was on the MITN web site and the CMHPSM web site, and also went out to the CMHPSM's provider network and the Human Services Collaboratives.
- Initially there was a 4-week window to submit, and an additional 2 weeks were added to give people more time.
- OPB members requested that staff revisit how RFP information is disseminated.
- C. Coleman recommended an RFP 101 type of training, and technical assistance.
- K. Comerzan recommended a save-the-date type communication months in advance, letting providers know that it's coming.

6. Report from Regional Board

- Washtenaw County provided an update. They are on target financially, forming a new CMH and in the hiring process for a new director.
- The regional board is planning to host an all-board meeting, which will include members
 of the OPB and the county CMH boards. It's tentatively scheduled for the 5th
 Wednesday in July.
- PIHP audit results were very good.

7. SUD Director Updates

- The Department of Corrections has mandated their contracted treatment providers to have a relationship with the PIHPs. They are identifying Healthy Michigan funds to be used for the treatment services after prison release. They will be releasing an RFP that would specify their curriculum and require the provider to contract with the PIHP for payment. The problem is the regulatory requirements for Medicaid apply to Healthy Michigan and are not aligned with the corrections mandates. This is all being explored at the state level with input from the SAPT Directors and the PIHP Directors.
- M. Scalera is part of a state-level workgroup that is looking at all the former SUD policies to determine how they will be integrated into new PIHP structure.
- LARA is in the process of changing its fee structure. License fees will cover a 3-year period (instead of 1 year), and SUD directors and PIHPs are advocating to keep prevention licensing. The state has been leaning toward dropping prevention licensing requirements.
- CCAR (Recovery Coach) training took place in Monroe. Approximately 30 people completed the training.
- The Prevention RFP for Monroe County is due June 8. Readers are needed, and should contact Jane if interested.
- Fred Branson from Project Lazarus came to a workgroup meeting in Washtenaw County. Project Lazarus' initiative to reduce opiate and heroin overdoses and death.
- Naloxone kits can be purchased with block grant dollars. The goal would be to have kits in each county.

8. Meeting adjournment

Meeting by C. Coleman, supported by C. Smith, to adjourn the meeting Motion carried Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

LENAWEE-LIVINGSTON-MONROE-WASHTENAW OVERSIGHT POLICY BOARD VISION

"We envision that our communities have both an awareness of the impact of substance abuse and use, and the ability to embrace wellness, recovery and strive for a greater quality of life."

AGENDA June 25, 2015

705 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor Patrick Barrie Conference Room 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

- 1. Introductions 5 minutes
- 2. Approval Of Agenda & March Minutes (Action) 5 minutes
- 3. Audience Participation 3 minutes per person
- 4. Old Business:
 - a. CMHPSM Regional SUD Financial Report -- 15 minutes (Attachments 1 3)
 - b. RFP specialty Funding Recommendations (Action) -- 30 minutes (Attachment 4)
- 5. New Business
 - a. Monroe prevention RFP Updates (Action) -- 10 minutes Attachment #5
- 6. Report From Regional Board (Discussion) 5 minutes
 - All board meeting end of July
- 7. SUD Director Updates (Discussion) -- 15 minutes
 - Naloxone
 - State updates

Next meeting: Thursday, July 23, 2015 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Community Mental Health Partnership of Southeast Michigan STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENSES CHANGES IN NET POSITION For the Seven Months Ending 4/30/2015

