

#2 AFP Questions Submitted Post Applicants Conference – March 18, 2013

AFP Reference	Question	Response
General Questions	For sole CMHSP regions, shall all attestation questions be answered with “yes” or “NA”.	It is acknowledged that the attestations related to dedicated PIHP staffing and consistent policies are not applicable to the single CMH PIHPs (Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb). Therefore, it is acceptable to answer those questions with N/A. Please note that if the state determines some noted as N/A are applicable, the State may request further clarity.
Page 13 1.3 Plan to Finalize Legal Entity	Even though Detroit-Wayne must convert to an authority status, can we assume that the plan requested in 1.3 does not require a response (does not apply), along with all 1.4 (.1-.9) items and 1.5. In other words, may these boxes remain blank?	Assuming the authority is not finalized by April 1, 2013 (for AFP submission), 1.3 should be marked by the applicant. All up to date legal documents from the County Commission Agency and authority including a timeline and plan must then be submitted by July 1, 2013. Additionally, proof of authority status is required by the October 1 deadline (established and administered).
Page 14 1.6 PIHP Board Member Categories	Does this apply to sole CMHSP state defined regions? If so, does the July 1 date apply to Detroit-Wayne? There is still confusion about one area of moving forward on PA 500/501, as it relates to the AFP board representatives.	This section would not be applicable to Macomb or Oakland as single CMHSP regions. Detroit-Wayne should reference relevant correspondence from DCH. The new regional entity board does require a representative of SUD on the regional entity board. This is per PA 500 of 2012. Sec. 287 (1) The composition of the Department-designated community mental health entity board (PIHP) shall consist of representatives of

#2 AFP Questions Submitted Post Applicants Conference – March 18, 2013

AFP Reference	Question	Response
	<p>What will be the standard used by the AFP reviewers to evaluate Regional Entity Board composition compliance?</p> <p>Should at least one person from all three</p>	<p>mental health, developmental or intellectual disabilities and substance use disorder services. This requirement for an SUD representative on the PIHP board is in addition to the “oversight policy board” required in Section 287 (5).</p> <p>Pertaining to the Governance section within the AFP, we will require: 1) Status as a Regional Entity under Section 1204b of MHC OR through Urban Cooperation Act; 2) The Chief Executive Office 100% dedicated to the PIHP Regional Entity (no dual role as also an active executive in a single CMH); 3) Descriptions of the PIHP board members ‘categories’ (e.g., person who receives services, family member of a person who receives services, person with a disability, advocate, provider, county commissioner, CMH representative, community member), the number of people to serve in each category, their affiliation (e.g., county) and if known at the time of application, but no later than July 1,2013, the name of the PIHP board member (note: we are not specifying a particular mix or makeup of the board other than it must be “representative” of the region). It is intentionally, left to the Region to decide the board makeup other than the SUD representative required for the PIHP in accordance with PA 500 of 2012.</p> <p>The composition of regional entity boards are</p>

#2 AFP Questions Submitted Post Applicants Conference – March 18, 2013

AFP Reference	Question	Response
	<p>service categories hold memberships on the Regional Entity Board?</p> <p>Will the less descriptive 1/3 membership standard for CMHSPs in addition to at least one SUD representative be used?</p>	<p>determined by the CMHs that govern them. The standard is simply that the model is one that is “representative” according to a model developed by the CMHs in the region. Note: the CMH board makeup requirements remain as are stated in law.</p> <p>The PIHP board makeup is a regional entity decision, the makeup of the CMHSP boards however, must continue as in law.</p>
<p>Page 15</p> <p>1.8: Signed Statement Attesting Consumer/Stakeholder Involvement.</p>	<p>Is there a template for 1.8 and does the signature requirement include both administration and Board signatures?</p>	<p>There is not a template and the statement may be signed by the Regional Entity CEO and/or Board chair. Or, if regional entity is not yet legally finalized, then it will require a statement that all CMH boards that will eventually govern the regional entity attest to the involvement of consumers and stakeholders.</p>
<p>Page 19</p> <p>2.1 General Management Functions</p>	<p>Specific to Detroit-Wayne, due to the Authority transition and current Agency Board expiration of September 30th, can the current Agency Board appoint/approve the Chief Executive Officer for the Authority?</p> <p>Given the October date for proof of an Authority, does the July 1 date, for identification of administrative officers, apply?</p>	<p>No. The new Authority will appoint the Executive Director. Please reference previous DCH correspondence to DWCCMHA Board Chair and County Commissioner. As stated in answer to question on section 1.3 above, Detroit Wayne’s application should include any updated legal documents available from the county, agency and authority available as of July 1, 2013, as well as a timeline for completing remaining items in order to be established and administered by October 1, 2013.</p>

#2 AFP Questions Submitted Post Applicants Conference – March 18, 2013

AFP Reference	Question	Response
	<p>Can the date for identification move forward from July 1, 2013 to perhaps October 31, 2013 when the Authority Board is in place?</p> <p>Concerning COO, CIO and CFO, can current incumbents (county employees) be leased from the county for a transition period and will conflict of interest policies need to be developed regarding these relationships?</p>	
<p>Page 21 2.1.5 Other Executive Staff</p>	<p>Concerning other Executive Staff, if they are provided via a staffing agent and Detroit-Wayne retains the authority to hire and fire, can Detroit-Wayne be considered the employer of record or must the staffing agent be identified in this capacity?</p>	<p>If an executive staff is to be acquired via a staffing agency instead of direct employment relationship, then the response should be “contracted” rather than listing DWCCMHA authority as employer of record.</p>
<p>Page 32 2.7 Quality Management #7 Conducting Research</p>	<p>Will you expand on Section 2.7 Quality Management functions, specifically #7) conducting research and a corresponding reference to another standard or contract sub-section?</p>	<p>This language was taken from the Administrative Cost Report. Please see link provided in the AFP.</p>
<p>Page 36 5.1.4 Table for Regional Analysis of People at Risk</p>	<p>Where are the 5 referenced questions located or identified?</p>	<p>The 5 referenced questions are not the table. It is the 4 questions following the table. 5.1.5 through 5.1.8.</p>

#2 AFP Questions Submitted Post Applicants Conference – March 18, 2013

AFP Reference	Question	Response
Page 44 5.3.1.9 Plan for Transitioning People back into the PIHP	Please explain intent of 5.3.1.9.	If a region does not have full capacity to service individuals who were placed outside of the PIHP region AND wish to move back to the Region, there will be a plan developed to build capacity.
Page 51 Section 5.5.5	It looks like this sentence is out of place; therefore, giving the wrong message.	By October 1, 2013, the applicant will present to MDCH a plan for sustaining positions currently supported by federal <u>Mental Block Grant funding</u> after the grant has ended. AND By October 1, 2013, the applicant will present to MDCH a plan for sustaining prevention and women’s specialty services positions that are currently supported by the federal <u>Substance Abuse and Prevention Block Grant.</u>
Other	Can MDCH clarify if the PA2 Liquor Tax Funds management will become part of the new RE/PIHP contract?	If the reference is to the State restricted, liquor licensing fees, then the answer is yes.