Monday, April 8, 2013

President Hank Fitzer called meeting to order.

President Fitzer had some items to discuss before starting the meeting. He thanked Stan Mead for the arrangements with the hotel, Stan you did a great job of putting this together.

He thanked Deena Brown for handling the registration for this meeting.

He thanked Jerry Berry for putting the reports together, printing them and getting the reports to the meeting.

He thanked the corporate sponsors for supporting us in this effort.

He also mentioned that we have a phone for members to call in, and at least Scott Carson is planning on calling in. Therefore, please speak up if you are speaking from the room and if you do not feel that we will be able to hear you would you please deliver your reports from the microphone/podium.

President Hank Fitzer asked Secretary Clark of New Hampshire to call the roll of the voting members of the Board of Directors to establish the presence of a quorum.

In attendance were 14 voting members of the board including Hank Fitzer of Maryland (President), Deena Brown of Oklahoma proxy for Brenda Weisz of North Dakota (Vice President), Dague Clark of New Hampshire (Secretary), Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma (Treasurer), Karen Fricke of Arkansas (Historian), Dague Clark of New Hampshire proxy for James Giffin of Vermont (Region 1 Director), Harry Roberts of Delaware proxy for Brian Reynolds of Delaware (Region 2 Director), Karen Fricke of Arkansas as proxy for Conitha King of Alabama (Region 3 Director), Meka Gaines of Ohio (Region 4 Director), Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma proxy for Jason Sanchez of New Mexico (Region 5 Director), Region 6 Director (Vacant), Melissa Lange of Oklahoma proxy for Scott Carson of Arizona (Region 7 Director), Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska (Region 8 Director), Hank Fitzer of Maryland proxy for Gregg Holland of Maryland (At Large Director 1) and Stan Mead Past President from Louisiana proxy for Doug Robinson of West Virginia (At Large Director 2).

After the roll call of the members was taken, Secretary Clark confirmed that a quorum was present for the business meeting.
President Fitzer reminded attendees that only the voting members that were recognized during the roll call from member agencies can make motions or can second motions. Also, that in this meeting the Committee Chair can make a motion to accept their report, but only voting members can second the motion.

President Fitzer provided a copy of the agenda for the Spring Planning and Business Meeting to each attendee and he asked for acceptance of the agenda.

Harry Roberts of Delaware made the motion and Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma seconded the motion.

Discussion:
None

The motion passed; the agenda was accepted.

President Fitzer stated that there are bound copies of the reports and that most of the reports are in the bound booklet.

President Fitzer asked for the presentation of the Secretary’s Report.

Dague B. Clark of New Hampshire gave the following report:

**Secretary’s Report (Reading of the Minutes)**
April 2013

Mr. President, Executive Board and members of HSFo:

The minutes of the Fall Planning and Business meeting of the Association, held December 1-5, 2012 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana have been posted to the organization’s website. I move for suspension of the reading of the minutes and for the adoption of this report.

Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion: none

Vote:
Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.
President Fitzer asked for the presentation of the Historian’s Report.

Karen Fricke of Arkansas gave the following report:

**Historian’s Report**

Mr. President, HSFo Members:

The National Association of State Human Services Finance Officers (HSFo) held its 2012 Fall Planning and Business meeting Saturday, December 1st through Wednesday, December 5th in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, with President Hank Fitzer of Maryland presiding.

The planning/business meeting was self-hosted by HSFo Leadership Team members, under the coordination of Past President, Stan Mead of Louisiana, at the Embassy Suite Hotel Baton Rouge. The meeting was productive and enjoyed by all.

Attendance in Baton Rouge totaled 39. The breakdown of the 30 registrants included 4 Louisiana hospitality staff, 4 corporate sponsors and 22 participating in the daily meetings. Additionally, 9 guests were in attendance.

Since the Fall 2012 Planning/Business meeting, HSFo has hosted one training course, arranged by Mr. Rick Brennan, of West Virginia, Chair of the HSFo Training Committee:

Cost Allocation Advanced-training was hosted by Scott Carson in Phoenix, Arizona from March 18 to March 21, 2013. The training included 42 attendees, with representation from 6 different states. Public Consulting Group provided the training, which offered up to 16.5 hours of CPE. Feedback on the training has been excellent.

Mr. President, this concludes the Historian Report and I request this report be accepted.

Second: Dague Clark of New Hampshire.

Discussion: It was stated that the hotel was the Embassy Suite Hotel Baton Rouge. (The minutes reflect this correction).

Motion to accept the report as amended, Karen Fricke of Arkansas, seconded by Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma.

Vote:

Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted as amended.
Harry Roberts of Delaware gave the following report.

Development Coordinator Report
4/8/13

President Fitzer asked me to serve this year in the role of Development Coordinator for the purpose of being a resource to Regional Directors, forming, guiding, and monitoring their efforts in carrying out their responsibilities including enhanced outreach to their States. I would like to report on the anticipated activities for this business year.

Since the Baton Rouge Planning Meeting, a conference call was convened with the special committee formed to re-look at the role of the Regional Directors. The volunteers for that special committee are Mr. Doug Robinson of West Virginia, Mr. Jerry Berry of Arkansas, Ms. Melissa Lange of Oklahoma, Mr. Harry Roberts of Delaware, Ms. Mary Fernald of Ohio, and Mr. Stan Mead of Louisiana. Additionally, Mr. Richard Billera of New York participated on the call.

The results of committee’s discussions are as follows.

The committee felt there was still a need for a position that reaches out to States/Members in a regional manner. Yet the committee believed the role of the position should be more closely targeted. The following conceptual direction/outline is offered to the Board for their consideration.

**Name of the position:** Regional Coordinator.

**Number of Regional Coordinators:** 4.

**Geographic boundaries of a region:** TBD, but conceptually could be northeast, southeast, northwest, and southwest.

**Role of Regional Coordinator:**

- Spokesperson to the Executive Board and general membership. Serves as an intermediary for States to bring issues forward. There could possibly be an issue that a State may not want their name identified with but would like support from HSFO in advocating action.
- To provide direct support and outreach in building and maintaining membership in HSFO within their region. Regional Coordinators, by virtue of their position, will automatically be a member of the membership committee.
- To actively reach out and seek to recruit staff from member and non-member agencies (on a one on one basis) to attend the annual conference.

**Election of Regional Coordinator:**

- Individuals interested in the position of Regional Coordinator would submit an application to the HSFO nominating committee for consideration. The application must be
accompanied with a “second”/recommendation from another individual. This should be from an individual associated with HSFO such as an individual working for member agency, Past President, etc.

- At the annual business meeting, the Nominating Committee would present a slate of Regional Coordinator candidates for member agencies to consider and vote on.

