



IBHC Meeting Minutes

September 13, 2024
9 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Location: Idaho Supreme Court, Lincoln Room (basement level)

Meeting Recording: <https://www.youtube.com/live/jpcnqyyQG3Y>

Members in Attendance: Sara Omundson, Jared Larsen, Judge Gene Petty, Rep. Chenele Dixon, Ashley Dowell, Sen. Ali Rabe, IDJC delegate – James Phillips, SDE delegate – Carl Crabtree, IDOC delegate – Bree Derrick, Sen. Doug Ricks, Brent Mendenhall,

Members Absent: Kate Dolan, Rep. Brooke Green

Staff: Adrian Castaneda (Spark), Ross Edmunds (DHW), Cheryl Foster (IBHC), Shannon McGuire (Spark), Scott Ronan (AOC), Liza Houser (DHW)

AGENDA

Actions taken in red

Welcome

Co-Chair Jared Larsen welcomed members and brought the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Review of IBHC Vision and Guiding Principles

Co-Chair Larsen read the IBHC guiding principles and Co-Chair Omundson read the IBHC vision statement.

Strategic Planning Methodology

Shannon McGuire from Spark went through the IBHC norming slides on the Council's vision and definition of the behavioral health system. She explained the accountability structure that built on subject matter workgroups and fed into the IBHC Advisory Board, which guided by the Ops Team, developed the recommendations to be reviewed by the Council.

She next described the methodology used for strategic planning with the human-centered systems framework that looked at people, organizations, and the broader community. During the July planning summit, the workgroups were tasked with persona mapping, revision of definitions and goals, persona journey, SWOTT overview, prior action item review, and developing workgroup action items. Approximately 60 people comprised the six workgroups: Criminal

Justice, Children & Youth, Commitments, Housing, Promotion, Prevention & Early Intervention, and Treatment & Recovery including Clinical Care.

Review of Draft Recommendations

Discussion of Public Comment

Prior to reviewing the recommendations, Co-Chair Larsen spoke about the public comment events. He asked Judge Petty who attended all four events to share his impressions. Judge Petty said they heard about first responder mental health and the impacts on their families. In Idaho Falls, they heard about the need for care for seniors and focus on the aging population. Co-Chair Omundson said that they had an important conversation at the Kootenai County public comment event about the Regional Behavioral Health Boards. She has a desire for the Council to interact with them and support that infrastructure around the state.

Other topics mentioned from the public comment forums include SIM follow-up, workforce, and the need for additional funding to support a mental health program for first responders.

Role of the Council and Behavioral Health System Framework

Ms. McGuire went through the role of the Council as described in the Executive Order. She explained how they would be able to accomplish all of the objectives through the strategic planning process: The strategic action plan will include a plan to inventory current expenditures, utilization and accessibility. They had the Advisory Board and workgroups review the previous recommendations. The Council will make recommendations that materially improve the behavioral health system. The public comment and workgroup engagement processes obtained broad stakeholder input and best practices. And finally, implementation would take place after the adoption of the plan in October.

Next, she explained the recommendation process, beginning with the workgroups developing over 200 action items, condensed to 51 recommendations for the Advisory Board, and then condensed further to 33 draft recommendations to review today. While drafting the recommendations, many crossed over the hard lines segmenting the protractor. She shared two new models of the behavioral health framework protractor that blurred the lines between the areas. The Council preferred the second model, which is a circle showing a cycle between prevention and recovery with promotion as the base. The center of the circle shows public agencies and community partners encircling the infrastructure gears.

Review of Draft Recommendations and Action Items

Ms. McGuire reviewed the recommendations in each segment of the behavioral health system, noting that the definitions of the segments had been updated. Recommendations in red font with an asterisk were prioritized by the workgroups submitting the recommendation.

The Infrastructure segment contained five recommendations. Ms. Foster noted that CCBHCs were included in Infrastructure Recommendation #3 – Infrastructure Evaluation. Co-Chair Omundson asked Director Dowell about Infrastructure Recommendation #2 – Data and Analysis, whether the governance structure and methods for data sharing had already been accomplished

through Insight Idaho. Director Dowell said that they had had multiple discussions about using Insight Idaho for both the Behavioral Health Council and Criminal Justice needs, but they have not had discussions about the governance and whether it needs to change.

