

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH TRUST AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Teleconference

June 25, 2014

1:30 p.m.

Taken at:

Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority  
3745 Community Park Loop, Suite 200  
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Trustees Present:

Paula Easley, Chair

John McClellan

Mary Jane Michael

Russ Webb

Laraine Derr

Larry Norene

Trust staff present:

Jeff Jessee

Steve Williams

Nancy Burke

Carley Lawrence

Valette Keller

Marilyn McMillan

Carrie Predeger

Kevin Buckland

Michael Baldwin

Amanda Lofgren

Natasha Pineda

Katie Baldwin-Johnson

TLO staff present:

Marcie Menefee (via telephone)

Others Participating:

Sheila Soule; Lisa Cauble; Karen Ward; Kathy Craft; Kelby Murphy (via telephone); Denise Daniello (via telephone); Kate Burkhart (via telephone); John Spurbeck.

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR EASLEY calls the Planning Committee meeting to order and begins with a roll call and introductions.

MR. BALDWIN introduces Carrie Predeger as a new Trust employee, stating that this is her first meeting day.

CHAIR EASLEY welcomes Ms. Predeger, and asks for any adjustments to the agenda.

*There being none, the agenda is approved.*

CHAIR EASLEY moves to the minutes of April 3, 2014.

TRUSTEE MICHAEL makes a motion to approve the minutes of April 3, 2014.

*There being no objection, the motion is approved.*

CHAIR EASLEY states that there will be a discussion on the Planning Committee authority and function. She asks Mr. Baldwin to summarize the prior introductory discussion.

MR. BALDWIN states that it is his understanding that the Planning Committee Trustees and other Trustees have been reviewing the current committee authorities and functions towards making sure that the most optimal arrangement and function is conducive to doing things efficiently and effectively. He continues that part of that would be due process, looking at the authorities in the by-laws, and then a discussion.

CHAIR EASLEY states that one of the discussions was changing the meeting dates of the Planning Committee to the week before the Finance and Resource Management Committees.

TRUSTEE WEBB asks about the Planning Committee's role in implementation, the authorities needed to carry out that role, how that relates to the various roles of the various committees, and what is needed to align those responsibilities with the authorities.

TRUSTEE MICHAEL agrees that the committee is evolving and that there should be an opportunity or a method to look at the committee's role programmatically.

CHAIR EASLEY states that, originally, it was the Program & Planning Committee and continues that the recommendation of the committee is to go back to Program & Planning.

TRUSTEE WEBB states that would require a motion.

MR. BALDWIN states that it would need to be a by-law change, and a motion is needed to do that.

TRUSTEE DERR asks what else would be changed.

CHAIR EASLEY replies that it would confirm the activities of the Planning Committee in its worth with regard to projects and programs that are being implemented by the staff.

A discussion ensues on the subject.

TRUSTEE WEBB states that the analogy is to operate the Program & Planning Committee similar to the way the Resource Management Committee operates.

CHAIR EASLEY asks to have this forwarded to discuss during the two-day work session in August, and then forward it to the Full Board in September.

The discussion continues and then moves on to the meetings schedule and the issue of adding more meetings.

CHAIR EASLEY states that staff will draft some different scheduling alternatives and work on the program name change. She moves on and recognizes Nancy Burke for the discussion on the work related to program-related investments.

MS. BURKE states that each of the Trustees have received a hard copy of the proposal which goes through some of the background, and then maps out some of the ways to use both financial and capital assets of the Trust. She adds that this is an attempt to start solidifying the program side of the house for PRIs. She continues that a PRI program focuses at both below-market and market-rate investments, and that many other foundations use it. She goes through, explaining the financial strategies and the capital strategies as she goes along. She adds that many foundations were using their PRI program as a special sort of set-aside where groups were allowed to come in and access that one tool.

TRUSTEE NORENE asks if the funds come strictly from income.

MR. BUCKLAND replies that, to the extent of program-related investments and items that are also capital in nature, it is assumed that Trustees would be using principal from the cash available in the Land Development Account. He adds that it would be appropriate to use income. He continues that the Trustees can decide whether those items come out of the annual payout, or if it is an additional draw off of budget reserves.

