

CFAC Meeting Minutes

May 21, 2009

Present: Steve, Gwyn, Benita, Linda, Diane, Leslie, Edward, Bradley, Pam, Heather, Allen, Marcus, Virginia, and Michael

Minutes: The minutes of the April meeting were approved.

REPORTS:

Update from CFAC Chair: Steve and Heather reported on their recent meeting with Judy Truitt (Heather joined Steve since Cheryl was unable to attend). They discussed the possible merger with Alamance-Caswell. Steve said that Judy Truitt did not see any red flags to suggest the merger would be a bad idea for OPC. In fact, it could benefit OPC because we are currently second from the bottom among all LMEs with regard to size. A merger with Alamance-Caswell would make the LME the 9th largest in the state. Heather mentioned that Judy said Alamance and Caswell counties are fairly conservative, which would be somewhat different from OPC. In addition to the merger, Steve and Heather learned about the OPC budget for next fiscal year. OPC is planning a 10% reduction in the service budget. They always have to try to predict how much will be allocated from the state, because they don't get their allocation letter until a few months into the new fiscal year. If more money is allocated than OPC expects, or if there is more money left toward the end of the year, OPC can increase the amounts in providers' contracts. Steve and Heather also learned that CARF will be coming to OPC in June for the accreditation site visit, and that OPC will be getting a new business system toward the middle of the coming fiscal year.

Update from OPC CFAC Liaison: Michael pointed out that the deadline for registering for the NC Council's Spring Policy Forum is tomorrow. The brochure is in the Pass Around Folder, and if anyone is interested, they should be sure to see Michael after the meeting to fill out a registration form. Michael also reported on the death of Chris Phillips, Chief of the Division's Advocacy and Customer Service Section. After sending out the email announcing that Chris had died, the Division learned that his death was a suicide. Michael reminded members that Chris Phillips was himself a consumer. Members shared their thoughts about the sadness of this news, and offered sympathies to his family.

Michael reported that the CARF site reviewers would want to interview two CFAC members. The interviews could be done individually or together, and in person or by telephone. The CARF reviewers would be here on Thursday June 11 and Friday June 12. Linda and Heather volunteered to participate in these interviews. Michael will follow up with them after we learn more details.

Club Creative still has not opened. At this point, Therapeutic Alternatives is still waiting for their DMA enrollment number, which they need in order to bill Medicaid once they are providing services. In addition, they are waiting for the Chrysalis Foundation to transfer the title to their 3 vans, which Therapeutic Alternatives will use to transport members to and from the program. In the meantime, Therapeutic Alternatives is providing a small amount of community support services to some of the members of Club Creative.

Finally, Michael let members know that from the recently completed Provider Survey (which is in the Pass Around Folder), OPC learned that a large number of providers don't really know about CFAC. To address this, Michael plans to write at least one article about CFAC for the provider newsletter. He asked whether any CFAC members would like to work on this with him. Edward offered to write a draft and send it to Michael.

Update from State CFAC Liaison: Suzanne was unable to be at this meeting. She has begun to work with another CFAC whose meeting date is the same is OPC-CFAC. Suzanne is at the other CFAC's meeting tonight, and plans to rotate between the two CFACs every other month.

NEW BUSINESS:

Budget Revision/Planning for 2009-10

Pam reported that she met with Michael to review the current year's budget, in order to determine where to take the \$5,000 from that CFAC returned to OPC. Members have a copy of the proposal in their packets for this meeting. The proposal is to take all the money from the following line items: "Mailing Supplies," "Equipment," "Speakers," and "Transportation" (since nothing had been spent from these line items, and no expenditures were expected). In addition, \$2,400 would be taken from the line item for last year's Peer Support Workshop. This would bring the total reductions to \$4,800. So the proposal also includes taking \$100 each from "Advertising" and "Consulting & Facilitation." Leslie moved to approve the proposal, and Gwyn seconded the motion. The proposal passed by unanimous vote.

Pam also asked for volunteers to meet before the next meeting to develop a budget proposal for next fiscal year. The proposal will be presented for approval at the June meeting. Allen, Heather, Leslie, Diane, Marcus, and Linda all volunteered to work with Pam on this task.

OPC-Alamance-Caswell Merger Discussion

Michael reviewed some highlights of the materials that were mailed out to CFAC members last week. The information included the By-laws and Relational Agreement for the ACR CFAC, as well as the minutes from their February meeting. The mailing also included the ACR Annual Needs Assessment, as well as a PowerPoint presentation on "What Happens When CFACs Merge" (from last year's statewide CFAC Conference).