The Promotion segment held three recommendations. The definition of Promotion had been changed by removing the specific reference to social determinants of health and replacing it with the definition of the social determinants of health. **For Promotion Recommendation #2 – Reduce Stigma, Mr. Crabtree noted that ranchers are different from farmers and should be called out separately in action item f for specific populations. Co-Chair Larsen also suggested adding first responders to this action item.**

The Prevention segment also included three recommendations, and the Advisory Board had made considerable changes to the Prevention definition. Judge Petty made a motion to **merge Prevention Recommendations #1 – Primary Prevention Programs and #3 – Protective Factors**, as the implementation teams would contain the same people and their objectives would overlap. Director Dowell seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

After reviewing the ten Engagement recommendations, Co-Chair Larsen relayed that during the creation of the Behavioral Health Council, over a dozen individuals wanted various interests represented on the Council. However, they were very intentional with the Council membership to ensure that members understood how the Legislature and state agencies work to accomplish things. The list of Engagement items shows the need to determine what is possible and what they can prioritize. Mr. Jeppesen suggested that first responders be added specifically to #9 – Help the Helpers. Judge Petty suggested behavioral health professionals are also caregivers and motioned to move them from #9 to #10 – Care for the Caregivers, as those are a different population and implementation team. Co-Chair Omundson seconded with a caveat that first responders also be separated from other health care providers – at least in approach or implementation team. Commissioner Mendenhall noticed that #9 was professional and #10 was personal and wondered if there was a difference, if the line becomes blurred. Ms. McGuire said that was the intention of the Advisory Board, that #9 focuses on occupational secondary trauma and the impacts on the family members. Ms. Foster added that the recommendation was originally for first responders, but the Advisory Board recognized the impacts on many other professions and individuals. It would be possible to create an additional recommendation or implementation team to divide among the different types of occupations. Director Dowell wanted to verify that #9 was to be split into two workgroups, and also add resources for caregivers in recommendation #10. Co-Chair Larsen asked for clarification on the motion. Co-Chair Omundson withdrew her second and offered a substitute motion. She moved to break **recommendation #9 into two, both as Help the Helpers, but the first for first responders or criminal justice-involved employment and their families (A) and the second for health care delivery services, mental and behavioral health professions, and their families (B).** Judge Petty seconded the motion. James Phillips suggested an amendment to change the **“criminal justice system” to “justice system,”** to ensure that both juveniles and adults are included, as well as defense attorneys, court clerks, and the family court side. Rep. Dixon seconded the amendment. The motion passed.

Co-Chair Larsen requested to **add foster families specifically to recommendation #10 on Care for the Caregivers**, and Director Dowell requested **“ancillary resources”** be added to allow parents, caregivers, and foster families to engage in that support.

After reviewing the nine Treatment recommendations, Bree Derrick said they have had conversations about enhancing treatment options, particularly **piloting a more intensive behavioral health program. It could potentially be an action item under #4 Criminal Justice – Treatment. She will follow up with language.**

Mr. Jeppesen wanted to discuss the scope of Treatment #9 – Older Adults. He noted that the Council’s original scope statement did not include many of the issues that fall under this recommendation such as dementia, Alzheimer’s, and other end-of-life type issues. Although they are important issues, they were previously considered out-of-scope. Co-Chair Omundson, Co-Chair Larsen, and Judge Petty discussed the issues surrounding the recommendation such as co-mingled legislative interests and the complex circumstances of older adults with co-occurring behavioral health and dementia-related conditions. They determined to have the recommendation focus on the behavioral health needs of the population with ADRD – Alzheimer’s Disease and Related Dementia. Co-Chair Omundson moved to **amend Treatment #9 to Older Adults – Develop level of care across the lifespan for those with co-occurring behavioral health and Alzheimer’s Disease, Dementia, and Related Disorders (ADRD)**. Judge Petty seconded. The motion passed.