**Board Status of Regional Coordinator:**

- Regional Coordinators shall serve as a member of the HSFO Board of Directors with voting rights.

The committee requests that the Board (1) provide us with feedback on this conceptual framework and (2) direction on how they would like the committee to proceed.

This concludes my report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Stan Mead of Louisiana.

**Discussion:**

The intent is not to have first time attendees be considered as Regional Coordinators, but rather to have individuals that have shown a commitment to the organization be considered for these positions.

It was stated that the framework is excellent. Also, that the Board might want to consider who should manage this group, perhaps the Vice President.

It was stated that we should consider that the Membership chair should have voting rights.

Call the question.

**Vote:**

Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

It was stated that this is a work in progress, and that it is an excellent start. It was also stated that if you make the Membership Chair a voting member, that would make 10 voting members with the President not voting except in a tie vote.

It was stated that we should send Scott Carson a copy of the report.
Dague Clark of New Hampshire gave the Federal Issues Report for Simone Roy of New Hampshire as follows:

Due to the length of the report, I would like to summarize the report and have the entire report reflected in the minutes.

HSFO Federal Issues Report
Reno, Nevada Spring Planning Meeting
April 2013

Medicaid Proposed Rule


This proposed rule reflects new statutory eligibility provisions, proposed changes to provide states more flexibility to coordinate Medicaid and CHIP eligibility notices, appeals, and other related administrative procedures with similar procedures used by other coverage programs authorized under the Affordable Care Act. This rule also implements CHIPRA eligibility-related provisions, including eligibility for newborns whose mothers were eligible for and receiving Medicaid or CHIP coverage at the time of birth.

Beginning in 2014, individuals and small businesses will be able to purchase private health insurance through competitive marketplaces called Affordable Insurance Exchanges, or “Exchanges.” The intent of this rule is to afford states substantial discretion in the design and operation of an Exchange, with greater standardization provided where directed by the statute or where there are compelling practical, efficiency or consumer protection reasons. This rule also proposes to update and simplify the complex Medicaid premiums and cost sharing requirements to promote the most effective use of services and to assist states in identifying cost sharing flexibilities.

The proposed rule includes revisions to the Medicaid eligibility final rule to provide for a coordinated system of notices across all insurance affordability programs based on Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI), regardless of where the individual initially submits an application or whether the Exchange is authorized to make Medicaid and CHIP eligibility determinations. Under the proposed rule, individuals will receive a single notice communicating the determination or denial of eligibility for all application insurance affordability programs and for enrollment in a Qualified Health Plan (QHP) through the Exchange, rather than separate notices from the Medicaid and/or CHIP agencies and the Exchange. The Medicaid and CHIP agencies and the Exchange must work together to provide a single combined notice of eligibility that includes all family members of the same household applying for coverage together. Given
the time needed to allow for systems builds, CMS is proposing that the policy to provide a combined eligibility notice will not be effective until January 1, 2015. Pg. 4602.

Former Foster Care Children 42 CFR 435.150 – States must provide Medicaid coverage starting in 2014 for individuals under age 26 who were in foster care and receiving Medicaid. CMS proposes to add 435.150 establishing the new mandatory Medicaid coverage group for individuals who: are under age 26; are not eligible for and enrolled in mandatory Medicaid coverage and were in foster care under the state’s or tribe’s responsibility (whether or not under Title IV-E of the Act) and also enrolled in Medicaid under the state’s Medicaid state plan or 1115 demonstration waiver. CMS is proposing an interpretation of the statute that when the individual qualifies for this mandatory Medicaid coverage if the individual attained age 18 or at the point of “aging out” of foster care. CMS is also proposing to give states the option to cover individuals under this group who were in foster care and Medicaid in any state at the relevant point in time. There is no income or resource test for this group. Individuals may apply and be determined eligible at any time between attaining age 18 and losing eligibility under this group, coverage shall not be terminated unless the individual is not eligible under any other group (for example, the new adult group at 435.119 of the Social Security Act. Eligibility under the adult group will not take precedence over coverage under the mandatory group of former foster care children. Individuals eligible for both the former foster care group and the adult group should be enrolled in the former foster care group. Pg. 4604.

Family Planning 42 CFR 435.214 - Section 2303 of the Affordable Care Act adds a new section of the Act for family planning under which states have the option to provide Medicaid coverage to women and men that is limited to family planning or family planning related services under the state plan. Beginning January 1, 2014, financial eligibility for this group will be determined using the MAGI-based methodologies. When determining financial eligibility for the new eligibility group of family planning, states may consider the individual’s household to consist only of the individual applying for coverage (while retaining other members of the household for purposes of determining family size), and may increase the family size used for determining eligibility for coverage under this group by one, similar to the increase in family size for pregnant women. Pg. 4605.

Certified Application Counselors 42 CFR 43.908 and 457.330- Many state Medicaid and CHIP agencies have a history of enabling providers and other organizations to serve as “application assisters” which CMS refers to as “application counselors” to provide direct assistance to individuals seeking coverage and these counselors play a key role in promoting enrollment among low-income individuals. The proposed rule will include training for application counselors to ensure they have the necessary skills to provide reliable assistance to consumers and that they will meet the confidentiality requirements that apply to the data they will be able to access in their role as assisters. The proposed regulation recognizes the role that may be played by application counselors in helping individuals with the process through either the paper or online applications. Pg. 4605.

Increased Income from Child Support or Spousal Support 42 CFR 435.115 – CMS currently requires a 4-month Medicaid extension for low-income families eligible under section 1931 of the Act who would otherwise lose coverage due to increased income from collection of child or
spousal support. CMS proposes to revise 435.115 to limit this requirement to spousal support because while spousal support is counted as income under the MAGI-based methodologies, child support is not. Therefore, increased collection of child support will not affect Medicaid eligibility for parents or children once MAGI-based methodologies take effect in 2014. Pg. 4607.

Extended and Continuous Eligibility for Pregnant Women and Hospitalized Children 42 CFR 435.172 – Section 435.170 implements section 1902(e)(5) of the Act, requiring extended Medicaid eligibility through the last day of the month in which the 60-day post-partum period ends for women who were covered while pregnant. This section requires states to provide “continuous eligibility to pregnant women, once determined eligible under any eligibility group, regardless of changes in the household income through the last day of the month in which the post-partum period ends. Section 1902 (e)(7) of the Act requires that infants and children under age 19 remain eligible for Medicaid until the end of a Medicaid-covered inpatient stay, if they otherwise would lose eligibility because of attaining the maximum age for coverage under the applicable section of the Act. Pg. 4608.