Departing Revenue		Original Budget	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	YTD Actual O/(U) Budget
Medicaid Capitation \$1,500,000 \$820,401 \$875,000 (\$54,599) Healthy Michigan Plan 2,960,442 2,306,107 1,726,925 579,182 MIChild 0 7,764 0 7,764 SUD Community Grant 3,767,460 2,197,690 2,197,685 5 SUD PA2 - Cobo Tax Revenue 3,717,346 2,339,825 2,168,453 171,372 Total Operating Revenue \$1,022,761 \$553,116 \$596,610 (\$43,494) Livingston County \$1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County \$1,43,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County \$2,031,88 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 \$175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 CMHPSM Administrative Costs \$300,188 </th <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Budget</th> <th>Actual</th> <th>Duaget</th> <th>O/(O) Budget</th>	Operating Revenue	Budget	Actual	Duaget	O/(O) Budget
Healthy Michigan Plan		\$1 500 000	\$820 401	\$875,000	(\$54 599)
MIChild 0 7,764 0 7,764 SUD Community Grant 3,767,460 2,197,695 5 5 SUD PA2 - Cobo Tax Revenue 3,717,346 2,339,825 2,168,453 171,372 Total Operating Revenue \$11,945,248 \$7,671,787 \$6,968,063 \$703,724 1a. Funding For SUD Services Lenawee County \$1,022,761 \$553,116 \$596,610 (\$43,494) Livingston County \$1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County \$1,143,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 Total Other Costs \$441,758 \$209,851 \$239,609					• • •
SUD Community Grant SUD PA2 - Cobo Tax Revenue 3,767,460 3,717,346 2,197,690 2,339,825 2,197,685 2,168,453 5 171,372 Total Operating Revenue \$11,945,248 \$7,671,787 \$6,968,063 \$703,724 1a. Funding For SUD Services Lenawee County \$1,022,761 \$553,116 \$596,610 (\$43,494) Livingston County 1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County 1,143,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Administrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344	, ,	· · ·		, ,	•
SUD PA2 - Cobo Tax Revenue 3,717,346 2,339,825 2,168,453 171,372 Total Operating Revenue \$11,945,248 \$7,671,787 \$6,968,063 \$703,724 1a. Funding For SUD Services Lenawee County \$1,022,761 \$553,116 \$596,610 (\$43,494) Livingston County 1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County 1,143,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs \$4410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Costs 44,3				_	•
Total Operating Revenue \$11,945,248 \$7,671,787 \$6,968,063 \$703,724 1a. Funding For SUD Services Lenawee County \$1,022,761 \$553,116 \$596,610 (\$43,494) Livingston County 1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County 1,143,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Salary & Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380					-
Lenawee County \$1,022,761 \$553,116 \$596,610 (\$43,494) Livingston County 1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County 1,143,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 CMHPSM Administrative Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Administrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854					
Livingston County 1,309,226 739,937 763,716 (23,779) Monroe County 1,143,346 733,609 666,953 66,656 Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Funding For SUD Services				
Monroe County Washtenaw County 1,143,346 3,203,188 733,609 1,959,079 666,953 1,868,531 66,656 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Administrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Non-Operating Revenues Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Lenawee County	\$1,022,761	\$553,116	\$596,610	(\$43,494)
Washtenaw County 3,203,188 1,959,079 1,868,531 90,548 Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs \$300,188 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Administrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Non-Operating Revenues \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Livingston County	1,309,226	739,937	763,716	(23,779)
Total Funding For SUD Services \$6,678,521 \$3,985,741 \$3,895,810 \$89,931 1b. Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax USE and HICA Tax Total Other Costs 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe Administrative Contracts All Other Costs All Other Costs Total Administrative Expense \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) All Other Costs Total Administrative Expense \$44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Non-Operating Revenues Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0	Monroe County	1,143,346	733,609	666,953	66,656
Other Contractual Obligations USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Administrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Washtenaw County	3,203,188	1,959,079	1,868,531	90,548
USE and HICA Tax 300,188 210,937 175,110 35,827 Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Total Funding For SUD Services	\$6,678,521	\$3,985,741	\$3,895,810	\$89,931 1b.
Total Other Costs \$300,188 \$210,937 \$175,110 \$35,827 1c. CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0	Other Contractual Obligations				
CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0	USE and HICA Tax	300,188	210,937	175,110	35,827
Salary& Fringe \$410,758 \$209,851 \$239,609 (\$29,758) Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Total Other Costs	\$300,188	\$210,937	\$175,110	\$35,827 1c.
Administrative Contracts 67,589 49,380 \$39,427 9,953 All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	CMHPSM Adminstrative Costs				
All Other Costs 44,344 31,945 \$25,867 6,078 Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Salary& Fringe	\$410,758	\$209,851	\$239,609	(\$29,758)
Total Adminstrative Expense \$522,691 \$291,176 \$304,903 (\$13,727) Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Administrative Contracts	67,589	49,380	\$39,427	•
Total Operating Expense \$7,501,400 \$4,487,854 \$4,375,823 \$112,031 Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	All Other Costs			\$25,867	
Operating Income (Loss) \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693 1d. Non-Operating Revenues \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Total Adminstrative Expense	\$522,691	\$291,176	\$304,903	(\$13,727)
Non-Operating Revenues Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Total Operating Expense	\$7,501,400	\$4,487,854	\$4,375,823	\$112,031
Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Operating Income (Loss)	\$4,443,848	\$3,183,933	\$2,592,240	\$591,693 1d.
Interest Revenue \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Non-Operating Revenues				
Change In Net Position \$4,443,848 \$3,183,933 \$2,592,240 \$591,693	· •	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Change In Net Position	\$4,443,848	\$3,183,933	\$2,592,240	\$591,693

¹a. Revenue trends continue as in previous months.