Director Dowell mentioned that older adults in the criminal justice system is increasingly an issue – both in front of the court and those on supervision. Some cannot be kept in the community and are going back to the Department of Correction. Some need a type of guardianship but are not able to obtain it. Judge Petty suggested it be added as an action item under Treatment #4 Criminal Justice – Treatment. Co-Chair Omundson wondered if this would be considered scope creep and suggested the Criminal Justice Commission as a better fit. Co-Chair Larsen said that the new DMI facility is intended to have elder care beds that may address some of the need. Director Dowell feels strongly that there should be a diversion component to this population. **Ms. Derrick suggested capturing it as an action item under #4, as this population is generally co-occurring.**

Mr. Phillips offered a change for **Treatment #2 recommendation to include “justice-involved youth”** after **“enhanced services for transition age youth.”**

Director Dowell requested to add the Department of Juvenile Corrections or Juvenile Correction Centers whenever there are mentions of prisons and jails, particularly in action items under Treatment recommendations #3 – Criminal Justice Continuity of Care and #4 – Criminal Justice Treatment. Co-Chair Omundson requested that Ms. McGuire incorporate those changes into the report and share a copy with Director Dowell in advance.

After reviewing the three Recovery recommendations, Ms. Derrick commented that **Recovery #3 – Re-entry Services overlapped with Treatment #3 and Treatment #4** as part of the continuum of treatment within the criminal justice system. Judge Petty suggested **combining the action items from the three recommendations into a single recommendation under Treatment #3.** Director

Dowell seconded the motion. The motion passed. Director Dowell requested the action item also examine **non-incarceration options for probation violations**, as well as the parole violations as currently stated in the action item. She also requested the same language **for juvenile justice-involved youth be added in the reentry services section**. Co-Chair Omundson requested that **Ms. Derrick also have an advance look at the report to make sure that any additions of probation are included appropriately**. Director Dowell requested a red-line version of the updates.

Guiding Principles

After completing the review of the recommendations, Ms. McGuire asked the Council if they would like to discuss changes to the Council's guiding principles. Co-Chair Omundson wondered if the "cross-system collaboration" is sufficient to recognize our community partners rather than just the government organizations. Co-Chair Larsen suggested "**multi-system collaboration**."

Commissioner Mendenhall asked the Co-Chairs if the Council needed to make a formal acknowledgment of acceptance of the new category definitions. Co-Chair Larsen said they are treating this as a working document and will finalize everything when they adopt the final report.

Liza Houser asked the co-chairs whether they needed a specific definition for the scope to delineate where the Council's oversight ends and starts. Co-Chair Omundson said that the initial report had, and the **new report needs as well, a specific section that provides clarity of scope**. The end of the report had items that came up during the planning process that are important but not part of the scope. She reminded the members that they adopt the recommendations, but not the action items. The implementation teams will have flexibility to determine what is possible underneath the high-level recommendation. **The report should include a clear definition of behavioral health**.

Break

The Council took a 15-minute break.

Introductions

Co-Chair Larsen introduced Carl Crabtree representing Debbie Critchfield from the State Superintendent's office, and James Phillips representing IDJC while Director Dowell serves in two roles on the Council.

Approve Minutes

Co-Chair Larsen requested approval of the minutes for June 14, July 19, and August 16. Director Dowell noted that she could not fill both roles on the June 14 minutes, though afterward, she had a proxy for IDJC. Also, **Jason Stone was present for IDJC on July 19. She will represent the Commission for Pardons and Parole in the June minutes**. Mr. Jeppesen motioned to accept the amended minutes. Director Dowell seconded the motion. The motion passed to approve the minutes.

Prioritization Activity

Ms. McGuire said that the members will vote on their top priorities but wanted to confirm the number of votes as they were originally advised three votes in the email. **Mr. Jeppesen motioned for five votes**, seconded by Judge Petty. The motion for five votes passed.

Ms. McGuire said that the Advisory Board rated the recommendations based on their sense of effort and impact, and she provided copies of their ratings to the members. She also encouraged them to view the workgroup personas and definitions posted on the back wall. They will receive five dots, which they can place next to priority recommendations listed on the wall. After all the dots are placed, they will tally the results.