Optional Coverage for Reasonable Classification of Individuals Under Age 21 42 CFR 435.222 – The existing regulations of the Act give states the option to cover all individuals under age 21 (or, at state option, under age 20, 19 or 18) or reasonable classifications of such individuals, who either meet the state’s AFDC income and resource requirements or would meeting them if not institutionalized. CMS propose revisions to reflect the need for states to convert their current AFDC-based net income standard to an equivalent MAGI-based standard unless the state currently disregards all income for a reasonable classification under this group which may not exceed the higher of the state’s AFDC-payment standard in effect as of July 16, 1996 or the state’s highest effective income level for the group. Pg. 4608.

Optional Eligibility for Individuals Under Age 21 Who Are Under State Adoption Assistance Agreements 42 CFR 435.227 – CMS proposes to amend 42 CFR 435.227 for children with a state adoption assistance agreement in effect (other than an agreement under Title IV-E of the Act) to reflect the need for states to convert their current AFDC-based net income standard to an equivalent MAGI-based net income standard. An individual must have been eligible under Medicaid state plan prior to the adoption agreement being entered into. CMS proposes language to clarify that it is the state agency which entered into the adoption agreement with the adoptive parents, which is not necessarily the state determining the child’s Medicaid eligibility, that determines whether those eligibility requirements are met. Pg. 4609.

Optional Continuous Eligibility for Children 42 CFR 435.342 – CMS proposes to added a new section of the Act which provides states with the option to provide up to 12-months of continuous eligibility for children under age 19, or a younger age selected by the state, once determined eligible for Medicaid, regardless of changes in income or most other circumstances which otherwise would render the child ineligible for Medicaid. The state would specify in their state plan the length of eligibility period not to exceed 12-months. Pg. 4609.

Presumptive Eligibility – CMS proposes to revise Medicaid regulations for children’s presumptive eligibility and to add regulations for presumptive eligibility provided by the
Affordable Care Act. The new options become available on 1/1/14 except that presumptive eligibility for the family planning option became available on March 23, 2010. Pg. 4610.

Presumptive Eligibility for Other Individuals 42 CFR 435.1103 – If the state has elected to provide presumptive eligibility for children or pregnant women, the state may also elect to provide presumptive eligibility for the additional populations provided for in the Affordable Care Act – parents and other caretaker relatives, adults and individuals under age 65, as well as former foster care children. Pg. 4611.

Presumptive Eligibility Determined by Hospitals 42 CFR 435.1110 – The Affordable Care Act added section 1902(a)(47)(B) to give hospitals the option (not at state option like for the other types of presumptive eligibility) as of 1/1/2014, to determine presumptive eligibility for Medicaid. The Act gives hospitals participating in Medicaid with this option whether or not the state has elected to permit qualified entities to make presumptive eligibility determinations under other sections of the statute. Pg. 4611.

Optional Eligibility of Lawfully Residing Non-Citizen Children and Pregnant Women 42 CFR 457.320 – Section 214 of CHIPRA amended section 1903(v)(4) of the Act to permit states to provide Medicaid coverage to children, pregnant women, or both who are lawfully residing in the United States, and otherwise eligible for Medicaid. CMS is proposing to amend the Act similarly to allow states to cover such lawfully residing children and pregnant woman under CHIP. CMS also proposes to align the Exchange definitions of “lawfully present” with the Medicaid/CHIP definitions in 435.4. Individuals who meet this definition could be eligible for enrollment in a QHP through the Exchange. CMS interprets “lawfully residing” to mean individuals who are lawfully present in the United States and who are residents of the state in which they are applying under the state’s Medicaid or CHIP residency rules. Pg. 4612.

Deemed Newborn Eligibility 42 CFR 435.117 – CMS proposes that a child born to a mother covered by Medicaid for labor and delivery as an emergency medical service pursuant to section 1903(v)(3) of the Act shall be deemed eligible for Medicaid during the child’s first year of life. CMS also proposes a new paragraph (c) to give states the option of recognizing the deemed newborn status from another state for purposes of enrolling babies born in another state without need for a new application. Pg. 4614.

Verification Procedures for Individuals Attesting to Citizenship or Satisfactory Immigration Status – Implemented in current regulations of the Act requires that individuals seeking an eligibility determination make a declaration of citizenship or immigration status, and that the status of non-citizens be verified with the Department of Homeland Security. Section 211 of CHIPRA also made other changes to section 1903(x), for example, exempting infants deemed eligible for Medicaid of the Act from the requirement to verify citizenship, and adding a statutory requirement to provide for individuals declaring U.S. citizenship to provide verification similar to the “reasonable opportunity” afforded initials declaring satisfactory immigration status under the section 1137(d) of the Act. Pg. 4615.

Reasonable Opportunity to Verify Citizenship or Immigration Status – During the reasonable opportunity period, states must try to resolve with SSA or the applicant inconsistencies that arise
from the data match, and request additional documentation from the applicant. If the agency
cannot resolve inconsistencies in a data match with SSA or DHS in a prompt manner, such that
eligibility would be determined and benefits provided with the same promptness as if the agency
were able to verify citizenship or immigration status in real-time, the agency must begin the
reasonable opportunity period, and benefits must be furnished as soon as other eligibility criteria
are verified. Pg. 4616. CMS proposes to apply the same reasonable opportunity period of 90
days that is required under section 1902(ee) of the Act, and which also is required for Exchanges,
to all citizenship verification procedures. CMS is also proposing the same 90-day timeframe to
verify and individual’s satisfactory immigration status. If citizenship or immigration status has
not been verified though efforts by the agency and satisfactory documentation has not been
provided by the individual by the end of the reasonable opportunity period, the agency must take
action to terminate benefits. Pg. 4617.

Coordinated Medicaid/CHIP Open Enrollment Process 42 CFR 435.1205 – During the initial
open enrollment period starting October 1, 2013, the Exchange will begin accepting a single
streamlined application for enrollment in a QHP through the Exchange and for insurance
affordability programs, with enrollment effective January 1, 2014. We are proposing to similarly
provide that Medicaid and CHIP agencies begin accepting the single streamlined application
during the initial open enrollment period to ensure a coordinated transition to new coverage that
will become available in Medicaid and through the Exchange in 2014. Proposed 435.1205
implements several provisions of the Medicaid eligibility final rule effective October 1, 2013,
and ensures the coordinated and simplified enrollment system for all insurance affordability
programs of the Affordable Care Act. Pg. 4621.

Single State Agency – Delegation of Eligibility Determination to Exchanges 42 CFR 155.110,
431.10 and 431.11) – CMS proposed to allow Medicaid agencies to delegate eligibility
determinations to Exchanges that are public agencies authority to make Medicaid eligibility
determinations as long as the single state Medicaid agency retained authority to issue policies,
rules and regulations on program matters and to exercise discretion in the administration or
supervision of the plan. Pg. 4627.