¹b. Lenawee CMHA is working with their providers, specifically the Women's Specialty program, to address underspending. Monroe and Washtenaw Counties continue to run over budget. No action is recommended at this time.

¹c. Higher Healhty Michigan revenue is resulting in higher HICA and Use tax.

¹d. We continue to have positive operating income.

Community Mental Health Partnership of Southeast Michigan

SUD Financial Highlights

April FYTD Report

Statement of Revenues and Expenses

1. Revenue

- Medicaid eligibles are down for the Region resulting in less Medicaid revenue. The annualized impact if the current trend continues would be approximately (\$93,598) less than the projection.
- Healthy Michigan continues to exceed budget projections we are \$579,182 higher than the
 year to date budget for April. The annualized impact would be approximately \$992,883
 higher than the projection. There is an indication the State may reduce the rate paid for
 Healthy Michigan eligibles to more closely align revenue with expenses reported by all
 PIHPs.
- We have now received our second PA2 distribution for FY2015 and that amount is now recorded as revenue and the four counties have been invoiced.

2. Funding For SUD Services

• We continue to be over-budget in both Monroe and Washtenaw counties. We have all fee for service in Monroe and partial fee for service in Washtenaw. In Washtenaw the trend in higher utilization of long-term residential and opiate detox services continues. In Monroe we are monitoring and continue to get a clearer picture of the need for services for Monroe County residents. Due to the need for services and the availability of funding we are not recommending any action beyond monitoring to ensure medical necessity is being met through our utilization review and authorization process.

Summary of Revenue and Expense by Fund

- This report takes the revenue and expenses and shows surplus / (deficit) by fund source. ROSC funds are paid out to the four ROSC providers based on budget; the estimated utilization line is based on encounter data that has been submitted through April. The utilization is based on a percentage of the whole and won't be finalized until yearend reports are completed.
- All fund sources are showing revenues exceeding expenses through April.

We submitted a budget amendment request to the state in May and the request has been approved. The amendment will increase the block grant funds used for Prevention services freeing up PA2 for special initiatives.

The CMHPSM is now investing a portion of our PA2 fund balance in accordance with the stipulations in our investment policy which allows for the purchase of federally insured Certificates of Deposit.

Attachment #3 - June 2015

Summary Of Revenue & Expense						_						
		Medicaid	MIChild	Ноз	Funding : althy Michigan		- Block Grant	SHI	D-COBO/PA2	Other	. To	otal Funding Sources
	'	viedicald	 Michila	1100	aitry Michigan	300	- Block Glain	301	D-COBO/I AZ	 Other		Sources
Revenues												
Funding From MDCH	\$	820,401	\$ 7,764	\$	2,306,107	\$	2,197,690			\$ -	\$	5,331,962
PA2/COBO Tax Funding	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,339,825	\$ -	\$	2,339,825
Other	\$		\$ 	\$		\$		\$	-	\$ -	\$	
Total Revenues	\$	820,401	\$ 7,764	\$	2,306,107	\$	2,197,690	\$	2,339,825	\$ -	\$	7,671,787
Expenses												
Funding for County SUD Programs												
Lenawee	\$	141,689	\$ -	\$	92,648	\$	250,261	\$	68,519	\$ -	\$	553,116
Lenawee Utilization - Based on Encounters	\$	(28,178)		\$	115,404	\$	(87,226)				\$	-
Livingston	\$	93,495	\$ -	\$	83,406	\$	382,571	\$	180,465	\$ -	\$	739,937
Livingston Utilization - Based on Encounters	\$	32,611	\$ 84	\$	55,477	\$	(88,172)				\$	-
Monroe	\$	73,295	\$ -	\$	133,074	\$	111,183	\$	416,057	\$ -	\$	733,609
All Fee for Service - Room&Board Adjustment	\$	(2,970)		\$	(7,965)	\$	10,935				\$	-
Washtenaw	\$	353,224	\$ -	\$	453,642	\$	830,513	\$	321,700	\$ -	\$	1,959,079
Washtenaw Utilization - Based on Encounters	\$	(287)	 	\$	207,478	\$	(207,191)				\$	-
Total SUD Expenses	\$	662,879	\$ 84	\$	1,133,164	\$	1,202,874	\$	986,741	\$ -	\$	3,985,741
Other Operating Costs												
SUD Use Tax	\$	49,060	\$ 464	\$	137,905	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$	187,429
SUD HICA Claims Tax	\$	6,153	\$ 58	\$	17,296	\$	-	\$		\$ -	\$	23,507
Total Operating Costs	\$	55,213	\$ 523	\$	155,201	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$	210,937
Administrative Cost Allocation	\$	52,107	\$ 614	\$	89,042	\$	149,412	\$		\$ -	\$	291,176
Total Expenses	\$	770,199	\$ 1,221	\$	1,377,407	\$	1,352,287	\$	986,741	\$ -	\$	4,487,854
Revenues Over/(Under) Expenses	\$	50,202	\$ 6,543	\$	928,700	\$	845,403	\$	1,353,084	\$ 	\$	3,183,933



