



MEETING NOTICE
INVITATION TO NEGOTIATE COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2013
7:30 - 8:30 a.m.
COUNTY – CITY BUILDING – 555 S 10TH ST
ROOM 113

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes - December 19, 2012
2. Review the “Request for Qualifications” Document and the FY2010, FY2011 and FY2012 Contract Summary Reports of Services Delivered by CMHC
3. Review the Next Phases and Time Lines of the Process

**MINUTES
COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER (CMHC)
INVITATION TO NEGOTIATE (ITN) COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2013
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING, ROOM 113
7:30 A.M.**

Committee Members Present: Ron Sorensen, Community Mental Health Center (CMHC); C.J. Johnson, Region V Systems; Judy Halstead, Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department (LLCHD); Lori Seibel, Community Health Endowment (CHE); Captain Joe Wright, Lincoln Police Department (LPD); Jane Raybould, County Commissioner; Gary Lorenzen, Mental Health Foundation; Gail Anderson, CMHC Advisory Committee; J Rock Johnson, consumer advocate; Kerry Eagan, County Chief Administrative Officer (Ex-Officio); Vince Mejer, Purchasing Agent (Ex-Officio); Scott Etherton, CMHC (Ex-Officio); and Wendy Andorf, CMHC (Ex-Officio)

Committee Members Absent: Brent Smoyer, County Commissioner

Others Present: Linda Wittmuss, Associate Regional Administrator, Region V Systems; Amanda Tyerman-Harper, Region V Systems; Jamie Monfelt, OMNI Behavioral Health; Allan Green, Mental Health Association; Will Spaulding, University of Nebraska; Tami Walden, consumer and member of the Consumer Family Coalition; and Cori Beattie, County Clerk's Office

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m., and introductions were made.

1 APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 19, 2012 MINUTES

MOTION: J Rock Johnson moved and Seibel seconded approval of the minutes. Sorensen, C.J. Johnson, Halstead, Seibel, Wright, Lorenzen, Anderson, Raybould and J Rock Johnson voted aye. Smoyer was absent from voting. Motion carried 9-0.

2 REVIEW THE "REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS" DOCUMENT AND THE FY2010, FY2011 AND FY2012 CONTACT SUMMARY REPORTS OF SERVICES DELIVERED BY CMHC

Wittmuss indicated that part of the document changed from a Request for Proposal (RFP) to a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). She noted the piece on submitting full proposals was removed from the document in response to input collected from the ITN Committee and provider meetings. She questioned whether it adequately explains that individual agencies will have to submit full proposals if selected to enter into the

process. It was also noted that several of the attachments were similar to those submitted with the original ITN document.

C.J. Johnson said Region V reviewed all CMHC funding. With regard to Region V money, he said there will be some core service capacities that will be required. He also mentioned that a number of outpatient services are funded at CMHC. Past discussions were held with the State of Nebraska - Division of Behavioral Health about allocating a specific dollar amount to agencies for these services with the agencies determining how that money is spent, i.e., therapy, medication management or other non-residential programming. He said agency proposals will have to address how best to use these funds to provide services and support to consumers. It was noted another dollar amount will be set aside, similar to what Lancaster County has done, to help support the transition. C.J. Johnson said when the transition is complete, those dollars would be used for innovative programming.

Lorenzen pointed out that the FY11-12 Contract Summary budget amount is listed at around \$6,000,000, although, he has seen actual CMHC budget figures in the \$7,000,000 to \$8,000,000 range. He wondered how the difference will be made up. Sorensen said the County has previously made up the difference and estimated this year's amount to be \$1.6 million. C.J. Johnson confirmed that the Contract Summary does not include these funds.

With regard to future County participation, Eagan said the Lancaster County Board has pledged \$500,000 per year during the transition which he thought was basically the same amount as currently allocated. C.J. Johnson added that these funds will not be guaranteed after two years, thus, Region V will utilize the monies they had allocated to the CMHC. He said other revenue streams (Medicaid, private insurance, etc.) will also be available.

With regard to general assistance, Sorensen said no direct CMHC revenues are associated with this program.

C.J. Johnson said the County still needs to make decisions on such things as buildings, vehicles, equipment and furniture and fixtures. He anticipated these answers will be sought during the negotiation process.

Lorenzen said it appears to him that agencies will be asked to provide services at a much lower rate than previously spent. C.J. Johnson said a large part of the difference is attributed to salaries and benefits in the public sector versus private sector.

Sorensen said there will likely be other programs (i.e., apartments) currently covered in the CMHC budget which may be lost in transition. C.J. Johnson said other funding

streams may help offset these costs. Lorenzen stressed that in order to have money for innovative programs and services, there will need to be greater efficiency in providing basic services.

J Rock Johnson said one area of concern to CMHC consumers is transportation. C.J. Johnson said they will try to maintain this service but he could offer no guarantee at this time. J Rock Johnson suggested that something be included in the RFQ addressing this issue. Raybould concurred with regard to the importance of the transportation element and did not feel it was adequately spelled out in the ITN or RFQ documents.