MS. BURKE states that in looking at a programmatic framework, the priorities can be fleshed out. She continues that housing really lends itself to a program like this because of the nature of the makeup of financing packages. She states that the Beneficiary Projects Initiative grant program could use a facility that would allow them to provide the services to Beneficiaries, and those programs are on a longer-term development trajectory than some of the other grantees.

CHAIR EASLEY states that the Fahrenkamp/Denardo properties would, most likely, be a good PRI investment. She adds that it was fortunate for the Trustees to be able to see them before the discussion.

TRUSTEE MICHAEL states appreciation of incorporating a variety of ways to use a PRI and likes the idea of the layering and how to build a project.

A short discussion ensues on how this could have been used in the past and continue into future projects.

TRUSTEE WEBB states that this is a tool, a mechanism for achieving some of the program goals, and asks if it is applicable to any or all of the focus areas or programs.

MS. BURKE replies yes.

TRUSTEE WEBB asks what the proposal is for PRI use.

MS. BURKE replies that, at the moment, she is proposing to have a committee to help set up and establish the program. She continues, there is a need to clarify the goals of the program and start with a selected number of projects.

The discussion continues.

MS. DANIELLO states that the concept of program-related investment is a good way to adjust the Trust funding and encourage investment from grantees of those programs. She continues that it is a sound idea.

CHAIR EASLEY states that the recommendations would come forward through the focus areas and from the advisory boards. She continues that Ms. Burke's suggestion included \$5 million for service supported units with rental assistance; \$1.5 million for preservation of supported units, in a priority region; \$3 million, Beneficiary Projects Initiatives infrastructure, as examples.

MS. BURKE asks where this money would come from.

A discussion ensues on the subject, and then continues into setting up policies

CHAIR EASLEY asks if Long House would be an example, and then asks Ms. Burke to talk about that.

MS. BURKE replies that Long House is an investment that is available but cannot be pursued until Alaska Housing Finance Corporation has the funding. She explains that this situation is a project that needs to move forward, but there are no details available until the financing package is put together. She continues that if there were an entity that could secure the property, put the finance package together, get a provider and housing entity in place, information could be provided on what the neighborhoods need and want without a two-year-long waiting period. She adds, that is an example of how this program would benefit the Trust.

TRUSTEE WEBB states that there is a need for a general policy statement that establishes that the Trust sanctions program-related investments of the full range.

MS. BURKE adds so that it becomes a policy.

The discussion continues and moves to the subject of funding.

MR. BUCKLAND states that it is a matter of having funds available, for instance, in the Land Development Account. He continues that if \$10 million is wanted for PRI principal, then that would not be available for real estate investment.

CHAIR EASLEY clarifies that a separate fund for principal for PRI would not have to be set up.

MR. JESSEE states that it cannot come out of the Permanent Fund; it would have to be intercepted before it goes in, which then is a pool available either for real estate investments or PRIs.

TRUSTEE DERR states that technically that fund should not be there and should be in the Permanent Fund. She continues that there is more income coming in from the resources and is a safer branch than going out on that \$25 million limb. She states that the bottom line is where the money is coming from.

MS. BURKE states that she has received great direction and if acceptable will be coordinating with Larry Norene and the Resource Management Committee on the drafts.

The discussion on the funding source continues.

CHAIR EASLEY thanks all for the discussion, and calls a break.

(Break.)

CHAIR EASLEY calls the meeting back into session and recognizes Sheila Soule.

MS. SOULE thanks all, and states appreciation for the opportunity to come back. She continues that the packet contains this comprehensive presentation and goes through some of the highlights, then moving to the graduates-to-work employment data. She states that health graduates were pulled from '02 to '11 and employment data was run for the entire year of fiscal year '12. She continues that all the health graduates were pulled out and it was found that 83 percent are still working in Alaska. She moves on, breaking down the data further in all the programs, explaining as she goes along. She then explains some of the systems change that happened through the workforce area that was experienced at the university and goes through a brief time line. She states that there are programs that were developed in this focus area and funded by the Trust which might not have existed without that support. She goes through some other examples of systems change for the university, stating that one of the things that was very successful through this workforce initiative area is that it got people to sit down, talk, coordinate and cooperate. She moves to the Behavioral Health Alliance at the university and asks Karen Ward for comments on the CE trainings.