Medical Support and Payments – Under the proposed revisions, individuals must attest on the
application that they agree to cooperate with the state in establishing paternity and obtaining
medical support payments. However, the state should not wait until otherwise eligible
individuals actually begin cooperating before finalizing the eligibility determination and
furnishing benefits. If the individual does not cooperate, consistent with the requirements in
433.147 of the regulations, the Medicaid agency must take action to terminate eligibility of the
parent(s) in the case (Note: children cannot be denied Medicaid eligibility or terminated from
coverage due to a parent’s failure to do so.) Pg. 4628.

Essential Health Benefits in Alternate Benefit Plans – Beginning in 2014, all non-grandfathered
health insurance coverage in the individual and small group markets, Medicaid benchmark and
benchmark-equivalent plans (now known as Alternative Benefit Plans) and Basic Health
Programs (if applicable) will cover essential health benefits (EHBs) which include items and
services in 10 statutory benefit categories, such as hospitalization, prescription drugs and
maternity and newborn care, are equal in scope to a typical employer health plan. Section
2001(c) of the Affordable Care Act modified the benefit provisions of section 1937 to add mental health benefits; medical/surgical benefits and mental health and/or substance use disorder benefits comply with the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008. Pg. 4629.

CMS also proposes changes in the regulations in order to promote simplification and clarification and provide some additional flexibility to states regarding benefit options. Some of the proposed changes are as follows:

- Conform the regulatory definition relating to who can provide preventative services with the statute. Sec 440.130 states that preventative services must be provided by a physician or licensed practitioner. This is not in alignment with the statutory provision at 1905(a)(13) of the Act that defines “services..” recommended by a physician or other licensed practitioner of healing arts within the scope of their practice under State law.”

- Revise 440.315(f) by modifying the definition of “medically frail” to specifically include individuals with disabling mental disorders (to include children with serious emotional disturbances and adults with serious mental illness), individuals with serious and complex medical conditions, individuals with a physical, intellectual or developmental disability that significantly impairs their ability to perform one or more activities of daily living, or individuals with a disability determination, based on Social Security criteria, or in states that apply more restrictive criteria than the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program, as the state plan criteria. Pg. 4631.

The remaining proposed rule covers:

- Eligibility Appeals and Other Provisions Related to Eligibility and Enrollment for Exchanges Pg. 4631
- Definitions and General Standards for Eligibility Determination Pg. 4635
- Functions of Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP) Pg. 4656
- Medicaid Premiums and Cost Sharing Pg. 4657
- The CMS proposed rule changes by Social Security Act section begins on page 4681 – 4724.


This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma.

Discussion: There was a discussion on the issues with CHIPRA.

Vote:

Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.
Dague Clark of New Hampshire gave the following report for Scott Carson of Arizona:

**HSFO MEMBERSHIP REPORT**
**2013 SPRING PLANNING MEETING IN RENO, NEVADA**

For healthy growth to the base of the organization to exist, it is important to first and foremost retain current members by ensuring they become engaged, feel valued, and perceive they are receiving a benefit by being a member. With a strong consistent base and negligible turnover, more focus can be placed on exploring new avenues for marketing the benefits of our organization and identifying/recruiting new members.

As such, the emphasis and focus of the first couple months of this year have been spent as follows:

- **Current Membership Outreach** – e-mails and/or phone calls to last year’s members saying hi, how much we appreciate their involvement, telling them about the exciting things that HSFO is doing this year, and soliciting them to contact me or anyone else on the board with any questions or ideas they have. Due to limited time, the target to date has been focused on members who are not particular involved with the conference or trainings each year. Eventually the plan is to have reached out to all last year’s members.

- **Last Year’s Members Yet to Renew** – similar e-mails and/or phone calls to those entities that joined last year but have yet to renew this year.

- **2011 Members Not Renewing in 2012 or 2013** – similar e-mails and/or phone calls to those entities that were members in 2011 but have not joined since. As part of these contacts, attempting to find out why they left and what we can do to get them back and inform them of what is going on this year and how it can benefit them.

- **Exploring Provided Leads** – similar e-mails and/or phone calls to possible members based on leads received from both internal and external to HSFO folks.

- **Training Attendees** – similar e-mails and/or phone calls to folks and entities that have attended one of our training sessions within the past couple years.

- **Identifying, Creating and Exploring New Leads** – after all above plans have been completed, emphasis will switch to the matter of what can and should we do to get our organization more exposure and attract involvement by new players (e.g. sponsors, members, presenters, etc.).

In order to maximize the impact and effect of the planned outreach efforts, it will be important to have the involvement of all the regional directors. A possible vision would be that after these
initial outreach efforts have taken place, information related to each respective regional
director’s areas would be provided so they could continue to foster and solidify relationships
throughout the remainder of the year.

On the following page, a summary of the recent HSFO membership history is included along
with a discussion of the picture it paints as well as the goal for what it should look like by the
end of this year.

As indicated by the chart above, HSFO experienced over a 44% decrease in membership during
the time period of 2008 through 2012 with 2012 having the lowest membership yet. While the
severe membership downturn in 2009 and 2010 was for the most part unavoidable due to the
recessionary economy and resulting restrictions placed on states budgets, recent years have seen
many if not most states begin to loosen up restrictions that have not led to the corresponding
increase to our membership base that we would expect.

Through the earlier mentioned efforts, the current year goal is to achieve a membership base of
44 that would constitute an increase of almost 16% from the prior year. While the year to date
number for 2013 sits at 36 currently, three additional long standing and active members are in
the process of renewing bringing the total to 39 as of now. Recent and ongoing conversations
that have occurred as a part of the outreach efforts being undertaken by many different folks
throughout HSFO seem to be having a positive result. Based on these conversations, it should be a reasonable and attainable goal to reach 44 by the end of the year.

Prepared By: K. Scott Carson, March 14, 2013

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Harry Roberts of Delaware.

Discussion:

It was stated that there are a total of 38 paid members as of today. It was also stated that this is an excellent report.

Vote:

Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Hank Fitzer of Maryland presented the Time and Place Report on behalf of Michelle McDonald of Maryland.

**HSFO**

**Time and Place**

Mister President, Broad Members:

The 2013 Annual Conference will be held in Columbus, Ohio. Doubletree by Hilton, 175 Hutchinson Ave, Columbus, Ohio

The dates are Sunday, July 28th to Friday August 2nd, 2013.

More information can be found at: [http://www.hsfo.com](http://www.hsfo.com). And Mary will give more information later.

The fall planning meeting with be in Phoenix, Arizona – December 7 – 11, hosted by Scott Carson.

The Spring Planning meeting will be in Portland, Oregon - April 12 – 16, hosted by Dick Humiston.

The 2014 Annual Conference will be held in Louisville, Kentucky. We are looking for volunteers for the 2015 conference.
We will provide updates as information becomes available.

