

CHILDREN'S SERVICES COUNCIL OF PALM BEACH COUNTY

February 28, 2019, 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

Present:

Thomas Bean

Tom Lynch

James Martz

Dennis Miles

Debra Robinson, M.D.

Jose Luis Rodriguez

Joined by phone: Melissa McKinlay

Excused: Donald E. Fennoy II, Ed.D.; Debra Robinson, M.D., Thomas P. Weber

A. Invocation – led by Vince Goodman

B. Pledge of Allegiance – led by Vice Chair Bean

C. Presentations

1. Presentation of Circles: Pathways to Prosperity – Kasha Owers, Director of Program Performance; Kemberly Bush, Executive Director, Pathways to Prosperity

Q: How many males have been through the program?

A: The Lord's Place re-entry program was an all-male program. In every class, we normally have between 2-3 males, approximately 25% overall. In the last couple of classes we have had couples coming together, as well.

Q: How many people will go through your Program this fiscal year?

A: 90.

It was stated that this is a match funded program. We started funding Circles in the 2013-14 fiscal year by providing them with \$61,000. In 2016-17 they indicated that they wanted to increase their footprint based upon demand. They went through a competitive bid process with the county and we ended up doubling the amount of funds we give them. They are now receiving \$122,000 a year from us to serve the 90 individuals per year.

Q: Is this program offered in other places outside Palm Beach County?

A: In Orlando.

Q: Who are some of your other funders, other than the CSC and the county?

A: Foundations, such as the Farris Foundation and a lot of the smaller family foundations, Palm Health has also provided funds.

Q: What would you say is the biggest driver for success of this program?

A: Many of the families that come in to the programs have not been connected to a group of individuals who are all travelling on the same road. You have to want this in order to be

able to succeed. The camaraderie and being able to have relationships with the allies are also important elements for the success of this program.

D. Election of Officers

A motion by Goodman/Lynch to keep the same officers was approved by unanimous vote.

Elected Officers

Chair – Tom Weber

Vice Chair – Thomas Bean

Secretary – Vince Goodman

2. Minutes

A. January 24, 2019 Council Workshop

A motion by Goodman/Rodriguez to approve the Minutes of the January 24, 2019 Council Workshop as presented was approved by unanimous vote.

B. January 24, 2019 Council Meeting

A motion by Goodman/Rodriguez to approve the Minutes of the January 24, 2019 Council meeting as presented was approved by unanimous vote.

3. Public Comment – Agenda Items – N/A

4. Council Committees:

- Finance Committee

Tom Lynch recommended the Council approve January 24th minutes and the December 31, 2018 and January 31, 2019 Financial Statements. The Finance Committee reviewed the Quarterly Investment Reports and stated that we did really well and we are receiving several hundred thousands of dollars of interest over the investments from last year. They also reviewed some of the budget assumptions for the next fiscal year and will be reviewing that again in the next meeting as they prepare to present to the Board for approval.

A motion by Goodman/Miles to approve the minutes from the January 24th Finance Committee meeting and the December 31st, 2018 and January 31st, 2019 Financial Statements was approved by unanimous vote.

- Personnel Committee

Thomas Bean thanked all Council members for providing feedback to the CEO's Annual Performance Evaluation. The Personnel Committee met this afternoon to review the CEO's

Annual Performance Evaluation. There was a document provided with the Personnel Committee's recommendations for the CEO's compensation package. During the Personnel Committee meeting there was a suggestion that the CEO's compensation recommendation be provided to the Council in advance of the Council meeting. The Personnel Committee will meet again in March to discuss this suggestion for further consideration. The Personnel Committee recommended approval from the Council of the CEO compensation package as outlined in the document provided.

A motion by Goodman/Martz to approve the Personnel Committee's recommendations for the CEO compensation package was approved. Jose Luis Rodriguez opposed this motion.