CMHPSM SUD OVERSIGHT POLICY BOARD ACTION REQUEST

Board Meeting Date:

June 25, 2015

Action Requested:

RFP #2016C – Substance Use Disorder Prevention – Monroe County

Recommend funding the following two proposals:

Catholic Charities of Southeast Michigan \$ 99,702.14

Interventions/Initiative: Student Prevention Leadership Teams, Peer Rx, and Michigan Model for Health Focus areas: Reduce alcohol, marijuana, nicotine, and prescription drug use among Monroe County youth.

Monroe County Intermediate School District \$114,444

Interventions/Initiative: Nurturing Parenting/Parents as Teachers Focus area: Reduce illicit drug use (and fetal/child impact)

Recommendation:

While the recommendation is to fund the above proposals in full, some programming elements will need improvements and technical assistance from the CMHPSM staff.

CMHPSM SUD OVERSIGHT POLICY BOARD ACTION REQUEST

Board Meeting Date: June 26, 2015

Action Requested: Review and Vote on RFP #2016B recommendations

Background: The OPB is responsible for managing the PA2 Liquor Tax funds for each county. Funds can only be used for prevention, treatment and Recovery services. Funds are flexible and allow for creative programming, pilots and traditional services.

Proposals were reviewed by one or more staff and one or more Board or Community members. Final scores represented an average of all scores, with finance reviewing and scoring separately. The attached table describes the program, scores and funding requests. Given the PA2 revenues will be reduced beginning 2016, consideration was made for sustainability and availability of carry forward funds by county. Staff noted that in some cases, technical assistance would be necessary to assist providers in both program planning, implementation and finance requirements. Additionally, some programs could be reviewed in the future for other traditional funding streams or a combination of PA2 and other funds for future sustainability.

Connection to PIHP/MDCH Contract, Regional Strategic Plan or Shared Governance Model:

The OPB is responsible for making funding decisions for PA2 funds, and making recommendations on funding for other streams to the PIHP.

Recommendation:

Accept the staff recommendations as presented

LIVINGSTON COUNTY

Projected 2016 PA 2 Revenue: \$426,226 Current Unallocated \$2,331,387.93

Total Amount Requested: \$479,290 Recommended Amount to Fund: \$454,848.00

PROGRAM NAME	TYPE TIER	SUBMITTING AGENCY	AVERAGE PROPOSAL	FINANCE AVERAGE	AMOUNT REQUESTED	STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	SUSTAINABLE FUNDS AVAILABLE	CARRY FORWARD FUNDS AVAILABLE	FUND ?
NAIVIE	HER	AGENCI	SCORE	OF SCORE	REQUESTED		FONDS AVAILABLE	FONDS AVAILABLE	•
				VALUE					
	1					One of the highest scoring proposals; Could be a great integrated partnership between MH, SUD, Healthcare System	Would have to seek other funding to sustain program after a few years by combining revenue sources, i.e. federal block grant, mental health or other local funding.	Potentially: We could make a multi-year commitment for sustaining over revenue to give time to explore other resources. Funds are available.	YES
Engagement Center		LCCMHA	92.16	94.29	\$ 398,780.00				
wrap Around	2	LCCMHA	91.28	100.00	\$ 40,000.00	High Score; funding partners include school, court, CMH, DHS, Public Health	Can only use local funds to support this due to the nature of the match for childcare funds.	Potentially: this could be funded solely by PA2 revenue under current projections.	YES
Curriculum Based Support Group (schools)	3	LCCMHA	84.25	100.00	\$ 16,068.00	Brings an evidenced based practice to children with high risk situations in 5 th and 6 th grades	Yes – may also be funded under general prevention budget in the future.	Potentially: This is slated as a pilot and would be evaluated for effectiveness and consideration for future funding either with PA2 or other state/federal funds.	YES
Opiate Intervention	3	LCCMHA	71.40	100.00	\$ 24,442.00	Score was below threshold. Additionally, the project falls under the block grant funding plan for this year.	FY 15 funds will be used to purchase the Naloxone Kits as directed by the state.	Could re-evaluate the need for future years	NO