Respectfully submitted,
Hank Fitzer for Michele McDonald

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Karen Fricke of Arkansas.

Discussion: none

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Deanna Brown of Oklahoma gave the following report on behalf of Stephen Gearheart of Kentucky:

**Resolutions Report**

I’m presenting the following Report on behalf of Resolutions Chair Mr. Stephen Gearheart of Kentucky.

To date, no Resolutions have been received. Members are urged to consider appropriate submissions for FY 2013 and send them to the Resolutions Chair as soon as possible.

I move for acceptance of the report.

Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion: none

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.
Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma gave the following report on behalf of Jason Sanchez of New Mexico:

**HSFO**
**Bylaws Report**  
**Spring 2013**

Mr. President: I am submitting this report on behalf of Jason Sanchez, By-Laws Chair.

The week of February 19\(^{th}\), 2013, the Bylaws committee consisting of Jason Sanchez, Chair; Past President Richard Billera, Past President Stan Mead, Past President Ted Martin, and Past President Harry Roberts exchanged e-mails regarding HSFO Bylaws.

Two potential changes to the HSFO Bylaws were reviewed and the recommended changes, which are underlined, follow:

**ARTICLE VI. BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Section 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of the Regional Directors and the five officers of the Association with the President as Chairperson of the Board. Past Presidents shall be ex officio members of the Board of Directors, however, shall not have voting privileges as a Member of the Board, unless they are an elected or appointed Member of the Board. The Board shall give active leadership to the Association in fulfilling its stated aims with consistency and continuity to purpose and activities from year to year.

**ARTICLE VIII. MEETINGS**

Section 3. One-half of the voting members registered and in attendance at a regular meeting shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

It is also requested by the Bylaws committee that the proposed amendment be placed on the HSFO website at least thirty days prior to the annual meeting and that the membership be notified of the proposed change.

I move for acceptance of the by-laws report on behalf of Jason Sanchez.

Second: Dague Clark of New Hampshire.

Vote:
- Those in favor say: Aye
- Opposed: Nay two

The report was accepted.
Discussion:

Some members did not agree with one of the proposed changes, stating that they believe that Past Presidents should have the right to vote. It was also stated that when the time comes to vote on the proposed changes, you could vote for or against the proposed changes as you see fit.

It was also stated that the proposed change is to implement what we have already been doing. That is that our corporate application and taxes do not list the Past Presidents as voting members. If Past Presidents have voting privileges, then these two items would need to change in the future and the Past Presidents would need to be listed. However, if we did that there are at least nine Past Presidents that are not here at this meeting, which would be an issue with getting a quorum.

It was stated that Past Presidents add a lot of knowledge of the organization. Everyone asks for the Past Presidents’ input, therefore, you do not lose their advice if they do not have voting rights.

It was also stated that the statement at the beginning of the meeting that listed voting members, did not list the Past Presidents, therefore, they do not have voting rights.

Karen Fricke of Arkansas presented the Newsletter Report for Mark Story of Arkansas.

---

**Newsletter Report**

March 26, 2013

Mr. Mark Story of Arkansas

The first newsletter of the current federal fiscal year was prepared and sent out to over 700 email addresses in the week after the Baton Rouge planning meeting. Those receiving the newsletter will include members, corporate sponsors and other interested parties. The focus of the edition was the conference in Baltimore, Maryland, the election of new HSFO officers, and training reviews and opportunities.

Articles are currently being submitted for inclusion in an edition to be released prior to the spring planning conference in Reno, Nevada. The editor is very appreciative of those who have suggested and or provided interesting and beneficial content for inclusion in this edition. We will continue to look for interesting ideas and items for inclusion in the newsletter and hope for your input in making it both informative and enjoyable for our membership.

Signature: R. Mark Story
This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma.

Discussion: Mark has increased color and layout of the newsletter. Is there any feedback on these changes? The newsletter lacks content, but layout and colors are great. Need content from all of us, it is not up to the Newsletter Chair to get the content for the newsletter.

It was stated that we should have had something on the upcoming conference in a newsletter. It was also stated that there would be another issue after this Planning Meeting and before the Annual Conference where we can include information on the Annual Conference.

Someone mentioned that they did not like the three columns, because it made the newsletter hard to read.

Someone else thanked Mark, Rick and Richard for the training article in the last newsletter.

The question was asked as to what is the timing of the next issue of the newsletter? The response was that we do not know at this time and that we will get back to the group on that.

It was stated that the Arkansas issue on the exchange in would be a good article for the next newsletter as well. It was also stated that HSFo could also do an e-mail blast for the Annual Conference, that we do not have to wait for the next issue of the newsletter.

It was stated that the discussion that we had earlier on CHIPRA would be a great article for the next newsletter.

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Deena Brown of Oklahoma gave the following report:

Nominations Report
HSFo Spring Planning Meeting
Reno, Nevada
April 6-10, 2013
Mr. President,

Applications for the anticipated vacant position of Historian on the Executive Board are currently being accepted. Any member interested in applying for this position is required to complete an application and submit it to the nominating committee. The required application form can be found on HSFO’s website and the completed applications should be submitted electronically to Deena Brown at deena.brown@okdhs.org.

As of today, I have received one application.

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma.

Discussion: none

Vote:
Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Rick Brennan of West Virginia gave the following report:

Training Report
Subsequent to the Fall Business and Planning Meetings, three Training Sessions have been scheduled for the Spring 2013 Calendar. These are:

1) Advanced Cost Allocation – March 19-21, 2013, held at the Embassy Suites Phoenix Airport at 24th Street in Phoenix, AZ. The Training was conducted by PCG, with 42 attendees – 32 from Arizona, 3 from Ohio, 2 each from Washington, Oklahoma, and New Jersey, and 1 from Alaska.

2) Medicaid II – Intermediate – May 14-16, 2013, to be held at the Embassy Suites Raleigh Crabtree in Raleigh, NC. Registration has just opened for this offering. PCG will conduct the Training.

3) Advanced Cost Allocation – June 18-20, 2013, will be held at the Embassy Suites Phoenix Airport at 24th Street. PCG will also conduct this Training. Registration has not yet been opened, but we have a guaranteed base from Arizona of 32 attendees. Inquiries from others, so I know that this will be filled.
The initial offering of the Advanced Cost Allocation in Phoenix is expected to show Net Revenue of approximately $3,500. With the guaranteed registration base, as well as lower room rates, and therefore Hotel commitment, for the June offering, the result there should also be significant positive Net Revenue.

The Medicaid II – Intermediate Training may be our real test of Training demand and travel availability, as there was no local Agency guarantee. Based on the results of this one, we will be better positioned to examine potential for Fall 2013 offerings.

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Karen Fricke of Arkansas.

