

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH TRUST AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

October 26, 2017

9:00 a.m.

Taken at:

Alaska Mental Health Authority
3745 Community Park Loop, Suite 110
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

OFFICIAL MINUTES

Trustees present:

Chris Cooke, Chair
Mary Jane Michael
Carlton Smith
Laraine Derr
Jerome Selby
Paula Easley
Greg Jones

Trust staff present:

Steve Williams
Andy Stemp
Miri Smith-Coolidge
Heidi Wailand
Mike Baldwin
Katie Baldwin-Johnson
Carley Lawrence
Valette Keller
Jimael Johnson

Trust Land Office staff present:

Wyn Menefee
Karsten Eden
Paul Slenkamp
Aaron O'Quinn
Sarah Morrison

Also participating:

Brad Myrstol, Ph.D.; Araceli Valle, Ph.D.

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR COOKE calls the Planning Committee meeting to order and states that all trustees are present. He asks for any announcements.

TRUSTEE MICHAEL asks Mr. Williams to introduce the new staff.

MR. WILLIAMS states that Andy Stemp, the new CFO, started on September 8. He has a strong connection to beneficiaries going back to the days when John Malone and Andy's paths crossed.

MR. STEMPE states that it was an eye-opening experience for him in Bethel to see the impacts that the community and people have. He did not realize how many lives and families are impacted by the work of the Trust and by the services that people are able to access. He adds that it is a real privilege to be here.

MR. WILLIAMS continues that there are two new program officers; Jimael Johnson is from the Department of Health & Social Services and the Division of Public Health; and Kelda Barstad from Senior & Disability Services.

MS. JOHNSON states that she has a background in working in Disability Services in Anchorage and FOCUS. She continues that, over the years, she has seen the great things that the Trust does both on the individual and systems level. She adds that she will be working on the beneficiary employment and engagement priority, as well as looking at systems of care for children.

MR. WILLIAMS adds that the other staff update is that Mike Abbott is starting on Wednesday, November 1st.

TRUSTEE MICHAEL welcomes Greg Jones, the new trustee.

CHAIR COOKE asks for any other announcements, introductions, comments. He moves to the agenda and asks for any additions.

TRUSTEE SELBY makes a motion to approve the agenda.

TRUSTEE DERR seconds.

There being no objection, the motion is approved.

CHAIR COOKE moves to the minutes from August 2, 2017.

TRUSTEE SELBY makes a motion to approve the minutes of the August 2, 2017 meeting.

TRUSTEE DERR seconds.

There being no objection, the motion is approved.

CEO UPDATE

MR. WILLIAMS states that the trustee nomination panel met and reviewed over 20 applications for the two seats that will be vacated in March. Trustee Easley is terming out, and Trustee Jones' interim status will be covered. The panel was Trustee Easley representing the board; Bob Coghill, Advisory Board of Alcohol and Drug Abuse; Charlene Tautfest, the Mental Health Board; Maggie Winston, the Governor's Council on Special Education and Disabilities; Banarsi Lal, Commission on Aging; and Andy Jimmy, Alaska Native Health Board. Those nominations are going to be submitted to the Governor's office, and we will wait to hear back. He continues that the financial audit is getting ready to wrap up, and we are still working with BDO to get them the information required. He adds that we are also working on responding to questions and requests for information from the legislative auditors. He states that there is a meeting with Legislative Budget and Audit. There is a topic on the agenda regarding the legislative audit which is a request of the committee to get an increased expenditure authority to make sure they get responses to a contract that is being put out for procurement. Regarding the FY19 budget, staff met with the folks from OMB and walked through the FY19 budget recommendation that were approved in September. It was a very productive meeting. He continues that he and Ms. Baldwin-Johnson attended an Alaska Health Care Forum. He asks Ms. Baldwin-Johnson to continue.

MS. BALDWIN-JOHNSON states that 60 people attended, and the purpose was to have a facilitated conversation about healthcare in Alaska specifically and whether those minds could start putting together a vision for where Alaska needs to go with healthcare. Discussed was where healthcare was going and how to get there, and what the issues are. The vision is somewhere along the lines of access to affordable whole healthcare for all; kind of a grand vision statement. She continues that the forum was with the Trust, Rasmuson, Mat-Su Health Foundation, AARP, the Primary Care Association, the University, who all look at healthcare. They were also historically engaged in SB 74 and the elements of that legislation. She adds that there will be more on this as this effort is digested and synthesized as to who will be involved, the strategies and the budget. All of those details will be forthcoming.