MONROE COUNTY

Projected 2016 PA 2 Revenue: \$311,827 Current Unallocated \$242,090.89

Total Amount Requested: \$677,338 Recommended Amount to Fund: \$277,338

PROGRAM	TYPE	SUBMITTING	AVERAGE	FINANCE	AMOUNT	STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	SUSTAINABLE	CARRY FORWARD FUNDS	FUND?
NAME	TIER	AGENCY	PROPOSAL SCORE	AVERAGE OF SCORE	REQUESTED		FUNDS AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	
			SCORE	VALUE			AVAILABLE		
							Program funds		
							can be managed	Potentially: Since there are	
						Program Scored in the 90%	with PA2. We	limited carry forward funds,	
Women						Range. May need some	may also look at	the program will have to be	
Empowering						Technical Assistance (TA) for	other resources	sustained in part with other	
Women,	2		02.04	74.42	ć 422 CEO	finance. Overall program	to support the	resources such as Block	\/F6
Inc.	2	Paula's House	93.81	71.43	\$ 133,650	meets community needs.	program.	Grant.	YES
						This program has been			
						traditionally funded with PA2 Funds in the past. However,			
						it does meet criteria for			
						traditional funding i.e.			
						Medicaid, HMP, and Block			
						Grant. Staff have been			
						working with provider this	This program	Not at this time. However,	
		The Salvation				year to "unbundle" and shift	cannot continue	staff will work with provider	
		Army Harbor			_	reimbursement to these	to be funded	for shifting resources to	
R.A.P.	1	Light	93.01	80.00	\$ 400,000	resources.	under PA2.	maintain program.	NO
		Catholic				Program scored high and			
		Charities of				meets the priority area for	Program can be	Potentially: Program would	
Peer	2	Southeast	02.02	00.00	ć 4F 20C	ROSC including recovery	supported with	be eligible to use carry	\/F6
Support	2	Michigan	92.03	80.00	\$ 45,306	peers at the program level.	PA2 funds.	forward if necessary.	YES
							Program funds can be managed	Potentially: Since there are	
						Program also scored high	with PA2. We	limited carry forward funds,	
						and meets community need.	will also look at	the program will have to be	
Touchstone		Touchstone				Provides Men's recovery	providing some	sustained in part with other	
Recovery		Recovery of				housing. Also will need TA	support with	resources such as Block	
Housing	2	Michigan	91.16	74.29	\$ 60,000	from financing.	other resources.	Grant.	YES
						Program adds an Evidence			
Family		Catholic				Based Program to their		Potentially: We will explore	
Supports for		Charities of				Adolescent services for in-	Program can be	possibility for other funding	
adolescents	_	Southeast				home family therapy and	supported with	enhancements with	
& families	2	Michigan	82.01	80.00	\$ 38,382	case management	PA2 funds.	traditional resources.	YES