Jose Luis Rodriguez stated that Lisa is doing a great job. He hopes that she continues as the CEO. He is voting no on this motion based on the concerns that he expressed at the Personnel Committee meeting regarding the package.

Tom Lynch asked if there is anything that should be shared with the Board, since not every Board member was present at the Personnel Committee meeting. Rodriguez stated that he has some concerns in terms of some items of the package that he would not support but not anything to do with Lisa and her very good evaluation.

Judge Martz stated that attending the Governor's Executive Order 8118 and going through what the other circuits throughout the state have done, it was abundantly clear that we are a leader here in a lot of ways. He also stated that the success in PBC is attributed to the work that has been done by the Children's Services Council under Lisa's leadership. For a number of years we have done a better job than any other geographic area that was outlined under the Governor's Executive Order. It is worth saying that there is proof to support the compensation package presented today. We could not find somebody better to lead the Council and it should be recognized in different ways, such as a recognition by the Board and a recognition through a compensation package.

5. Consent Agenda

1. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions – N/A
2. Items to be Pulled for Discussion – Agenda item 5A(1) (Reference #3) and agenda item 5A(2) (Reference #4) were pulled for discussion purposes.
3. Adoption of the Consent Agenda and Walk-in Warrants List

A motion by Lynch/Rodriguez to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Agenda items 5A(1) (Reference #3), and approve the Walk-in Warrants list was approved by unanimous vote.

A. Program

1. Resolution #19-002 Authorizing Increased Allocation for FY 18/19 Dental Services
Tamara-Kay Tibby DMD, MPH, Dental Director for C. L. Brumback Primary Care Clinics,

Health Care District of Palm Beach County and Terry Megiveron, Director, FQHC Practice Operations joined this discussion

Q: Who is eligible for this program and what is the age limit?

A: The program currently serves any pregnant women within our nursing home visiting service programs.

Q: Do you have a specific age limit?

A: There is no specific limit. Some of our programs serve teenage pregnant women.

Q: It is stated that this Program serves women and families, not only pregnant women, can you please clarify?

A: We say women and families because when the mother is healthy she is more able to take good care of their children. We also serve women that are post-partum and that are uninsured through Project DULCE program.

Q: If you took the 95 into the amount of money you have spent so far \$15,700, that is 165 dollars per person, is that what the average cost is?

A: We get \$180 reimbursed per visit for each client and they provide full dental services, from cleaning, exams, X-Rays, fillings and extractions. These services would not typically be provided to these clients because they don't have insurance.

Q: So \$165 in the \$82,000 would come up to 496 people?

A: We did 95 visits but 85 of those were covered with the grant. The other women had coverage, so 10 had Medicaid or other insurance that covered. Of those clients, 85 were uninsured and the grant covered the expenses.

Q: How far after giving birth are women covered for dental services with your program?

A: Some of them will go until the baby is 2 years old and some go until the baby is six months.

Q: How do these women know where to go to receive treatments?

A: Each program has nurse case managers that refer the clients to these services. Healthy Beginnings, Nurse Family Partnership, the WHIN Program and Project DULCE.

Q: How many people have been served to date?

A: In 2015-16 CSC funded approximately \$60,000 a year and they never spent all of it. Last year, they took on Project DULCE and we are now receiving many clients and are using all of the money dedicated.

Q: Where would the money that is requested today go? If we grant \$50,000, how would you use it?

A: Clients will be able to continue with the services. These women have dental issues and have no place to go. In emergency cases, they would go to the ER, but they don't have insurance and we know that dental services can impact the health of the fetus, so it helps to prevent poor birth outcomes.

Q: We recently heard about the Health Care District and their approach to health care, wanting to attend all of the client's needs whether it be mental health, fiscal health or prenatal. Are dental services not available through any Health Care District locations? Does the Health Care District also offers these services?

A: Clients would have to pay out of pocket.

Q: We recently heard from the Health Care District that that is not the case.

