

ICSA BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

LOCATION: GoToMeeting

DATE: Monday, 2/23/09

TIME: 1:00 – 4:00 pm

ATTENDANCE: David Barnes, Bethany Gadzinski, Laurie Hancock, Sharon Harrigfeld, Norma Jaeger, Kathy Skippen, Gayle Hines, Debbie Field, Shane Evans, Scott Ronan, Terry Pappin, Roger Brown, Sharon Burke, Sara Stover, John Davison, Amy Holy-Priest

CHAIRPERSON: Kathy Skippen

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Approval of Minutes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bethany made a motion to accept the minutes, Norma seconded the motion.
<i>Outcome Snapshot – Laurie Hancock</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention is spending right on target. We will be okay financially for the rest of the year. Looking at the tabs from BPA, they show an accrual basis on a year-to-date number. Recovery support from IDJC needs to get juveniles back in the system faster, maybe communities are not ready to get them back? A possible solution may be to get juvenile officers into the community to get these kids back again. Assessment here is GAIN I only. Suggestion was made to figure out what is happening to the 729-817 ineligible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laurie will continue to send the Snapshot out ahead of time and will send a copy after the meeting. Norma says to accept the snapshot as presented. Shane seconded the motion.
<i>Output Report Update – David Barnes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Started getting the coded data, unfortunately, the programming didn't work. Good progress is being made, because BPA has been able to start showing data to us that goes back as far as July 1, 2008. Now it is just a matter of getting the programming to match up. One concern, Laurie's numbers are coming directly from BPA, anything that we do will be coming from our Warehouse. Our numbers will not correspond directly to what we get out of BPA. We are working on a solution and I expect to come back with some better information 	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>later. Just wanted to convey that fact. By the next meeting in March we should have the numbers pretty close for the numbers that are in the warehouse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data that BPA reports to us on this is more of a timing issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BPA's reports are more in real time vs. what we pull up from the warehouse. - Our records, depending on the day will not be a one-to-one match. - BPA numbers are given to us upon request. - If we pull real time from WITS, it will be real time for everything but the discharges since most of our reporting takes place out of the warehouse and not out of WITS and so we extract data from WITS and put in our warehouse on demand. So, 100% real time – no, whatever interval we decide to pull data from the WITS into our warehouse and at that point it will be up-to-date. Will discuss further. • Envelope Assessment piece update, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for now, it appears follow-up GAIN assessment will be a GAIN SS. - progress has been made in being able to import data from GAIN and just last week we finally had the software working. Now can download gain data from the gain warehouse and right now D7 has some pretty good data in it, but we don't have anywhere else. 	
<p><i>Millennium Fund Update – Kathy Skippen</i></p>	<p>The questions are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the programs for the millennium fund be funded or are they being funded and , • can they be funded better? <p>The millennium fund committee is having some issues over who is mulling around in the millennium</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action with the Millennium Fund until it makes sense to bring it back.

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>fund. As a result, we won't do anything with the how the millennium fund will be spent until those decisions are made and that session is gone, then it probably needs to be a part of the prevention strategic plan and Debbie is going to catch us up on that.</p>	
<i>ICSA Grant Submission Policy – Kathy Skippen</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee updated the policy during the meeting. • ICSA will decide when the policy will become effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give Kathy any grants that are on-going for the State. • Norma made the motion that the ICSA Grant Submission Policy be given to ICSA with a due pass recommendation for their next meeting. David seconded the motion. Motion passed.
<i>Waitlist Update/Bethany Gadzinski</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 273 people are on the waiting list for residential as of February 20th. The number has decreased from last month of 300. • 53 or 19% weren't on any level of care. The concern is the 53, not the 273. From BPA the 53 are waitlisted for treatment because of their choice, not ours. • Satcee or EOC that we had talked about notifying a judge or probation officer, for example, if they choose not to have treatment. Will be on the satcee agenda for tomorrow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topic of those waitlisted that do not choose treatment will be added to the SATCEE agenda for tomorrow.
<i>“GoToMeeting” Process – Kathy Skippen</i>	<p>Consensus on whether to continue the “GoToMeetings”.</p> <p>PRO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saves time in members driving/parking/walking to meetings. • Saves on cost of snacks. • Saves time in hauling equipment/food downstairs • Not everyone is able to view screen <p>CON:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long distance charges, less than 2 cents a minute. • No treats. • Not being able to see each other. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members to email Kathy of any problems they experienced in getting on to “GoToMeeting”.

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>2010 Treatment Funding Request – Sara Stover</p>	<p>The Department asked how Laurie arrived at the process for reduction for each program and kind of looking forward.</p> <p>Quick overview:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the governor first issued his executive order it was for a 1% reduction in any ongoing general fund that each agency had. If you looked at the substance abuse program, it actually worked out better for the department in the end that they received a treatment last year as a one-time, instead of the holdback which was only for ongoing funds and a large portion of the treatment was appropriated for one-time which was last year so actually salvaged what would have had to surrender more from substance abuse treatment. 1% that was just a little over 8.9 M general fund appropriations for 2009 equals 89,220 (thousands). That is exactly what the department used and reverted 1% holdback on substance abuse was exactly that 89,220. 2. Shortly thereafter, the Governor issued an additional 3% holdback that allowed agencies to find the savings with what didn't necessarily have to be ongoing reductions so as long as they were able to identify the ongoing reduction by 2010. So the reduction was going to be ongoing, however, if the department had one-time money such as for computers, cars or whatever they had for one-time salary savings, they could apply that money they had for reduction by 2009 in order to give themselves a little bit of time to figure out how they were going to make that reduction in 2010, so they needed to have the plan in place but they didn't necessarily have to execute that plan until July 1st of this upcoming year. 	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="716 233 1291 488">3. Since H&W had the surplus in substance abuse resulted in a slow wrap-up on the treatment had access funding means that they offered up to the rest of the department to use for part of the 3% ongoing reduction. That was a 4.5M total appropriation adjustment out of 3% of substance abuse when it really needed to provide \$267,600K out of substance abuse. <li data-bbox="716 493 1291 781">4. Those one-time deductions were allowed to be made through DFM as long as a department had a plan going forward of where they would make those deductions for 2010 permanent. The funding that was surrendered to the department this current year was always intended to be replenished for the next fiscal year. The funding was just to help cushion this year's reduction. <li data-bbox="716 786 1291 1198">5. The unknowns are, the Governor has made a recommendation for a portion of the treatment money to be replenished, the one-time money to be replaced; part of that was the Millennium Fund and part of it was with the general fund. I think that the numbers the department had calculated by the time they paid for prevention and based on the governor's recommendation was after the whole back amount, they would have to reduce their monthly spend at about \$100K. So, they would go from 2009 appropriation which was about 2.1M per month to just around 2M per month. <li data-bbox="716 1203 1291 1328">6. So the basic confusion was why that large chunk of money came out of substance abuse in 2009 and how we can expect to see that restored for 2010. <li data-bbox="716 1333 1291 1422">7. Hopefully this explanation will help explain how we have allowed those one-time reductions for this year with the expectation that the 	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>department make those changes ongoing and elsewhere for 2010, which they did. They submitted a full plan to DFM that we worked with and the legislative budget office shared with us all that information. The plan was approved by our office as well as the legislative budget (didn't technically have the rights to approve it), we walked through it with them and they were in agreement that this was a fair way to tackle the difficult holdbacks and move forward without providing any one program too much of a hit.</p>	
<i>Adjourned</i>		

Documents shared:

- Minutes of last meeting
- Agenda
- Laurie's Outcome Snapshot
- ICSA Grant Submission Policy
- Sara Stover – form