CHAIR COOKE asks for any questions. There being none, he moves on.

MR. WILLIAMS wants to provide an update which will be a good segue for Brad Myrstol and Araceli Valle, who are here to do a presentation on the work they have been engaged in regarding Results First. He states that the Legislature is in a special session and one of the items is Senate Bill 54, which was passed out of the Senate during regular session and is now sitting on the House side for review and, hopefully, adoption. In Anchorage there have been several town hall meetings that were held prior to special session, and now there are several committee meetings going on related to this. He states that crime rates have been going up steadily prior to SB 91, and the victimization is becoming personal, and an emotional issue. People who are victimized should not be victimized. He continues that there is a disconnect between what the data is showing and what the people perceive is happening. They are trying to make a connection between the two. He adds that some of the work was being used to help lay the foundation for criminal justice reform which is being used to educate the public around what is

going on and the changes since the passage of SB 91. This has been done by the Alaska Justice Information Center. Brad Myrstol is the acting director of the Justice Center and the director of the Alaska Justice Information Center. He is also the director of the Justice Statistical Analytical Center. The Trust is partnering with the University in funding. Araceli Valle is a research professional within the Justice Information Center who has been doing a lot of work related to the Results First Initiative.

CHAIR COOKE states that before going further, he asks about the CEO update on the Legislative audit. First, there was a significant change with the auditors about their request for documents related to the Trust's legal position or legal basis for some of the actions taken. There were communications back and forth with Mr. Jones, the Trust attorney, and the legislative auditors.

MR. WILLIAMS replies that the request for information was responded to by the legal counsel, and a letter was sent to the auditors signed by Trustee Michael. He states that, since then, no requests or correspondence from the auditors on that particular issue have been received.

MR. JONES stated that the letter went out at the end of August.

CHAIR COOKE asks about the overall timeline for the audit.

MR. WILLIAMS replies that the projected timeline was in an update to the trustees, and he understands that the auditors are looking at getting their report to the trustees in January or February.

CHAIR COOKE asks if there is anything further on the audit.

TRUSTEE JONES states that early in the audit the auditors assured that if there were any issues that they felt were material, a letter would be immediately issued and they would not wait until the final report. He asks if any other letters indicating any kind of material issues were received.

MR. WILLIAMS replies no.

CHAIR COOKE moves into the Criminal Justice Reform update and asks about the Senate Bill 91, whether that should be discussed beforehand or whether is it all intertwined.

MR. WILLIAMS states that it is all intertwined, and it was put in the packet as informational background. The two-page overview that was put together by the Judicial Council and the folks from the Justice Information Center, and is an educational tool about SB 91.

CHAIR COOKE moves back to the agenda and recognizes Dr. Myrstol.

DR. MYRSTOL states that he is the director of the Alaska Justice Information Center and also the director of the Justice Center. He thanks the trustees for the opportunity to present some work which is a culmination of two years of full-time effort on the part of the Justice Information Center to provide the state with critical information on the return on investment for adult