Discussion: Scott Carson thanked Rick for the excellent training that was done in Arizona, stating that everyone just raved as to how good the training was. Scott went on the say that HSFo might get three new members from people that had attended this training.

Vote:  
Those in favor say: Aye  
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

BREAK

Mary Fernald of Ohio gave the following report:

Arrangements Report  
HSFo 2013 Annual Conference  
Columbus, Ohio  
March 20, 2013

Mr. President, Members of the Board:

The 66th HSFo Annual Conference will be held July 28, 2013 (Sunday) through August 1, 2013 (correction) (Thursday) at the DoubleTree by Hilton, 175 Hutchinson Avenue, Columbus, Ohio. Room rate will be $94.00 government per diem rate and includes breakfast and Wi-Fi in guest and meeting rooms. Rates are subject to state and local taxes which currently total 16.75%. Room nights blocked total 830 with an allowable 20% attrition rate to 664 room nights.

A “save the date” was sent out through the HSFo web site at the end of February 2013. A conference logo has been developed. Time lines and cash flow projections will be finalized following the Spring Planning Meeting in early April. A process for conference purchasing and
book keeping has been established to ensure good check and balance. Youth release forms have been drafted. Bags have been identified and cost estimates obtained. Staff are quite busy pursuing “give-a-ways” for the bags as well as door prizes. A speaker gift has been identified.

As of the writing of this report no disbursement has been made from the $10,000 advance. It is anticipated, however, that some disbursements will have been made by the Spring Meeting. A draft registration form will be adjusted for items clarified at the Spring Planning Meeting and then finalized following the meeting.

I have participated on the Program Committee and it is anticipated Ohio will identify keynote, motivational, Medicaid and possibly Strategic Planning speakers.

The following events are being planned:

Conference Events
- The Board Dinner on Saturday evening will be at The Lakes Golf and Country Club in Westerville, Ohio.
- Sunday evening conference attendees and guests will board buses for the President’s Reception to be held at the Statehouse. Heavy hors d’oeuvres will be served.
- The Conference Event on Tuesday will be a trip to the Zoo with an option to add (at your own expense) the Zoombezi Bay water park. Dinner and entertainment will be included.
- A trip to the Columbus Clippers (Triple-A Affiliate – Cleveland Indians) baseball game is being planned for Wednesday evening at the new state-of-the-art Huntington Park.
- The conference banquet will be held at the hotel on Thursday evening. Entertainment will be provided by Arnett Howard and The Creole Funk Band. Bring your dancing shoes!!

Guest Events
- During the day on Monday the guests will travel to German Village, tour, shop, learn the history and lunch at Schmidt’s Sausage House.
- Of course there will be informal shopping trips available.

Youth Events
- Sunday evening and in association with the President’s Reception youth will tour the state house followed by time outside, a box dinner and touring of the downtown common areas and river front. Youth will board their bus ahead of the adults, tour the state house while the adults are in transit then proceed to the outside activities. Youth are not permitted at the President’s Reception. All will return at the same time.
- During the day on Monday the youth will visit the Columbus Center of Science and Industry.
- Parents/guardians may opt to take youth to the Zoo/Zoombezi Bay (at own expense) for the Conference Event on Tuesday.
• Parents/guardians may opt to take youth to the Clippers game on Wednesday evening.

• During the day on Thursday there will be a tour of the OSU Stadium from 1:00 to 2:30. There will be a box lunch on the Oval prior to the tour.

This concludes the Ohio 2013 Arrangements Report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion: none

Vote:
Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Margaret Wahrer of Kentucky gave the following report:

**Arrangements Report – Louisville, Kentucky 2014 HSFO Conference**

The 2014 HSFO Conference will be held at the Hilton Seelbach in Louisville, KY from July 25, 2014 to August 1, 2014. Lodging will be at the Seelbach Hotel. The luxurious hotel was built in 1886 with 30 rooms atop the Seelbach Restaurant & Café. In 1907, following several expansions, a Bavarian-style beer hall, the Rathskeller, was built in the basement of the structure.

The Seelbach has been contracted to the HSFO for July 25, 2014 through August 1, 2014 at the prevailing government rate. The rate applies for the three days immediately prior and immediately after the contracted dates. During the conference, HSFO will be the primary tenant of the hotel.

The location of the Seelbach affords easy access to Fourth Street Live! which is Kentucky's premier dining, entertainment and retail destination located on Fourth Street, between Liberty and Muhammad Ali Boulevard, in the heart of historic downtown Louisville, KY. Fourth Street Live! is a short walk from downtown hotels, waterfront park, Main Street, Slugger Field, and many other downtown attractions. Fourth Street Live! is your one stop destination for retail, dining and entertainment. Other evening events (if in town) could be a Louisville Slugger Ballgame, or a visit to the Horseshoe Casino across the river from Louisville.

In addition to Fourth Street Live!, there are ample venues within Louisville for the youth and spouse day trips. Louisville offers include Louisville Slugger Museum, The Children’s Science
Museum, Muhammad Ali Museum, Kentucky Derby Museum/Churchill Downs, the Louisville Zoo as well as Hadley’s Pottery, Louisville Stoneware and the Speed Museum. Showcasing Kentucky outside of Louisville, points of interest include Mammoth Cave, historic Bardstown (location of My Old Kentucky Home) and the Stephen Foster Story performed in the amphitheater.

There are several areas/places/events which could be considered for the Tuesday afternoon team building event. Kentucky offers the Kentucky Dinner train, the Bourbon Trail, Kentucky Horse Farms or maybe the Belle of Louisville.

Overall, we feel with so many choices within Louisville and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, we will provide a conference to be remembered.

Thanks to Renee Close for helping put together information on this report.

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion: none

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

---

Arrangements Report – Planning: Fall Planning Meeting 2013, Phoenix, AZ and Spring Planning Meeting 2014, Portland, Oregon. – Verbal updates were given. The first update was for the Fall 2013 Planning Meeting in Phoenix, AZ by Stan Mead of Louisiana.

We have received proposals for hotels from various Embassy Suites. The rates will probably be around $105, with the rates being less around the airport. We have good working relationships with the hotels in the area due to the trainings that we have held in Phoenix recently.

This concludes the update.

Motion to accept the update by Dague Clark of New Hampshire.
Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion: none

Vote:
- Those in favor say: Aye
- Opposed: Nay (none)

The update was accepted.

Dick Humiston gave the following update on the 2014 Spring Planning meeting in Portland, OR.

We are looking at two Embassy Suite hotels for the Planning meeting. We should have more information on their proposals in the near future. We are looking at April 12-16th for the meeting.

Motion to accept: Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma.

Seconded by Karen Fricke of Arkansas.