After the votes were tallied, the list of recommendations with the number of votes was displayed on the screen. The Council went at ease to correct the numbering and add the titles.

<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>Votes</u>
Prevention #1 – Primary Prevention Programs	8
Treatment #5 – Competency Restoration	7
Treatment #1 – Crisis Centers	6
Engagement #9A – Help the Helpers – First Responders	6
Infrastructure #1 – Workforce	6
Treatment #3 – Criminal Justice Continuity of Care	5
Recovery #1 – Supportive Housing	4
Treatment #4 – Treatment Courts	3
Prevention #2 – Foster Care	3
Engagement #4 – Diversion Systems	3
Engagement #5 – Youth Assessment Centers	2
Engagement #6 – Warm Handoffs	2
Promotion #2 – Reduce Stigma	1
Treatment #2 – Youth Treatment	1
Infrastructure #2 – Data and Analysis	1
Promotion #1 – Program Awareness	1
Engagement #1 – Crisis Response System	1
Treatment #7- Treatment Services	1
Engagement #10 – Care for Caregivers	1
Engagement #8 – Peer Support Specialists	1
Promotion #3 – Well-being Plan	1
Recovery #2 – Recovery Services	
Treatment #8 – Older Adults	
Treatment #6 – Civil Commitments	
Engagement #3 – Protective Holds	
Engagement #2 – Schol Behavioral Health Resources	
Engagement #9B – Help the Helpers – Mental Health	
Infrastructure #5 – SIM	
Engagement #7 – Personal Health Risk Reduction	
Infrastructure #4 – Care Coordination	
Infrastructure #3 – Infrastructure Evaluation	

After reviewing the votes, Co-Chair Larsen determined that a natural break of three votes encompassed the top ten priority recommendations. However, he noted that they had no recommendations from Promotion. He said that while at ease, he discussed with Co-Chair Omundson the possibility of adding a recommendation from Promotion and asked the members for their input.

Mr. Jeppesen noted that number 10 is in the right range, as a manageable number of priorities. Co-Chair Omundson advocated for Promotion, noting they should include all parts of the system. She also noted that stigma (Promotion #2) was a big part of the struggle for the first responders and is a critical component of most, if not all, of the items. She moved to add Promotion #2 to the list of priorities. Carl Crabtree seconded the motion. Judge Petty moved to combine Promotion #1 – Program Awareness with Promotion #2 – Reduce Stigma and adopt it as the 11th priority recommendation. Mr. Jeppesen seconded. Director Dowell thought that Promotion #1 and Promotion #3 (Well-being Plan) appeared to be very regional implementation and wondered if working about working with the regional boards on them. Co-Chair Omundson noted that it could be added as an action item. She also suggested that the Council itself take on the sponsorship and implementation instead of forming an implementation team.

Co-Chair Larsen restated the motion as **adopting recommendations ranked 1 through 10 and combining Promotion #1 and Promotion #2 as recommendation 11 as the recommendations of the Council.** The motion passed unanimously.

The Co-Chairs discussed the implementation of the new number 11. **Co-Chair Omundson said that as action items they would be meeting with the local boards.**

Ms. McGuire said that the next steps would be for the Operations Team to take these and incorporate them into the Strategic Action Plan, which will be presented to the Council for approval on October 18 for implementation in November. That document will highlight the process and all the recommendations and action items. Co-Chair Omundson said that the plan will need to include **the sponsors for the recommendations, so the October meeting will be when they are “voluntold.”**

Adjourn

Co-Chair Larsen said that he was pleased to be involved at this level and hoped they could live up to the level of the previous Council’s accomplishments. Co-Chair Omundson thanked everyone who participated in the process for giving up their time, such as those who provided public comment, as well as the workgroups, the Advisory Board, the Ops Team, and Shannon’s organization.

Co-Chair Larsen wanted to emphasize that those items that received two votes or fewer are definitely important, but they had to make decisions on what they could commit to doing. Those items will still be identified in the report as having merit and will be available for other entities such as advocacy groups, state agencies, legislators, or other community partners to consider. They invite anyone to become involved in any of the items, both prioritized and not.

Co-Chair Larsen adjourned the meeting at 11:52 a.m.