criminal justice programs. The Justice Information Center is supported with funding from the Trust as well as a legislative appropriation going back to 2015. The mission of the Justice Information Center is to compile, analyze, and report on criminal justice topics to policymakers and practitioners in order to improve public safety, to increase criminal justice system capability, and to reduce recidivism. He continues that these objectives will be achieved specifically with respect to improving public safety by promoting evidence-based best practices and providing data to inform administrative and funding decisions. AJIC facilitates criminal justice system accountability by developing, producing, and tracking criminal justice agency performance measures, and AJIC assists with recidivism reduction by providing criminal justice policymakers and practitioners with data and analyses that can be used to assess the effectiveness, the costs, and the benefits of existing programs and practices. He explains Results First as implemented in the State of Alaska led by AJIC. The Pew-MacArthur Results First provides expertise and technical assistance to jurisdictions across the country that want to engage in this work and seek out their assistance. The State of Alaska sought out this partnership and its technical assistance and expertise prior to 2015. He continues that all three branches of Alaska's State government committed to the project. Letters endorsing the initiative were supported by the Governor, the Legislature, and the Court System. Then Alaska became the 19th jurisdiction in the United States to partner with Pew-MacArthur to engage in this work. He adds that Results First became AJIC's first major project. The Results First process consists of three steps: One, conducting a program inventory; second, matching programs identified in and to existing research evidence base; and, three, using the Pew-MacArthur benefit/cost model to estimate benefit/cost ratios for the program in Alaska's adult criminal justice portfolio. He states that there is much more complexity than these three steps, and he delves into each one with more detail. With the program inventory, they were able to identify 54 adult criminal justice programs and then categorized them into eight groups. Of those 54 programs, 36 were identified as being funded wholly or in part by the State of Alaska at an estimated cost of \$25.5 million annually. Eight programs were identified as existing and operating, but not funded by the State. They were volunteer programs or self-pay programs. He moves to the second step and states that they engaged in this program-matching process to compare Alaska's programs to an evidence base that exists out in the literature. He continues that there are three main criteria for executing the matching exercise: first is to match on program features; second is the locus of treatments; and does it target the same population as what the evidence base suggests. Of those 32 programs, 26 were funded wholly or in part by the State of Alaska, totaling \$23 million. It was a long and arduous process of data compilation, correction, analysis.

MR. WILLIAMS asks to walk through the challenges of collecting the data, where it came from, and what it took to pull the data together in such a way to do the analysis required to look at these programs.

DR. MYRSTOL replies that, of the two years it took to complete this entire project, two-thirds to three-quarters of it was this process. He states that the costs of operating programs beyond the high-level budget allocation needed to be identified. He continues describing the process in greater detail. He highlights one of the big steps and advancements this project was able to make is that an average cost includes fixed costs. This was overcome because of the work Dr. Valle did due to persistence and creativity in problem-solving. He states that recidivism work was done that the State has never seen before. He adds that they computed recidivism rates

out to eight years for noncohorts across seven crime categories. They have a very robust understanding of recidivism matters over the long term which becomes important because the benefit/cost analyses are projecting anticipated benefits relative to costs out to eight years moving forward. He explains the process relating to this in more detail. He states that the purpose here is to provide information back to the State about its return on its investment. He explains the benefit/cost ratios and what they are. For the purposes of Results First, benefits consist of two quantities, both of which are future orienting: Avoided future criminal justice administration costs and avoided future victimization costs. He adds that the risk of oversimplification of the benefit/cost ratio can be larger or better by increasing benefits, decreasing costs, or doing some combination of both. He explains in greater detail.

TRUSTEE DERR asks how would you get a ratio of zero.

DR. MYRSTOL explains that if there are no benefits for the program, if recidivism was not reduced at all, it had no impact, there is no future savings because of it, then it would be zero. There are three big takeaways to consider: One, 90 percent of the State's investment in adult criminal justice is directed to programs that were matched to the evidence base; two, of the 19-adult criminal justice programs modeled, all but one produced positive returns; third, benefit/cost ratios are not fixed forever in all time and can change. He reiterates that at the program level, the issue is programmatic data and compilation. At the policy level, the State is here to develop a program and a culture of rigorous program evaluation and assessment and institutionalize for real a paradigm of continual process improvement. He states appreciation for the time and asks for any questions.

TRUSTEE EASLEY asks how to track from the data release of an incarceration to eight years.

DR. MYRSTOL replies that known is who came out of the Department of Corrections in 2007. The information came from the Alaska Department of Public Safety from the criminal history repository where all criminal history information is kept. He states that when someone is arrested, prosecuted, and convicted, there is the ability to identify when, for what, and what that disposition was every time for eight years.

TRUSTEE SELBY states that his question is due to the quality of the data input, which is what drives the reliability of the whole study. He asks about the effort to analyze the quality of the data that is being put in because that obviously drives the output in terms of reliability for the decisionmakers looking at the program. If some regression analysis and some data error probability analysis type of stuff is being done, that would allow a good confidence level in reliability.

DR. MYRSTOL replies that there is tremendous confidence in the quality of all the data. The primary verification process is a request for a particular program cost information from a particular provider or an agency who is responsible for a particular program. He states that professionally informed estimates in terms of the validation process were relied on. He continues that he is proud of the work done on this project because of the collaborative partnership with the agencies that are invested in getting the most accurate data.