Vote:
- Those in favor say: Aye
- Opposed: Nay (none)

The update was accepted.

Discussion:

Having the dates of April 12-16th might be an issue for some members due to the dates corresponding with tax season and legislative sessions. There was a discussion on possible alternative dates, but nothing was decided.

Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska presented the following Audit Report:

March 28, 2013

Mr. President, Board Members, Regional Directors, Past Presidents and guests:

I have received all financial documents from Ted Martin, former HSFO accountant to begin reviewing the Annual conference held in Baltimore, MD and the fall 2011 Business/Planning meeting held in San Antonio, TX, and the Spring 2012 Business/Planning meeting in Burlington, VT.
A full audit report will be presented at the annual conference in Columbus, OH with an update at the Spring Business/Planning Meeting in Reno, NV.

I move for acceptance of this report.

Seconded by Karen Fricke of Arkansas.

Vote:
Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Discussion:

There was a discussion around what was meant by “update at the Spring Business/Planning Meeting in Reno, NV.” It was stated that the report that was just given was the “update at the Spring Business/Planning Meeting in Reno, NV.”

Stan Mead of Louisiana gave the following update on the 2015 Annual Conference:

Great first proposals from the hotels, the hotels have very good rates, 70% attrition with no food beverage minimum, many compensations, and free meeting space. Now, these are the hotels first proposals, we should be able to get a lot more, once we start negotiating and asking for final offers. Therefore, it is hard to refuse Reno as a site.

It was mentioned that we should consider if there is a hotel shuttle from the airport, because it makes the trip cheaper. It was also mentioned that having Reno as a site, might make it hard for some members to attend the conference. It was mentioned, that having the conference in Sparks might help, with the image of Reno as a conference site.

President Fitzer stated that the rest of the day would be taken up with site visits, with the first one starting at 11:45. Also, please note that the Board dinner tonight will be next door.

President Fitzer asked for a motion to recess.

Dague Clark of New Hampshire.

Seconded by Karen Fricke of Arkansas.

Vote:
Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The meeting was recessed.
After the site visits, the Site Selection Committee, which was comprised of a quorum of voting
members attending the Spring Planning Meeting, met to discuss the impressions of the site visits. All agreed that Reno\Sparks would be site for the 2015 Annual Conference, with the final hotel decision to follow pursuant to the best and final proposals.

Tuesday, April 9, 2013

President Hank Fitzer called the meeting to order, and he asked to have the reports taken out of order from the agenda, with the first report will be the sponsor development report.

Stan Mead of Louisiana gave the following report for Doug Robinson of West Virginia.

**HSFo Spring Business and Planning Meeting**

**Reno, NV**

**April 2013**

**Sponsor Development Report**

Good day Mr. President, Board Members and Past Presidents. I am presenting this report on behalf of Doug Robinson. As of March 20, 2013, HSFo has received corporate sponsor fees from the following vendors:

- J.P Morgan
- Amerigroup
- Sivic Solutions
- Public Consulting Group
- Cenpatico
- Northwoods
- Navigant Consulting

This is the same number of paid corporate sponsors as this time last year.

I am happy to report that Northwoods Consulting is back this year after a one-year absence due to limited conference budgets. Also, we have one new vendor Navigant Consulting. Other vendors are reviewing and finalizing their budgets for the current year. I will be sending out reminders to the vendors and will do so again in early May for those that have not replied.

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.
Margaret Wahrer of Kentucky gave the following report:

Continuing Education Committee Report
Spring Planning Meeting
April 2013

Mr. President, Members:

The following is a report of Continuing Education Committee activities since the report for the Baton Rouge Fall Planning Meeting.

An Advanced Cost Allocation Training was held in Phoenix, Arizona March 19 – March 21, 2013. Issuance of earned CPEs is pending.

There has been a selected Audit of Training, based on a selected Training session offering. While we are in good standing, the Audit was a good refresher and examination of our processes and practices for the Exec. It also resulted in our awareness of potential deficiencies related to the same standards in terms of the Conference, and these must be looked at during the Spring Meeting, as well as ongoing practice.

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion: What is pending for the training that was mentioned? The response was that the issuance of the certificates is what is pending.

Additional discussion centered on the issue with the ability to issue CPEs for the conference. The question was asked what are the issues? The issues are mainly concerning listing of the
prerequisites, etc. for any announcement and any other notification of the Annual Conference. It was stated that we should have a small group to work with Mary on how to get the required information into all notifications concerning the Annual Conference. It was discussed if it should it be the Arrangements or Program Chair to get the required prerequisites. It was suggested that the Program Chair link back to Arrangements Chair to get the correct information in the announcements. It was also discussed that we need the bios from the speakers at least before the start of the conference. It was suggested that the findings from the audit be shared with everyone, so that everyone has the details.

It was suggested that we change the name of the Committee to the Professional Development Committee.

Vote:
  Those in favor say: Aye
  Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Hank Fitzer gave the following information concerning a review of the Fee Schedule:

In Ohio we expect that many attendees will be from Counties and the local governments. They have a strain in funding, like many of us have. What we are proposing is to amend the fee schedule for 2013 to include a “Host State” fee. This would be to recognize the support that we are getting from the State and to hopefully make it financially possible to send as many people from that state as possible. It also is of benefit to HSFo: not only do we get some revenue from the additional attendees, but also we are exposing the organization to many additional organizations. Hopefully, this would be a great marketing tool, as they will see all of the benefits of being a member agency.

Proposed amendment to the 2013 HSFo Fee Schedule:

In recognition of the valuable support and resources contributed by a state in hosting an HSFo Annual Conference, this amendment establishes special considerations and discounted Annual Conference Fees, available to employees of state and local governmental agencies located in the state hosting the HSFo Annual Conference. These special Annual Conference fees are designated in the HSFo Fee Schedule as “Host State Annual Conference Fees”.

For full conference registration, the HSFo discounted Member rate is offered to employees of the aforementioned host state agencies without regard to membership in HSFo. Employees from non-member host state agencies may attend at the same rate as those from member agencies. For non-member host state agencies, this is a $300 savings per registrant vs. the HSFo non-member rate.
For single day and half-day registration, HSFo is offering to employees of the aforementioned host state agencies a discount of 50% of the regular single day and half-day registration fees. These special Host State Annual Conference fees are summarized as follows:

**Host State Annual Conference Fees:**
- Full Conference Registration, Early: $600
- Full Conference Registration, Regular: $650
- Single Day Conference Registration: $125 (50% of $250 single day rate)
- Half Day Conference Registration: $75 (50% of $150 half day rate)

Motion to accept: Harry Roberts of Delaware.

Second: Karen Fricke of Arkansas.