In reference to a sliding fee scale, C.J. Johnson said Region V has a financial eligibility policy which defines these fees. Sorensen noted that this is a State contract requirement so anyone wanting to be a Region V provider will have to comply.

J Rock Johnson said she does not want the employment aspect to be overlooked. For example, the AWARE program employs consumers to clean CMHC and Trabert Hall.

With regard to vehicles, it was noted some programs require either the employer or employee to provide transportation. Sorensen said this issue, including associated liability, will have to be addressed by the provider(s).

Seibel questioned the meaning behind the wording, "*It is the intent of Region V Systems to contract...with priority given to consumers in Lancaster County.*" (See Page 3, Paragraph 2 of draft RFQ.) C.J. Johnson explained the intent is that Lancaster County individuals will have service priority over those from another county since federal and state funding coming through Region V has specific stipulations attached. Sorensen suggested the wording be revised as it implies that the contracting process gives priority to Lancaster County consumers.

With regard to the second sentence in the same paragraph, Seibel asked if primary care should be included. C.J. Johnson said they need to be careful not to imply that Region V will be the one delivering primary care.

Seibel said after reading the second heading on Page 3, "*Selection of Qualified Applicants/Negotiation/Contract Process*", it appears this has become a two-step process. She questioned at what point the process goes from RFQ into contract negotiations with selected applicants.

Wittmuss said the idea was that initial applicants would go through a question and answer (Q & A) process to identify additional things to include in the formal document or RFP. Tyerman-Harper added the consensus when drafting the document was to include two separate stages with negotiations to be included in the latter one. C.J. Johnson noted that there is the chance a RFP will need to be issued.

C.J. Johnson recommended that the title be changed to "*Selection of Qualified Applicants/Negotiation Process*" and the last sentence referring to contracts be removed. Raybould suggested including the verbiage, "*Once qualified, Region V Systems reserves the right to negotiate with more than one applicant that best fits the needs of the community and persons served.*" Seibel added it may be fair to state that this process could be considered two stages and then line things up according to the proposed schedule. Wittmuss noted the wording on Page 8, Subsections C and D, was intended to further explain the process.

With regard to proposals, C.J. Johnson indicated all qualified applicants will have to submit one. Halstead suggested this be clearly outlined on Page 8, Subsection D. Tyerman-Harper reiterated that the intent was for Phase One to include an informal Q & A session with qualified applicants after which time they can decide whether or not to proceed to Phase Two. Phase Two is when applicants would be required to submit a full proposal. C.J. Johnson said wording could be included in Subsection D regarding proposal requirements for selected applicants.

Returning to Page 3, Lorenzen suggested that the word "*Selection*" be changed to "*Identification*" in the second heading and that Subsections C and D on Page 8 be inserted before "*Schedule of Events and Deadlines.*" C.J. Johnson said they will work on new wording for this section.

Mejer inquired about proposal rankings. C.J. Johnson verified that Region V has a RFP process in place which addresses this issue.

J Rock Johnson voiced concerns with: (1) the use of the word "*proposals*" on Page 3 (first paragraph, second sentence); (2) the need for clarification of evidence based practices versus best practices; and (3) various definitions. She suggested if a definition section is used, careful consideration be given to the language referenced. She noted focus group information is referenced in the document, although, she did not feel that true focus groups, by definition, were utilized. She also questioned the need to include specifics with regard to outcome measurements. Sorensen felt some of those specifics need not be included at this time. Halstead agreed that these will come out later in the process.

Spaulding said it is difficult to include technical criteria at this level. He felt the key is to make sure those individuals reviewing the proposals have the technical expertise and credibility to do so.

3 REVIEW THE NEXT PHASES AND TIME LINES OF THE PROCESS

C.J. Johnson said proposed wording changes should be e-mailed to Amanda Tyerman-Harper at atyerman-harper@region5systems.net by Friday, January 11. He said the

final draft will be discussed at the ITN meeting on Wednesday, January 16, 2013 at 7:30 a.m., in the County-City Building, Room 113. The document will then be forwarded to the Region 5 Governing Board on January 28 and the Lancaster County Board on January 29 for consideration.

J Rock Johnson said she would like to see the phrase "*peer supported programming*" removed from the document. Additionally, as a consumer advocate, she said it has been difficult to contact CMHC consumers regarding the ITN process due to various obstacles. She said eventually there will be a legal obligation to do so and she asked Ron Sorensen and Kerry Eagan for their assistance in contacting those whose lives will be dramatically affected by the transition of services.

4 ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: J Rock Johnson moved and Raybould seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 a.m. Sorensen, C.J. Johnson, Halstead, Seibel, Wright, Raybould, Lorenzen, Anderson and J Rock Johnson voted aye. Smoyer was absent from voting. Motion carried 9-0.

Submitted by Cori Beattie, County Clerk's Office