A: If they don't have insurance, they would have to pay out of pocket. Through District Cares, dental services would not be covered.

Q: What portion is funded through the Health Care District and what is covered by CSC?

A: Per under the District Cares, the client would have to be referred by a general practitioner.

Q: How do clients get to the specialist if they don't have a general practitioner looking at them first?

A: They would go through the Primary Care office and the Primary Care office would refer the client. In order to get to a specialist through District Cares, you would have to be referred by a general practitioner.

Q: Does the Health Care District has nine locations?

A: Yes

Q: Would any of those locations allow for a pregnant or not-pregnant female to walk-in with a dental health issue and be served?

A: There is dental services in only four locations. Any of the four locations would accept women. This program serves uninsured pregnant women.

Q: Why is it CSC dollars and not dollars from the Health Care District?

A: The referral comes from the CSC and this program offers a partnership to care for these patients.

Q: Usually, if they don't have a primary dentist, that's when they get in trouble and need more specialized dental care. Do these people have a regular dentist?

A: No, they don't have any dental care. Most women would get gum disease and severe dental periodontal disease that can affect the health of the baby they are carrying.

Q: Regardless of whether a woman that needs dental care is referred to the Health Care District by us, or as a private citizen not associated with the CSC and walks in to the Health Care District, they get treated the same way, they are not denied care and the care gets paid by the Health Care District.

A: Depending on the income. Some services are uniquely offered to women that are on the grant and not to other patients. The Health Care District does not cover for additional services. Women in this program receive care coordination. By being part of our system, they are properly educated about the effects of gum disease and the need for dental care. If these services were not available, they would not receive this education.

Q: Is there a limit where you have a set amount in your budget to treat 100 women and when 101 walks in then she gets turned away because you don't have any more money in your budget or is any woman that walks-in gets treated?

A: The Health Care District doesn't have a cut-off.

Q: If there are women that may not know about the opportunities that are presented to them to get this treatment on prevention of care, they can still be advised by the CSC and referred to the HCD and the HCD would pay for it. Does it matter how they walk-in there, they will get treated? Should CSC be paying for enhanced dental treatment for CSC's clients or not? Why is CSC funding dental work for people that the HCD is going to treat? If we advise them as part of one of these four programs on the need to go get dental treatment and one of the four HCD locations, they will not be denied service. This Council needs to decide if we are going to fund up to \$50,000 worth of enhanced dental treatment for CSC clients.

A: Services provided through this program are enhanced services, such as the need for restorative services.

Q: If someone goes for treatment and they need not only preventive, but something beyond, like an extraction, does the Health Care District pay for the filling and extraction or do we pay for the whole visit? If the visit is \$500 and \$300 is crisis or urgent need and \$200 is preventive, then why don't we stretch the money more and we pay for the \$200 because they wouldn't be able to get those services anywhere and services that they can get through another funding source gets paid by that funding source.

A: Most of the visits are preventive visits. Only approximately 20% of the patients do restorative. We can clarify, as part of the contract, the specific dental services that will be covered under our contract. We will also go back and confirm what types of dental services are covered by the Health Care District and ensure that we are not paying for something that should be paid for by another government entity and that it will not compromise the access to dental care services to pregnant women. Part of the issue is that clients that are in our programs need immediate care, and that may not be the case for those that walk-in to a Health Care District clinic to receive services.

Q: How many pregnant women are in PBC in a year that are in an economic situation?

A: We have 15,000 births a year. Medicaid covers approximately 55%. We need to look at the uninsured population and emergency Medicaid. It could be up to approximately 2,000 women.

Q: This could be between 490-500 women, so what happens to the rest?

A: This a population that currently is receiving care coordinated services and we have the ability to make the connections. We know that there are barriers in the access of care. We do have the entry agencies that provide ongoing assessments and we want to make sure that clients are established with the right tools and that they are accessing the services they need. There is a responsibility within the prenatal care office to encourage pregnant women to go out and receive the services they need. Unfortunately, there is still a population that is probably missed.

