

Sec. 417(5) Quarterly Report on activities by CMHSPs to form regional partnerships

January 30, 2002

- A. With the publication of the Implementation Guide on October 11, 2001, MDCH restricted its involvement in helping to shape or provide individual CMHSP consultation regarding affiliations to avoid violation of procurement requirements. Specific affiliation questions were addressed system wide as part of a series of regional meetings held on the Implementation Guide during November/December of 2001, and through published answers to questions on the Implementation Guide (posted on the MDCH Web Page). There are still a few CMHSPs that either have not made a commitment to a particular partnership, or are engaging in the development of a partnership but it's not solidified at this writing. The remainder of this report gives a summary of the status as of the date of the report.

One additional and important activity is a survey conducted by MDCH during November 2001. This brief survey was designed to a) determine if CMHSPs and affiliations would meet the 20,000 covered lives requirement, and the contiguity requirement as specified in the Appropriation Act; b) identify what legal mechanisms the affiliations were planning to utilize and who the partners would be; c) what kinds of barriers they were facing and what kinds of assistance they needed. The results of this survey enabled the MDCH to address identified problems as part of the regional trainings noted above, and through the published Question and Answer documents. It also enabled MDCH to verify that the CMHSPs and affiliations were in compliance with the 20,000 covered lives and contiguity requirements, and this was communicated to them in writing. We also confirmed that two CMHSPs (noted below) that do not meet the 20,000 covered lives provision are not definitively part of an affiliation, and as such may not qualify for participation in the AFP portion of the procurement process. However, the procurement process includes additional steps that will assure that people in those service areas will continue to have access to appropriate services on October 1, 2002.

- B. Listing and status of Affiliations: (the lead CMHSP is asterisked when known)
1. The entire Upper Peninsula has formed a partnership among the five (5) CMHSPs, and this is unchanged from the last report.
 - a. Gogebic CMHSP
 - b. Copper CMHSP
 - c. Pathways CMHSP *
 - d. Northpointe CMHSP
 - e. Hiawatha CMHSP

2. The NE Mitten consists of the following CMHSPs, and the Substance Abuse Coordinating Agency in that region. This affiliation has been together for quite a while and is unchanged since the last report.
 - a. Northern CMHSP *
 - b. Northeast CMHSP
 - c. Antrim-Kalkaska CMHSP
 - d. AuSable CMHSP
 - e. Northern Michigan Substance Abuse Services

3. The NW Mitten consists of the following CMHSPs. Manistee-Benzie dropped out of this affiliation during the last quarter.
 - a. Great Lakes
 - b. North Central *
 - c. West Michigan

4. The Access Alliance is a partnership that has been together for quite a while and seems well developed. This group includes Montcalm CMHSP, which is not contiguous except for statutory language in the current year appropriation act. This is unchanged since the last report.
 - a. Bay-Arenac CMHSP *
 - b. Huron CMHSP
 - c. Tuscola CMHSP
 - d. Montcalm CMHSP
 - e. Shiawassee CMHSP

5. Muskegon* and Ottawa CMHSPs have developed a county level agreement to partner. This is unchanged since the last report.

6. Newaygo CMHSP has joined Gratiot and Ionia CMHSPs to affiliate with the Clinton-Eaton-Ingham CMHSP. Newaygo is contiguous, only with the statutory exception in the current year appropriation. This is unchanged since the last report.
 - a. Newaygo CMHSP
 - b. Gratiot CMHSP
 - c. Ionia CMHSP
 - d. CEI CMHSP *

7. The M-23 Corridor partnership continues to develop around Washtenaw CMHSP. This group operated for some time with Monroe and Shiawassee as members, but the latter CMHSPs were removed last quarter, reducing the group to three CMHSPs.
 - a. Livingston CMHSP
 - b. Washtenaw CMHSP *
 - c. Lenawee CMHSP

8. The Thumb partnership consists of the following CMHSPs. It has been together for quite a while. This is unchanged since the last report.
 - a. Sanilac
 - b. Lapeer
 - c. St. Clair *

9. The Venture group has been organized for a couple years. This is unchanged since the last report.
 - a. Berrien CMHSP
 - b. Van Buren CMHSP
 - c. Barry CMHSP
 - d. Summit Pointe CMHSP *
 - e. Pines CMHSP

10. The SW Partnership has evolved over the past six months or so and appears on track. This is unchanged since the last report.
 - a. Allegan CMHSP
 - b. Kalamazoo CMHSP *
 - c. Woodlands CMHSP
 - d. St. Joseph CMHSP

C. Listing of CMHSPs that do not need to affiliate and do not plan to, and those that do need to affiliate, but have not solidified a partnership.

11. CMHSPs searching for an affiliation: Monroe and Manistee-Benzie are unattached at this time.

12. The following eight (8) CMHSPs are of sufficient size and are not planning to form partnerships as of the date of this report.

13. Kent CMHSP
 - a. Saginaw CMHSP
 - b. Genesee CMHSP
 - c. Macomb CMHSP
 - d. Oakland CMHSP
 - e. Lifeways CMHSP
 - f. Detroit-Wayne CMHSP
 - g. CMH of Central Michigan

D. Next Steps

The MDCH requirements and expectations of CMHSPs and affiliations for next year (FY 03) are reflected in the Implementation Guide published October 11, 2001, and the Application for Participation published January 2, 2002. This means the procurement process is now under way. These documents reflect the same expectations that have been published and described to CMHSPs since

September 2000, but offer more detail. It is now up to the CMHSPs to firm up their affiliations so they reflect the stated requirements when they submit their Application to MDCH in mid-February.