

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. Motion passed.
<i>Outcome Snapshot – Laurie Hancock</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snapshot showed that treatment and prevention spending is on track for year and is being managed according to priority population. (approved snapshot will be sent to BSC members by email) Committee asked for more information regarding the 817 clients that are categorized as “ineligibles”. Once this population is fully understood it may help to address what the need is for treatment that isn’t currently being met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the future Laurie will send the Snapshot as well as the background information to BSC members prior to the meeting. She will also provide the approved Snapshot to the BSC chairperson for dissemination to the committee after approved changes have been made. Norma made a motion to accept the snapshot as presented. Shane seconded the motion. Motion passed.
<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. 	
<i>Millennium Fund Update – Kathy Skippen</i>	Further discussion on the Millennium will wait until appropriation decisions are made in the 2009 legislative session and the Prevention Strategic Plan is finalized.	
<i>ICSA Grant Submission Policy – Kathy Skippen</i>	The Committee made changes to the proposed ICSA policy covering SUD grant submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathy will email the completed policy to committee members for any final wordsmithing that may be needed. The expectation is that these

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>changes will not make any primary changes to the presented policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 treatment as of February 20th. • 53 of these individuals weren't in an alternative level of care and the committee would like more information on why they are not. • This is an issue that should be discussed further at SATCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topic of those waitlisted that do not choose treatment needs to be an issue addressed by SATCC.
<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".
2010 Treatment Funding Request – Sara Stover	<p>2009 & 2010 treatment budget DFM perspective:</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 	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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 	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>intended to be replenished for the next fiscal year. The funding was just to help cushion this year's reduction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="716 331 1285 743">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="716 753 1285 873">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="716 883 1285 1356">7. Hopefully this explanation will help explain how we have allowed those one-time reductions for this year with the expectation that the 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. 	
<i>Adjourned</i>		

Documents shared:

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