A motion by Lynch/Rodriguez to approve up to \$25,000 and to revisit any additional funding need in a month was approved by unanimous vote.

It was stated that they are currently at full budget expenditure.

2. Council Workshop Follow-Up

High level walk-through of the items discussed at the Council Workshop:

Great Ideas Initiative:

- Eligibility and parameters - medical and housing expenses will be excluded from funding.
- Capital expenses would be limited to \$10,000 in total and the purchase of vehicles will be prohibited.
- We will retain the application requirement in regards to registration with the State to solicit funds.
- Community Involvement- We want to continue to look at involving local business leaders and partners in the process.
- Early release of application for 2019 will be released in May and moving forward after doing current research, we recommend leaving the timing as is.
- Two areas where we are continuing to explore:
 - a. Resident-led grant making – we will continue to look at that and will come to the Board with a recommendation in March.
 - b. Funding for sustainability and growth – the annual RFP process will continue to be for a one-year grant and we will continue to explore and research other areas that we can help with the capacity building and sustainability of smaller organizations so that we can move them into an area where they can apply in the future for funding from us. If there is a program that we believe, after implementation, is vital to our early system of care, we will come forward with a recommendation to you to continue funding forward.

Capital Expenditures

- We will be changing our current fiscal guidelines to eliminate funding of vehicles.
- As per your recommendation, we will consider funding capital associated with security, such as cameras and locking doors to ensure safety in our programs.

Playgrounds

- We shouldn't be involved in building playgrounds. We will consider if we want to offset costs associated with making a playground inclusive. If we get any of these requests, we will vet them and will bring to the Council with a recommendation.

Q: There is a playground item in the walk-in warrants today.

A: That is not building a playground, it's a community event.

Q: If we fund a playground, do we get to hold harmless from the group that is building it and do we approve that they will be maintaining it so that we don't get brought up in a suit?

A: Yes, we would. This would be not building the playground at all. For example, it would be to provide options for children with special needs to enjoy the playground.

Refrigeration

- While we have not received requests so far in terms of the Hunger Relief Plan, we will continue to gather information and if something comes forward we will bring to this Council for consideration.

B. Business

1. Warrants List – Approved by Consent

6. **Non Consent Agenda**

A. Business – N/A

B. For Informational Purposes Only – N/A

7. **Walk-In Items** – N/A

8. **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

- Lutheran Services Florida, Inc. update.
- Great Ideas Initiative
- Client Counts, FY 2017-2018
- 2019 Race to Equity Summit
- Legislative Update
- Communications Update
- Staff Accomplishments
- Reminders:
 - Broken Places on March 27 at 5:00 pm
 - Groundwater Analysis on April 4 at 1:00 pm
 - Birth to 22 Business Event on April 12 at 8:00 am

9. **Legal Reports**

When CSC releases an RFP or an invitation to bid, part of that package provides the proposers are prohibited from contacting any CSC personnel or Council members regarding the request with the sole exception of a single contact person, which is documented. This is the cone of silence and it is a typical characteristic of these processes and it helps ensure an open and fair competition. Our recommendation is if someone tries to contact you on a specific RFP, rather than engaging in a conversation, simply let them know that they have to talk only to the contact person listed in our website. At the top page, click on the dollar sign, which takes you to our RFP page and they can find any current RFPs, click on it and see who the contact person is. If a proposer violates any of this part, it will become ineligible to apply.

10. **Public Comment – Non-Agenda Items** – N/A

11. **Council Comments**


- Vince Goodman thanked CSC staff for all the work they do for the Council.

12. **Adjournment**

The meeting was recessed at 5:15 pm to hold a Prevention Partnerships for Children, Inc., meeting and reconvened at 5:18 pm. The meeting adjourned at 5:56 pm.



Vincent Goodman, Secretary



Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer

