

LCMH Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Date: 05.03.2018

Start time: 12:05 pm

Adjourned: 1:18 pm

Board Members: Zach Williams, Fred Ober, Fein Rosenblum, Dot Reeve, Mary Anne Lewis, Sharon Menard, Karen Carlson, Savi Van Sluytman

Absent: Chip Troiano, Nancy Durand, Bev Allen, Michele Whitmore

Staff: Ginny Havermayer, Rebecca Copans, Christina Glowac, Savi Van Sluytman, Robyn Daley, Denis Houle, Jennifer Stratton

Notes: Luciana Swenson

Guest: Sarah Williams

Topic	Discussion	Action	Person Responsible
1. Introductions	Introductions were made.		
2. Approval of Minutes	<p>The board reviewed the meeting notes from October 2017, January 2018 and March 2018.</p> <p>Mr. Ober moved the motion to approve the minutes from the October meeting. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. All approved.</p> <p>Ms. Menard moved the motion to approve the minutes from the January meeting. Ms. Reeve seconded the motion. All approved.</p> <p>Ms. Lewis moved the motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting. Ms. Reeve seconded the motion. All approved.</p>	<p>By unanimous vote, the minutes of October meeting were approved.</p> <p>By unanimous vote, the minutes of January meeting were approved.</p> <p>By unanimous vote, the minutes of March meeting were approved.</p>	

<p>3. CEO Report</p>	<p>Ms. Van Sluytman presented the CEO report. She asked if there were questions.</p> <p>Mr. Williams asked for a brief update on the union negotiations.</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: there was a 1st meeting scheduled to set the ground rules. The next meeting will be this week and both union and management will present their proposals, and start the negotiation process. We hope to agree on the final terms before the beginning of the next fiscal year. Generally, our management team will present and offer what LCMHS has received from the State. The State has been prescriptive on how we may use the money given, and now we see the impact on this year's financials from last year's disbursement.</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman presented an update on Project CHART, IT infrastructure and a backup system for records. The project is happening in collaboration with 2 other agencies. Access to the system is given to direct service personnel individually, and having other agencies join represents a better deal for each license needed. The infrastructure piece of the project has started with the initial \$ expenditure. We are seeking a cloud-based service for the system, and this will secure all information and</p>		
----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>protect against server malfunctions. This project is a heavy lift for all agencies, and has high associated costs. LCMHS represents 21% of the cost of the estimated project that will likely total around \$3M.</p> <p>We are revisiting the position of our IT Director, his availability to LCMHS, and our IT resources needs in general. We could possibly change the contract with WCMHS on how we are using our IT resources' hours.</p> <p>Ms. Carlson: what is the projected life of the new system?</p> <p>Ms. Copans: The life of the hardware upgrade will be between 5-8 years.</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: Our current Electronic Medical Records (EMR) system has been purchased by Netsmart, and this company has no plans to update or improve the current system.</p> <p>We are also working towards the standardization of documents across the DAs.</p> <p>Mr. Williams: What is the estimated cost of the Unified EMR project?</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: \$13M, with LCMHS share likely being just under \$1M. The amount will shift depending on the number of agencies who join and the number of total licenses needed. The greater the</p>		
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>number of partners, the lower the cost will be to us.</p> <p>Ms. Carlson: Did we research other vendors?</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: there was a Request For Information (RFI) sent out to 6 vendors, who then presented to a team of representatives from the DAs.</p> <p>This kind of major software investment will happen once, and only the hardware will need regular upgrades. The operational costs are ongoing for technology, and we already have high costs.</p> <p>A new system will help staff on efficiencies with time, mileage and reporting. The current record system does not allow us to get data out of the system to appropriately do the reporting required by the Department of Mental Health (DMH) or any federal grants.</p> <p>Ms. Carlson: Why are only 3 DAs involved ?</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: It has been a very difficult discussion among many different interests on how they want the system to work. Cost is a major factor. So when it's time to take action many retreat.</p> <p>With the standardization that is already ongoing, the first step is being taken, an action step. There are risks, but we need a system that reports well in order to operate well.</p>		
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>Mr. Williams: Agree with the need to update the system and hardware but is concerned with going from a strong balance sheet position to spending cash on the project and putting the agency at risk.</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: We are exploring every option to make sure we can serve our consumers well, and looking at where we can improve our fund balance to do the work at the agency. We are asking legislators for money for infrastructure and staff.</p> <p>Ms. Carlson: Would like to see any future disbursements previously approved by the boards from both LCMHS and WCMHS.</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: Will confirm with WCMHS, but believe that the board does not approve any operational expenses, and have given their approval to the UEMR project in general.</p> <p>Mr. Williams: Would like a tangible understanding of the software investment.</p> <p>Mr. Ober: Agreed. Would like to know where the money is coming from. Would like to know if there is any update on the issue of the case rate.</p> <p>Mr. Houle: That is the payment reform that is currently being discussed by the state.</p>		
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

4. Strategic Plan	<p>Mr. Williams: Asked members to visit the shared plan and GANTT chart individually, and with each committees. It's a good summary of our accomplishments during the board retreat.</p> <p>The goal of each committee is to identify and prioritize items to be done. Focus on short term items and report back to the board.</p> <p>Mr. Williams plans on joining committee meetings in the near future to review goals.</p>	Review plan and GANTT chart with committee and bring priority list to next meeting.	All board committees
5. Board committees	<p>Mr. Williams: Asked members to review committee reports and if there were any question.</p> <p>No questions.</p>		
6. Standing committees reports	<p>Mr. Williams: Asked members to review standing committee reports and if there were any questions.</p> <p>No questions.</p>		
7. Board Education – List and tours	<p>Mr. Williams: Asked members to look at future presentation list, compare to each committee individual goal, and how they fit on our accomplishments.</p> <p>Then prioritize the list and share at the next meeting.</p> <p>Suggested tours at the end of each meeting and visit other facilities (15-30 minutes). Each visit should include a basic PowerPoint presentation with an overview of what they do in each location for those who can't be there in person.</p> <p>Next meeting the board will go to Copley House.</p>	<p>Review presentation list with committee and bring priority list to next meeting.</p> <p>Copley House to prepare a basic PPT presentation for board.</p>	<p>All board members and board committees</p> <p>Ms. Swenson will work with Copley House manager.</p>

8. Annual Meeting Date	Mr. Williams: Need a date in October for the 2018 annual meeting.	Ms. Swenson will create a scheduling poll for board members.	
9. New Business	<p>Ms. Menard: Question: Is there is any update on the 3rd bed at the Oasis House?</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: The operational dollars are the biggest issue. DMH has not committed to pay to operate the 3rd bed and we can't move forward without it.</p>		
10. Tiny House	<p>Ms. Van Sluytman: We've received \$10K for a feasibility study done by the Lamoille Housing Partnership. The proposal they sent back was for \$730K to build the units.</p> <p>Ms. Carlson: Do the homes need any specific licensing?</p> <p>Ms. Van Sluytman: There is no need for licensing. They are regular homes but LCMHS will offer services to the individuals in those homes.</p>		
11. Adjourn	<p>Mr. Ober moved the motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Carlson seconded the motion. All approved.</p> <p>Closed executive Session</p>		