DR. VALLE states that the level of detail received varied across the different programs. There was a lot of working together to come up with the best possible estimate given the information available for each of the programs. She continues that for each of the areas, they went back to the managers, the appropriate people and talked about the numbers, which gave a level of check, in addition to deriving an estimate as best as possible from the data.

DR. MYRSTOL states appreciation for the question, but one of the things that this very sophisticated tool did was enable the Monte Carlo Simulation. All of these estimates have been simulated 10,000 times. He explains that the Monte Carlo Simulation allows developing parameter estimates that consider unmeasured errors across various domains in the model.

TRUSTEE JONES states that he sees the benefits are primarily based on recidivism and asks if there is any evaluation that the distribution of spending is appropriate to community needs. Is there any part of this that links that to community needs.

DR. MYRSTOL replies that collecting and compiling information on the site level was done but not reported out as that. There is a sense of how funds are being distributed to different sites or communities. The other thing collected was capacity information on the programs and knowing where there were some programs that might have long waiting lists. The sex offender programs had the highest recidivism reduction rates. That gives the sense that not enough capacity is being provided, and it is a program that is quite effective.

TRUSTEE DERR goes back to the actual equation, which she understands, but asks how the avoided victimization costs were done.

DR. MYRSTOL replies that avoided victimization costs came from national research. There is a very substantial body of research on victimization costs. That was broken down into two forms: tangible and intangible costs. He explains in great detail.

CHAIR COOKE asks what programs fall within the category of psych ed.

DR. VALLE replies that the DOC substance abuse programs are tiered levels, depending on need, and the psych ed is that lowest level. It is people who just need the short-term six- to eight-week programs because of fairly straightforward substance abuse issues.

CHAIR COOKE asks if this is a snapshot of what is being done in terms of programs that are in place through DOC.

DR. VALLE replies that the programs taken are actually in place at DOC, and then the individual programs were matched to what the literature says. So, the psych ed program corresponds to a low-intensity inpatient program within the prison. Then, the expected recidivism reduction for that program is applied based on the literature.

CHAIR COOKE asks about the next step and what happens to the research now.

DR. MYRSTOL replies that the hope is that through public funds like this we will get that word out. The report was issued and the full executive summary plus all the appendices were sent to every legislator in the state of Alaska, as well as the commissioners of all the various departments across the state.

CHAIR COOKE asks the trustees for any other questions. There being none, he thanks Dr. Myrstol.

MR. BALDWIN states that a copy of the Alaska Justice Forum, the most recent issue that has some current information about crime rates, as well as a crisis intervention team program and some programs that the trustees have invested in over time, has been provided. It is also on the Trust Web site. In terms of the other items on the agenda, he proposes rolling them over to the November board meeting's Planning report.

CHAIR COOKE asks the committee what they prefer.

TRUSTEE MICHAEL supports moving it forward to the November meeting.

CHAIR COOKE asks for any other comments. He asks about a statement made in the two-page summary of Senate Bill 91. It states that 80 percent of the offenders were diagnosed with a substance-use disorder. The next sentence says: DOC provides substance abuse treatment for roughly half of all prisoners. In other words, 80 percent of the prisoners were diagnosed with substance-abuse disorders, and somewhere around half of that number are getting treatment, and the others are not. Here is a known problem and it is apparently not being reached, and they are not being provided with any treatment.

MR. WILLIAMS replies that there are a number of things to consider in looking at this. What is the current capacity of DOC, the way it is currently structured and funded, to provide access to individuals who are interested in pursuing substance-abuse treatment. He continues that DOC does not have the capacity to serve everyone who may be diagnosed with a substance-use disorder. The individual may not be interested in accessing that treatment.

CHAIR COOKE asks if that is a known fact, or does the treatment not exist.

MR. WILLIAMS replies that it is both. There are multiple factors here that are impacting access to treatment and people's actual engagement in it.

CHAIR COOKE asks what the criteria is for behavioral health seeing them.

MR. WILLIAMS replies that he does not know, and states that could be put on a future meeting agenda, a topic around correctional healthcare which would include access to substance abuse, mental health services, and other healthcare services.

CHAIR COOKE asks for a motion for adjournment.

TRUSTEE DERR makes a motion to adjourn the Planning Committee meeting.

TRUSTEE SELBY seconds.

There being no objection, the motion is approved.

(Planning Committee adjourned at 10:25 a.m.)