Michael pointed out some differences he found while reviewing ACR CFAC's By-laws and Relational Agreement. For example, the ACR Relational Agreement does not specify a process for resolving disputes. Instead, it simply states that the CFAC and LME must "delineate a process for dispute resolution." But Michael noted that it's easier to do this ahead of time, than when you are in the midst of some sort of dispute. Benita pointed out that the ACR Board appoints their CFAC members, which is quite different from OPC's process, which is completely independent of the Area Board. CFAC members found this item concerning, and were clear that they would not want to have Board members appoint CFAC members if OPC merges with Alamance-Caswell. THE ACR CFAC's By-laws indicate that a "limited time" be allocated in each meeting for public comment. While this is not specifically addressed in OPC CFAC's By-laws, the practice has been to allow public comment throughout the meeting (though only CFAC members can vote). Leslie expressed concern that their By-laws also prohibit more than one member of a family from serving as a voting member at the same time. This CFAC currently has 2 families with 2 voting members each. CFAC members opposed adding such a restriction to the By-laws. Michael also pointed out that ACR's By-laws allow non-CFAC members to serve on Committees of their CFAC, though they would not have all the rights of a voting member. Members of this CFAC speculated that this probably meant non-members were not entitled to stipends. In addition, ACR's By-laws include fairly strict attendance requirements. If a member of their CFAC misses 3 meetings in a year (and the absences are not excused), they may be subject to removal from the CFAC. Michael noted that the format of ACR CFAC's minutes seems to have been developed to track absences, since they are included in the minutes (as well as whether the absence was with prior notification). Some members said they liked the format of the ACR CFAC's minutes, since they help keep track of decisions, next steps, and the current status of each issue. Michael said that he chose the February minutes at random from the ACR website, so he does not know whether these minutes are typical or not. But it appears their February meeting was primarily reports from LME staff to the CFAC. Heather noted that there seemed to be a lot of staff at this meeting and wondered whether that was always the case. Next, Michael mentioned that the ACR Needs Assessment showed some similarities to OPC's. For example, one of the big issues they face is lack of transportation. They also listed problems with housing, lack of insurance, and stigma as barriers to treatment. These are also issues familiar to OPC. Michael pointed out that one of the innovative things ACR has done is to start a DBT program for sophomore students in the high schools. Several CFAC members said they were impressed by this.

Michael said that one of the things OPC was requesting from CFAC was a list of pros and cons to this merger, especially as it would affect CFAC. CFAC members were focused primarily on issues of transportation and where meetings would be held during this discussion. They also asked whether Michael would continue to be the staff liaison. Michael suggested a review of the

PowerPoint presentation that was mailed out to members. He attended this session at the CFAC Conference last year, and had reviewed his notes to prepare for tonight's meeting. Michael said that the presenters included representatives of two CFACs that had merged. He could not recall specifically which LME it was, though it was one of the LMEs from the western part of the state. In that merger, the staff liaisons from the two CFACs both continued to work with the newly merged CFAC. They discussed various possibilities in the presentation, including models that incorporated local CFACs and a merged CFAC. The local CFACs had members who served on the merged CFAC, and these members were to represent the local CFACs on matters voted on by the merged CFAC. Some mergers ended up with one meeting in a central location every month, and others involve rotating locations from month to month, so that no one county always has a burden with regard to travel. Most mergers end up re-writing By-laws and Relational Agreements, combining elements from each CFAC. Sometimes the merged CFACs end up with Co-chairs from each CFAC. Michael thinks this was done by the merged CFAC who presented at the conference. Members expressed some concerns that transportation would prove to be a very difficult problem to overcome in a merger with Alamance-Caswell. Some members suggested that Chapel Hill may still be a central location for meetings. Members also had some brief discussion about the possibility of using electronic means to allow people to participate in CFAC meetings when they cannot travel to a meeting location. Michael suggested that if the merger is approved by the Board, then working out these details would likely need to have both CFACs sitting at the same table.

Michael informed CFAC members that Judy Truitt intends to ask the Board to make a decision during their June meeting. The time pressure is so that if OPC decides not to merge, Alamance-Caswell has time to look for another LME to merge with. So OPC would like for CFAC to make a recommendation that can be given to the OPC Area Board while they are deliberating their own decision. CFAC members expressed their approval of moving ahead with the merger. Although everyone acknowledged that there would be challenges with a merger, CFAC agreed that it was better to merge by choice, when OPC would likely be the lead LME, than to be forced to merge with another LME further down the road.

OLD BUSINESS:

Because it was nearly 8:00, members agreed to table discussion of social activity planning and re-appointment of CFAC members until the June meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

AQIC

Report tabled until June.

Provider Community/Quality Management Committee

Leslie asked to be able to report on this Committee's activities, which CFAC approved. She noted that they reviewed information from the Provider Survey that Michael had mentioned earlier. They also learned about the new business system, which should be a big help to OPC.

Service Management Committee

Report tabled until June.

Public Awareness and Advocacy Committee

Report tabled until June.

PSW (Peer Support Workshop)

Report tabled until June.

OPC Area Board

Report tabled until June.

Proposed Agenda for June Meeting:

- RecoveryNC presentation
- 2009 Local CFAC-to-State CFAC report