MS. WARD states that the course came out of that Behavioral Health Alliance with the need to give students some information about suicide, substance use, domestic violence, and sexual assault, all of the issues and how they interface. She continues that this year, evidence-based practice was featured; gatekeeper training; mental health first aid; motivational interviewing; prevention and intervention around domestic violence and sexual assault. She adds that there were students from all disciplines involved, and this year included nursing. She states that it has been fun and very successful.

MS. SOULE states that these are priorities in the focus areas for the Behavioral Health Alliance and will be focused on. She concludes her presentation and thanks all.

CHAIR EASLEY thanks Ms. Soule and moves to focus area updates.

MR. BALDWIN states that, as talked about in some of the focus area updates, an update on some of the stakeholder kind of action will be included.

MS. BURKE states that in this time line there will be an update about the stakeholder meeting and how budget recommendations and meetings are going.

MS. PINEDA states that the work group is working with the Board Advisory Committee focus area and will be meeting later this week to talk about how to break that group into a few different work groups around advocacy, results-based accountability. She continues that the initial conversations with the large stakeholder meeting will discuss policy programs and needs to get more focused in that area.

MS. BALDWIN-JOHNSON states that under Recover Alaska the leadership funding committee has been looking at different potential models for how to structure the initiative. She continues that a staff has been settled for an interim period while recruiting to bring on an executive director that will run the Recover Alaska initiative.

MS. LOFGREN states that for Employment there was a large stakeholder meeting at the end of May to bring together and have some discussions with the contractors to look at recommendations and prioritize around the seven performing states modeled for successful employment framework. She continues that a core team meeting was held to start looking at different strategies and action items to allocate the resources. She adds that there will be stakeholder groups around those strategies that will identify and flesh out what will work and the potential impacts.

MS. BURKE moves to Workforce.

MS. CRAFT states that industry and government stakeholder meetings were held over the spring, and recommendations for FY16 and FY17 are ready for the spreadsheet. She adds that the final recommendation is scheduled for July 10, 2014 from 9:00 to noon.

MR. WILLIAMS states that the Disability Justice Work Group has held a preliminary budget planning meeting for FY16-17 and they have another one coming up in July. He talks about a

potential overlap within the focus areas that has been discussed internally and is considering the whole. On a sideline, he states that a recidivism plan is starting to be developed and is at the very beginning preliminary stage.

MR. JESSEE states that it is an important process together with the Criminal Justice Commission and could actually get the Legislature into a long-term plan for how to actually reduce the prison population.

A short discussion ensues on the subject and then moves to the overlapping areas in the workforce groups.

CHAIR EASLEY moves to the report on the MMIS meeting follow-up.

TRUSTEE WEBB states that the intent of the meeting was to find some solutions to the Medicaid problem that was seen at the meeting in Fairbanks. He continues that from the Commissioner's perspective it was fixed, but it did not seem from the provider perspective that was perceived. He states that the gist of the meeting is the realization that there is a bit of disconnect between how the Department perceives things and the problems that the providers continue to have. He continues that the providers were asked to put together a proposal to come back to give them resources to put together all of the information needed so that the Commissioner understands. He adds, that would be a systematic approach to getting this fixed and looking at solutions. He states that the emphasis has been to not let the provider systems die while the Commissioner gets MMIS fixed, which would cause the Beneficiaries to suffer.

A short discussion ensues.

CHAIR EASLEY asks for Board updates.

MR. BALDWIN states that there are a number of board updates and adds that this was an interest in having a spot on the agenda for some informal input and sharing.

CHAIR EASLEY states that a behavioral health systems assessment update can be given later.

MR. BALDWIN states that every year the Trust has to do an annual missions and measures report to OMB, and that process is beginning. He adds, that will be shared with the Trustees.

TRUSTEE WEBB makes a motion to adjourn the meeting.

*CHAIR EASLEY adjourns the meeting.*

(Planning Committee adjourned at 4:07 p.m.)