LENAWEE COUNTY

Projected 2016 PA 2 Revenue: \$146,289 Current Unallocated \$1,007,929

Total Amount Requested: \$ 332,599 Recommended Amount to Fund: \$332,559

PROGRAM	TYPE	SUBMITTING	AVERAGE	FINANCE	A	MOUNT	STAFF	SUSTAINABLE	CARRY FORWARD FUNDS	FUND?
NAME	TIER	AGENCY	PROPOSAL	AVERAGE	REC	QUESTED	RECOMMENDATIONS	FUNDS AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	
			SCORE	OF						
				SCORE						
				VALUE						
l							Program scored in		Detection would accepte	
l							high range. Will need some TA with		Potentially: would need to	
							Finance. Meets	Program has been	support the program with some carry forward funds in	
Intensive							community needs.	funded in the past	next few years. Would look	
Home-							Provides evidence	with PA2. Services	at whether program could	
based							based services for	have been	be funded with traditional	
Therapy		Lenawee County					youth involved in	expanded and	funds such as Medicaid,	
with youth	2	Probate Court	91.08	77.14	\$	130,992	juvenile court.	enhanced.	HMP and Block Grant	YES
						,	Since this is a grass			
							roots, family-based			
							program to increase	This would be a		YES*
							awareness of Opiate	one-time funding		with TA
							addiction and	request. Program is		from
							community	looking to become		staff
							resources, the	self-sustaining in		and
							sophistication was	future years. Staff	Future initiatives could be	only
							limited, resulting in	would like to	requested through mini-	one
Andy's	2	Adrian Andy's	74.00	74.40	_	0.007	low score. TA would	recommend one-	grant process or from other	year of
Angels	3	Angels	74.92	71.43	\$	8,987	be required.	time funding.*	sources.	funding.
							LCMHA wants to	While funding requested is		
							develop an	currently at this		
							engagement center	level, the request		
							program. The scores	for the Year 2 is		
							did not meet	\$250,000. This		YES*
							threshold. Since this	could be achieved		with TA
							request is for a	solely through PA2	Potentially: At this time the	from
							planning/pilot grant,	Funds, but may	additional funding could	staff
							staff could work with	need other	come from carry forward in	and
Engagement							provider to re-valuate	resources for future	Year two. But there must be	future
Center	1	LCMHA	75.15	85.71	\$	192,620	the budget and	years.*	a sustainability plan built in.	plans.

	planning needs and		
	provide TA.		

WASHTENAW COUNTY

Projected 2016 PA 2 Revenue: \$906,256 Current Unallocated \$2,406,665

Total Amount Requested: \$1,011,625 Recommended Amount to Fund: \$981,646

PROGRAM NAME	TYPE TIER	SUBMITTING AGENCY	AVERAGE PROPOSAL SCORE	FINANCE AVERAGE OF SCORE VALUE	AMOUNT REQUESTED	STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	SUSTAINABLE FUNDS AVAILABLE	CARRY FORWARD FUNDS AVAILABLE	FUND?
EC (Hamilton House)	1	Home of New Vision	96.65	88.57	\$391,228	Achieving the highest score of all proposals, the EC continues to exceed expectations for a viable community program	Can be sustained through PA2 Funds.	Potentially: if needed in future, carry forward funds could be used.	YES
Integrated Health Youth	2	Corner Health Center/Ozone House	95.64	91.43	\$150,000	New program proposed by two youth organizations partnering for integrated adolescent services. Much needed resource.	Can be sustained through PA2 funds.	Potentially: if needed in future, carry forward funds could be used. Could look to develop other resources through Medicaid and HMP for future supports	YES
Integrated Health Housing Case Mgmt.	2	Avalon Housing	93.20	80.00	\$150,000	New program to provide intensive case management and health services for chronic homeless SUD folks in housing setting.	Can be sustained through PA2 funds.	Potentially: if needed, could look to see if any services could be covered with other fund sources.	YES
Recovery Community Support Services Program	1	Home of New Vision	88.25	80.00	\$290,418	This program provides intensive case management for homeless SUD folks with a strong peer component. Will place peers in the primary care clinic to improve health outcomes.	Can be sustained through PA 2 Funds.	Potentially: if needed, will look to see if some case management and peer services will be eligible for funding with Medicaid and HMP in the future.	YES
Recovery Community Organization	3	Home of New Vision	77.01	71.43		New concept. Did not meet scoring thresholds.	While this program meets PA2 funding, staff does not recommend funding.	Could be funded with unallocated funds but only on a annual review time basis. Could re-work and submit a mini-grant at a later date.	NO

	REGIONAL													
	Total Amount Requested: \$ 46,000 Recommended Amount to Fund: \$ 0													
PROGRAM NAME	TYPE TIER	SUBMITTING AGENCY	AVERAGE PROPOSAL SCORE	FINANCE AVERAGE OF SCORE/VALUE	AMOUNT REQUESTED	STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	SUSTAINABLE FUNDS AVAILABLE	CARRY FORWARD FUNDS AVAILABLE	FUND?					
Regional Learning Collaborative for		Monroe Community Mental Health				Lowest scoring proposal. Concern the program did not fall within contractual	Would have to pull funds from each county in							
Coalitions	2	Authority	60.26	Rejected	46,000	requirements.	the region.	None	NO					