



California Mental Health Services Authority

Options for Funding of Future Project Planning and Development

Generally all options shall be presented in proposal form describing in sufficient detail to the project (scope and budget estimate of each proposed), such that a member could submit to CAO, BOS, and/or other for appropriation or other approval.

RECOMMENDED OPTIONS	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
<p>1. Project participation and funding would be optional for each county member and project. If project is approved, the initial investment of planning and development would be partially returned for all participating members. This return would be derived by those new members joining and participating in the funding of planning and development. (This way each program participant has interest in equal shares)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members have the choice of participating and funding the investment of each project. Participating members would see a “hard” return on the investment of each approved project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Late joining counties would not have money at risk initially. Projects would be fragmented due to varied participants. Non-participants receive benefit of information without cost.
<p>2. Project funding would be based on the estimated cost of FTE(s) for research specialist or other skill sets to work on the project. The counties have an option to participate, and fund a project. FTE or a portion would be dedicated to planning and development with the cost of the FTE allocated to member counties—rather than having dues or funding a process, counties would be funding a position.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTE estimates of cost may assist with approval by BOS and perception of project funding. Costs are attached to a position and not a project per se. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be difficult to determine expertise needed especially if multiple projects are desired. May not be an acceptable approach to participating members. Non-participants receive benefit of information without cost.

NON-RECOMMENDED OPTIONS	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
<p>3. Establish an initial Planning and Development fund, requiring a one-time investment from counties to be replenished from implemented projects. Amount to start is recommended to be smaller than the \$300,000 in budget.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A great start reduced initial financial impact, and all members participating. • Could be a compliment to number 5 below. • Ability to quickly respond to opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding may not be enough, requiring multiple approvals at CalMHSA and at each county. • Reinvestment may be required at a future date. • Still need to address what it is titled and ability to be approved by BOS
<p>4. GHC will perform all planning and development for 2013-14 (including cost of proposal) at no cost. This does not include the State Hospital Bed project and any payments to other service providers. This in-kind contribution would be reimbursed if the project is approved. A cap on estimated reimbursed cost to be provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No up-front costs to county members. • Avoids debates of dues, charging all members or not, and investment cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members may not be interested in reimbursing if project approved. • The option going forward is unknown.
<p>5. The JPA could become more "skeletal" in the future (e.g., tapping existing county personnel, including county counsel). Rather than buying into an FTE or adding an FTE with contract administrator, CalMHSA member(s) would provide at cost or donation of existing county personnel. This option may be scaled such that member counties do only the planning and development or the actual project implementation or both.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option allows for great flexibility while reducing contract costs. • Broad base of resources to consider. • If the costs of the providing county are not required to be reimbursed it would be a savings. • Could establish member expertise in certain subject matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May delay response to opportunities. • Reliance on county members to provide resources. • Required reimbursements to counties could lead to greater costs. • Reliance on personnel who may leave the county and expertise goes away.
<p>6. This proposal would be funded by dues or other described source and all members would contribute.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to respond quickly to opportunities that arise, once funding in place. • Establishes unity amongst JPA members for the betterment of JPA purpose. • Straightforward and ease of calculation and possible return/carryover of funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception and inherent connotation of the word "dues," and thus all members cannot participate. • The JPA Agreement addresses the option of participating in projects and not planning and development, thus there is some confusion. • Board members may need Board of Supervisor approval for non-PEI projects.