

**MINUTES**  
**ST. CHARLES COMMUNITY 708 MENTAL HEALTH BOARD**  
**Tuesday, November 4, 2014**  
**Finance Conference Room – Municipal Building**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Barb Gacic, Maureen Lewis, Ron Weddell, Mary Hughes, Michael Cohen, Carla Cumblad, and Carolyn Waibel

**ABSENT:**

**OTHERS:** Tina Nilles

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Barb Gacic opened the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

**2. Approval of minutes of February 27, 2014 St. Charles Community 708 Mental Health Board.**

Motion by Cumblad, second by Lewis to approve of minutes of February 27, 2014 St. Charles Community 708 Mental Health Board.

Question was raised that minutes were transcribed verbatim which it is the understanding that minutes only need to be transcribed that way in closed session, and the Mental Health Board meetings are an open session. What is the past practice of minute taking?

**Tina:** The minutes are verbatim but I try to use good judgment when I transcribe of not including random comments or if I can't figure the flow of the conversation to make sense, I don't include it because on the tape there is so much over talking of one another to understand the structure content. This question came up several years ago and with PAC direction, meetings where there is discussion, we need to get the content of what's being said as opposed to doing it in bullet item style. There are executive sessions meetings that are done in the same format but they don't get released until the minutes are reviewed and voted on before releasing them and some don't ever get released. This question gets volleyed back/forth all the time on what should and should not be written. Bullet points were to be stricken because they don't give enough content. All of our minutes for committees here at the City are done this way. It creates total transparency and there are requests, at any given time, to go back into past year's minutes to look up information on a given subject matter.

**Maureen:** When someone is not at a meeting, the minutes are very helpful in having the discussion that went on to get a better understanding of a situation.

**VOICE VOTE:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chrmn. Gacic did not vote as Chair and Ald. Lewis did not vote as City liaison. **Motion carried.**

**3. Discussion of DayOne Network funding.**

**Barb:** Earlier this year there was some discussion on whether DayOne Network qualified for funding. I met with John McGuirk, City Attorney, Mayor Rogina, Mark Koenen, City Administrator, and Tina in September. I gave Atty. McGuirk a copy of the original 708 Act that was passed by the state in the 1960's, our bylaws, the letter that we received from the Director of DayOne Network and a history of the funding that the St. Charles 708 Mental Health Board has given them since 2005, that was as far back as my records went. The bottom line from that conversation is that legally they do qualify with what they do for us to consider them for funding. So when they come before us next year, it will be up to us to determine, as we do with all agencies, whether or not they are to get funding and how much. We now have a legal determination that they do qualify and provide direct services.

**Mary:** Going back to pre-2005 they have always come in with a request. It may not of always been as much as they were asking for but they did receive something. Last year was the first year they didn't receive anything.

**Barb:** There just have been lots of questions to their qualifications; so it was time to get a legal determination.

**Maureen:** If any agency qualifies does that automatically mean they must receive?

**Barb:** There is no determination that we must give any agency that comes to us funding; they do qualify for consideration. DayOne did not get funding this past year. The issue has been whether they were a direct service agency or if they were a pass through agency that was not providing any direct services to the clients. We determined they did not qualify based on what we knew of them at the time. DayOne questioned the City about this and that's when I got this legal ruling.

**Maureen:** Do these agencies have recourse when they are turned down to go to some other entity?

**Barb:** That will be discussed in item 7 on the agenda as that is another alternative for funding.

**4. Review write-ups of agency visits.**

**Carla:** I have not written my reviews yet because I have questions on what I should be writing and emailing. I have concerns about staying in the structure of the Open Meetings Act and need some guidance. We have a written application process that people are to meet a certain criteria, then come and do a presentation and sometimes reiterate what's in the application, than we have these visits that are fairly unstructured.

**Carolyn:** I went in as a fact finder and am reporting factual information; there is nothing opinionated, I don't come out with a recommendation but rather stated this is the percentage of people, where their funding comes from, statistically how they get their budget, etc. I started out with a verbal introduction of what we need from them to come in under mental illness, mental disability, or substance abuse which is the definition of this commission. This year we are going to be more stringent in not accepting applications who do not have budget/financial information accompanied with it; and no one is guaranteed of receiving the allocation of which they ask for. I also explained why the decrease in grant funding due to property taxes.

**All:**

- There was round table discussion on some of the write-ups, some had recommendations and could be susceptible to FOIA if discussed outside of a called meeting.
- All correspondence is filtered through the City administrative personnel as the only key contact to correspond with.
- These agency visits are only done every few random years.
- These visits started up as being just a friendly visit, not going out with a check list to see what they are doing.
- It's a way to find out more about the agencies overall. As board members, we don't see any of them outside of the annual funding meeting. It's feeling the atmosphere of their everyday process.
- It helps to make an informed decision and without the field visits you're not making an informed decision on the allocations.
- The idea is to go out and be the face of this into the community and to establish an informal kind of relationship.
- It would be helpful for new members to go out with some of you experienced board members on a visit to shadow you on a site visit.
- Just want to be concerned with neutrality in the write-ups and it doesn't affect our decisions in the process.
- A good point was brought up in making sure we keep within the Open Meetings Acts parameters. We have to remember the population and agencies that we are dealing with. These agencies work hard with very little money, do the best they can for an extremely difficult and complicated population; I don't go in with an advocacy role. These are not businesses but a group of mental health agencies that we are dealing with and are very different from a business world environment.
- One board member has been to all but a few agencies over time and it has given her an awareness and appreciation in how they are reaching out to their clientele. Numbers are important and wants to see what we are giving them money for.
- Reviewed charter that was created in in 1985 that had only seven agencies at that time and now we are up to 20 agencies. If it would make things more comfortable we could continue to make our agency visits but not share the information until we are all gather at a quorum meeting. We have to share this

- information somehow and we don't have enough time for a one-night meeting with these many agencies coming forward.
- The premise of why Tina sends information out to all board members is strictly for each individual to get a head start on the materials and board members are not to share thoughts/comments amongst any other board member. When Tina does receive an email it's always in a single person format and generally the question isn't even referring to the email that was sent.
  - Perhaps we should meet more than just once a year – change up the format.
  - **Barb would like to have an allocation funding sheet on a table for a handout at the February meeting with just single grand total amounts of distribution of funds over the past years so agencies can see the decline of dollars over the years – ACTION for Tina (Att. I).**
  - Most agencies were not aware that the funding dollars are based on a percentage. They thought it was a council allocated amount. So clarifying that in the visits has also been helpful in taking that adversarial attitude down a notch. It started out at 5% then to 4.5% and now is 4%.
  - **Board would like to have an estimated total allocation stated in the application letter for FY15/16. Tina will check into this with Finance. Generally it's only an estimate due to property tax returns not being final until June time frame – ACTION.**
  - Talked about a reserve balance. The MHB no longer keeps a reserve of any significant amount and there is also a cost deducted from the City for overall administrative support.
  - Circling back to the beginning of this item – at this year's annual meeting there were some agencies that we didn't know at all or how they operated. When applications come in and there are new agencies, shouldn't we try to make a visit before the meeting so that we can make a better informed decision? We all know what the regular agencies do because they have been repetitive applicants over the years.
  - To take on new agencies, current agencies will be allotted less and how will this be done? Another discussion regarding percentage cuts across the board – not all viewed that as favorable.
  - Few years past a tier structure was created to place agencies into a criteria model for allocations as there was no rhyme or reason as to why the MHB was making some of the allocations; and based on the category an agency was slotted into would help to determine the need for more funding due to following the charter (e.g., hands on service vs. support services). **Board members asking for criteria description – will have to look back into minutes – ACTION for Tina (Att. II)** This was not a policy but something the board members at that time voted on.
  - Would like to see these agencies' outcome measures because there has to be some sort of measurement for the money we're giving them. Ask for quarterly satisfaction surveys to see who they are, how they are connecting with clients and how effective they are. Otherwise we are giving money just because they serve St. Charles people – how do we know it's effective.

- Want to see result base reports on the application on what they are going to use the money for that is being requested – more round table discussion. From a different view of an accounting perspective, on paper, numbers can be manipulated anyway you want and we don't have any better feel than we have right now going out and making a site visit every three years. Some agencies don't see the tangible outcome results, such as, when an agency takes in phone calls or doing a seminar talk to a body of people; in comparison to a one-on-one interaction. They should give surveys to their clients to see if what they're doing for them is being effective. We can recommend to the agencies that we would like to see that but I don't know if you can require it because some of it is intangible. It's not unreasonable to ask any agency what their outcome measurements are.
- This is a complicated conversation, you need to have accountability and metrics and Renz, for example, gives some great raw data, but to a certain extent we are not qualified or able to review raw data, collate it, and come up with some analysis of it. We have to take their information and weigh it and say it is honest. TriCity Family Services is another example.
- Circling back on what's been stated. I've heard it's probably good to have more meetings, but the agency write-ups we should not make recommendations regarding them. Should we write things up for posterity or do we bring our thoughts here and just have an open discussion?
- To clarify we do not make any recommendations of funding and tiers in the write-ups and do we write them up and share them in advance of the meeting?
- Regarding the write-ups, one board member thinks it's important to make a visual, tangible synopsis for people to review vs. verbally hearing it the day of. It helps us to be more educated to make those decisions for the taxpayers. If you're not fully educated, you're doing the whole board a dis-service.
- Perhaps we could have some guidelines for the write-ups so we all are looking for the same thing. **ACTION for Board Members for future meeting after February 2015.**
- Discussion on taking a motion of whether board wants to continue the site visits and list criteria regarding their facility and atmosphere, but not get into their financials. We do this every three years or so; we have time to develop these guidelines. Parameters would have been helpful to share ahead of time. **ACTION for Board Members for future meeting after February 2015.**
- Had information sharing on the site visit for DayOne agency.
- Discussion on incomplete applications and if such is submitted incomplete, they will be immediately disqualified.

##### **5. Discussion of the proposed Accountability Checklist for Mental Health Board applications.**

**Barb:** (Distributed a handout of the checklist for comments Att. III.) This checklist will be included with the application as a front page when it is sent out in January and is to be turned in with the application. Sign-off on this sheet is required and wants the application packet sent back to us in the order that this checklist is listed.

**Tina:** FYI, for the agencies that receive over \$25K in grant money are required to send me quarterly financial reports. I date them when I receive them and file them away; so at any time if any of you want to see the reports that I receive you are welcome to.

**Comments:**

- Have received good feedback from agencies such as we are the most cooperative and compassionate board to deal with. They appreciate the forethought we put into our decision making.
- This checklist is a gentle reminder.
- Question was raised on where is the line item for the amount requested and its use? That is on the application. This checklist is a tool to assist them as they are completing the application and to be considered as a gentle reminder. This is in no way a supplement to the application.
- Include a line on application that specifically asks what the use of the requested money is going to be used for what services, staff, technology, etc. And then next year come back and show us how that line item worked for them. Want the agency presentations to focus on how the previous funding request dollars was used and forego all the other usual general information that is in the application.
- Brainstormed application word-smiting changes. **ACTION for Board Members to have a handout prepared at the annual meeting of changes/criteria that need to be incorporated in application process for next fiscal year (FY16/17).**
- Some agencies (schools) don't have proper coaching in handing off this funding process to another person and hence they come to our meeting not fully prepared or understanding the requirements. It's their responsibility.
- Presentations from the agency needs to be more structured, such as, what specifically are you using this money for, how many St. Charles residents are you serving, how else are you offsetting your costs.
- Perhaps MHB acts as a panel and ask the key questions we want to hear and that may keep everyone more on task.
- Still circling back to the specifics of requested funding and how it's being used.
- TriCity, as an example. serves 10,000 people of which 3,500 were St. Charles residents; vs. an organization that serves strictly St. Charles residents – they are seen differently such as Easter Seals that serves a county.
- There is also cost structure to take into account where an agency uses a sliding scale which will allow \$10,000 to go further with assisting more clients than an agency who does not use a sliding scale. There are also so many factors that go into helping clients that can't all be broken out. Continued round table discussion – pros/cons.
- **Change last paragraph on first page of application – ACTION for Tina.**

**6. Discussion of any revisions to the Mental Health Board Accountability Report for Funds Expended Application.**

*This item was discussed in previous agenda item #5.*

**7. Presentation on Community Foundation of the Fox River Valley – Barb Gacic.**

Barb attended a presentation of the Community Foundation of the Fox River Valley which is an incredible organization located in Aurora. They are looking to tap into the Fox Valley/Geneva/St. Charles areas. They are an agency that administers 436 charitable funds. Of these are 259 endowments of which they are the fund managers. They are not a non-for-profit but a fee-based agency that deals with non-for-profits. They are a national organization and have been in the Fox Valley area since 1946. They support five agencies that we provide funding for: DayOne, AID, TriCity Family Services, Lazarus House, and TriCity Health Partnership. I was specific that I did not want them to come and give a presentation at our annual February meeting. I would like them to provide some pickup information for agencies who may not be aware of them and this is another place that maybe an agency can go to as a funding source. They don't want anything from us but are looking to bring an awareness to the community that they are available and have additional funding and will manage their funds too.

I do want to draw your attention to some of their criteria, in particular, that applications packets that are not complete and not filed before 12:00 noon on the designated date are automatically excluded.

**8. Additional Items.**

**Tina:** In wrapping up there has been a lot of discussion and action to be taken. Do you feel the need to meet again before January? My schedule is to get applications out the first week of January and ask for them back within 30 days – February 6, 2015 - NOON. Copies are made for all of you and mailed and you get a week to review all the data before the meeting on February 26. Do you want to break the annual meeting into two nights?

**Carla:** We get the applications and as a group have a pre-meeting to discuss the applications and answer any questions. We can keep the February 26 date for this pre-meeting and then one or two weeks later have the presentations and make the decisions.

**Barb:** The February 26 meeting has to be kept for next year as the presenters already have that date on their calendars for the annual presentation. So we are talking two meetings: one to review the applications, one to present and decide.

**February 18 @ 6:00 p.m. will be the next meeting to go over the applications prior to the annual meeting.**

- Discussion on whether the checklist that will be included with the application can be given out ahead of time to the agencies to get them prepared? It was decided to send it out with the application.
- For the next meeting can we add an item on the agenda on how to coach new members in making decisions based on the state and federal funding these agencies receive, or size of the budget. Seasoned members don't really look at that – they look at people and hours served. Last year Barb gave a copy of a

spreadsheet she created of people and hours served for all the agencies, dollars per hour, etc.

- **Members liked the concept that having a discussion on what is our criteria before making a decision especially when we are under the pressure of making a decision, so we have some guidelines in our head on how to address the situation (Guidelines for Decision Making on next agenda – 2/18/15) ACTION.**
- Things cannot always be clear cut due to the nature of the agencies and what they provide.
- Kudos to the board as a whole for the in-depth conversation tonight and special thanks to Barb for her Chairmanship.

#### **9. Adjournment**

Motion by Hughes, second by Cumblad to adjourn meeting at 8:00 p.m.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chrmn. Gacic did not vote as Chair and Ald. Lewis did not vote as City liaison. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted by Tina Nilles  
Recording Secretary

Atts.

## **Attachment I**

### **St. Charles 708 Mental Health Allocations (February 2015)**

The St. Charles 708 Mental Health Board was established by a 1986 city referendum. The by-laws followed those established in the State of Illinois' Community Mental Health Act (405 ILCS 20/).

St. Charles 708 Mental Health Board funding is derived from a \$.04/\$100 EAV (Equalized Assessed Valuation) of City of St. Charles residents. This comes out to .0004 of a \$100,000 home OR \$40.

The total city tax rate is \$.04 which is 5.6% of the city's total rate.

The St. Charles 708 budget is assigned based on what taxes are anticipated to be collected for the upcoming year.

#### **St. Charles 708 Mental Health Board Fund Allocations History**

2004/2005	\$448,500
2005/2006	\$481,000
2006/2007	\$514,500
2007/2008	\$566,200
2008/2009	\$605,900
2009/2010	\$606,000
2010/2011	\$724,500
2011/2012	\$634,000
2012/2013	\$584,850
2013/2014	\$581,100
2014/2015	\$520,600
2015/2016	

- 2.) specific protection against disorder – to establish a defense against a disorder by elimination of an essential causative factor (i.e., primary prevention);
- 3.) detection and treatment in its earliest stages – to introduce remedial measures when cure is still possible;
- 4.) disability limitation – to arrest deterioration and to preserve the maximum of normal functions;
- 5.) rehabilitation – to restore the individual to the highest level of independent activity of which he is capable.

It also states that the Board is to meet quarterly and we should meet sometime this summer especially if we have new board members to replace Mary and Jane. The Board also discuss about going out to agencies to survey what they do in their environments which was done a few years back.

Mary had suggested to set tiers for the agencies to gauge the level of support they provide to their clients.

- Class A are the traditional agencies, e.g., Ecker Center, Renz, AID, TriCity Family Services – there is no doubt of what kind of services they provide – they fit the requirements.
- Class B is where there is an environmental situation that can cause mental stress such as Hospice, Living Well, Fox Valley Pregnancy Center where mental health services are still required but not for long term.
- Class C is where some agencies are questionable as to whether they do qualify such as Family Services Association of Elgin.

Cliff asked where do the schools fall into?

Middle schools vary widely in their programs between each other. They can possibly fall into B Class but the high schools are definitely in C class. They are not traditional agencies of mental health services. The Board is not concerned about the Counseling Department, they are more concerned about the socialization that is brought on and how it might create better mental health. The schools were decided to be classified in the C class. Need to look at the agency by itself for what it does and also look at the programs they offer to see how they fit and do something worthwhile to the program.

John prepared a draft spreadsheet listing out how he classified the agencies for discussion. The Board went through a series of rounds deciding final classification placement of agencies and deciding whether to give the agency full dollar credit, partial, or anything at all.

Table showed what the total amount requested from all agencies was \$604,350.00 and the Board has 588,300.00 of available funding and \$20K to be kept in reserves.

There was discussion on how much money should be kept in reserves in case in the middle of the year an agency may need an additional request and we may be able to grant

ATTACHMENT III

City of St. Charles  
708 Mental Health Board  
Accountability Report for Funds Expended Checklist

It is the responsibility of the agency requesting City of St. Charles 708 Mental Health Board funding to verify all Accountability Report requested information is submitted at the time of application submission.

Please use the following checklist to sign off as you compile your application packet for submission. Incomplete applications or applications submitted after \_\_\_\_\_ will not be considered for funding for the 2015/2016 funding period.

**Please submit your information in the order in which it appears on the application.**

**Initialed by Grant Requestor as included in application packet**

- 1: \_\_\_\_\_ Agency and contact information completed.
- 2: \_\_\_\_\_ 2015/2016 total funding request is: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_ Completed narrative mission of the organization as it relates to the City of St. Charles 708 Mental Health Board's charged areas of residents with, or at risk of:
  - a. mental disorders
  - b. developmental disabilities, including mental, retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and autism
  - c. substance abuse
  - d. drug abuse
- 4. \_\_\_\_\_ You have **specifically** described your organization's goals as it relates to our mission
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_ On the application you have broken down/described:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ How funds will be expended and have quantified services provided to City of St. Charles residents
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Attached annual detailed budget or year ending Financial Statements and annual report (audited Financial Statements if available)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Described St. Charles 708 Fund Expenditure History
  - \_\_\_\_\_ The total direct number of individuals your agency served in the past year \_\_\_\_\_ (individuals)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Direct number living **within the City of St. Charles city limits** served in this timeframe \_\_\_\_\_ (individuals)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Direct number of service hours provided to City of St. Charles residents: \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Quantified costs allocated to the services provided, i.e. cost per hour and or program costs for City of St. Charles residents \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Identified other services provided to and for the City of St. Charles' residents
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Attached a list of current Board of Directors for you agency *as specified in our application*
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Attached a copy of your current 501 (c) (3) approval letter

*Keep in mind individuals are to be counted only once, regardless of the number of times served per fiscal year though the direct number of hours these individual are served need to be quantified.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Agency submitting their funding request application \_\_\_\_\_ Date  
Name of Agency

\_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Title/Position  
Printed Name of Person  
Completing Application