Discussion:

It was discussed that we should offer this for all future conferences, because the host states put in a lot of time and effort, and it is, therefore, something that we should offer all host states. The reduced fees might help in getting more states to offer to host the Annual Conferences. We could possibly include reduced fees for host states for Planning Meetings as well.

Another suggestion was that since we passed the budget based, in part, on the fees that have been approved, it would be better to just have the revised fees for 2013 Annual Conference only and address on a state-by-state basis in the future. It was also stated that we could try it this year and see what happens, that is, see if we get additional members? And then address the fees each year, when we vote on the fees at the Planning Meetings.

It was also stated that as an organization we need consistency, therefore, it would be good to be consistent in offering the reduced fees to host state attendees.

It was stated that it was felt that we should offer to all host states. Even if the host state can afford the fees, it would be a great incentive for the state to host an Annual Conference. Even though we set the rates year to year, it was felt that it is a great thing to adopt.

If we do not adopt a policy to offer a reduce fee to host states, how can we guarantee to future host states the reduced fees as an incentive, because the host state volunteers long before the fees would be set for the conference that they would be hosting? Therefore, if we do not make this a policy, we could lose the benefit of states receiving a discount on the fees if they agree to host.

It was stated that the incoming President will need to adopt her own rates, and she may decide to increase fees, therefore, this amendment should be just for this year, as stated in the amendment.

It was asked where is the Fall Planning meeting? Is it in a member state? The response was yes, because it will be in Arizona. Okay, they will not be covered under this amendment for reduced fees.
It was stated that why don’t we pass this and then decide if we want to do anything with Planning Meetings, because that is a different issue.

An amendment was proposed to make this fee schedule for 2013 and for 2014 Annual Conferences. And rather than set a dollar amount, that we set a discounted percentage of the rates for host states.

It was also stated that someone could not agree with the amendment, that this is a one-time thing. We cannot do anything to influence the incoming president’s ability to set the fees to meet her budgetary requirements. Since we did not adopt the other fees for next year, why adopt these fees for next year? Even if you set a percentage you are affecting the 2014 budget.

It was also stated that we pass the fees each year at the Fall Planning Meeting, and they are based on the President’s budget, therefore, these are the rates for the 2013 conference only.

Perhaps we could propose a policy for the consideration to set rates that give the host state a discounted fee. That would give the President the ability to decide what percentage discount they would like to offer the host state.

It was stated that there are two things; one is to provide a discount of some sort to the host state, and the second issue is how much of a discount. The how much becomes an annual question. Therefore, the only thing that we need to decide is if we develop a policy to offer host state discounted fees. That discount could be zero, if that is what the President proposes and we vote to accept.

It was stated that we all are agreeing on what we want, but if we put 2013 here, how does that accomplish what we want? Part of why we are discussing this is to publish the rates to try to encourage states to host Annual Conferences.

The problem is that you can only publish a year’s fees at a time, because they are tied into the President’s budget. Now the policy and principle can be expanded to include discounts to host states.

And we will let states know that is the new policy?

Yes, we will publish it in the newsletter.

The amendment to make this fee schedule for 2013 and for 2014 Annual Conferences was withdrawn.

Vote on the motion to amend the 2013 fee schedule as it is stated above:

Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The motion passes.
Stan Mead of Louisiana made the following motion: Propose that HSFo sets a policy to offer a discount to host states for Annual Conference and Planning Meeting fees.

Second: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Discussion:

Have we ever in the past published our internal policies?

Yes, we published a free membership with a registration to the Annual Conference.

We also published what we give Corporate Sponsors, in an effort to get more sponsors.

Vonnetta Allenbaugh of Oklahoma gave the following report:

HSFo 2013 Spring Planning and Business Meeting
Tuesday April 9, 2013
Reno, Nevada

Please note that the Balance Sheet should read as of 3/31/2013, which is corrected on the sheets that I handed out. The total assets were $320,374.66 and total Liabilities and Equities were $320,374.66.

Total income for the period was $101,084.35, and total expenses were $41,403.38, for a net income of $59,680.97.

This concludes the report and I move for its acceptance.

Second: Dague Clark of New Hampshire.

Discussion: Where do we put the paying for comps when they are for the Planning Meeting? They are in the Planning Meeting budget.

Vote:

Those in favor say: Aye
Opposed: Nay (none)

The report was accepted.

Next we will cover the Web Site Update.
Richard Billera the web site contractor gave the following information.

First I will start with the Credit Card Account.

Spreadsheet covering the credit card transactions is sent to the accountant and the treasurer every month.

Richard showed that the Bank Statement from Citizens Bank matches the spreadsheet that is sent. He stated that he would give the accountant access to the bank account. The many issue is the fees there are different fees for different cards. Richard is the only one with signatory ability, however the accountant can transfer funds electronically. Therefore, if Richard is unable to sign a check, the accountant can transfer the funds from the account.

It was asked if this was good internal control since the accountant can transfer the funds anywhere? The response was no, it is not. We need a process that requires two people to withdraw funds. We will need to let the accountant have read only access to the bank account. The password could then be in a sealed envelope given to the treasurer that would only be read once Richard is no longer able to transfer funds. Then it would take the accountant and the treasurer to transfer the funds.

The only issue is that right now, is that Richard could take the funds himself. It was stated that our bond would cover any amount that the account would have. It was stated that last year about $80,000 went through this account. It was stated that this still is an area that need to have more control.

Next item is an amendment to the Internet agreement.

Richard started out with the Shopping Cart. Store: 9648, allows him to set the fees, etc for each type of transaction. Every code goes through the Shopping Cart. All of the transactions are here. He went through an example. The account holder’s credit card number only shows the last four (4) digits of the credit card number. Therefore, there is no exposure for us here. The only thing that he can do with this information is to allow a refund to the original purchaser.

The Credit Card Clearing House makes sure that the account holder’s account number is a valid number.

That completes the Shopping Cart.

Next I will discuss the Bank Account.

Citizens Bank User ID: removed from the minutes.

With this user ID the accountant can get into the identical account that I am showing you right now.
Web.com is the host. Richard pays an annual fee for this, which is cheaper than paying the monthly fee. Our account is HSFO.com. Once you are in the account you have 100% access to everything in the account. This is the control center for everything concerning the web page. The number of e-mail accounts we have different e-mail address for each activity such as each training, conference, etc.

With one password you have control over the enter server. This password was given to Justin to work on the web site.

A different password can get into each of the types of files. Richard showed that everyone’s individual password is encrypted, so he does not know our passwords. He stated that we might want to rethink if we want individual passwords or an agency password.

Every file of HSfo for the 16 years that we have had the web is in this database.

The thing that he brought up for potential discussion is the newsletter account. Icontact is the account for the newsletter. It is password protected. 646 people received the last newsletter. The account has data that shows which parts of the newsletter people clicked on the most. Also, it showed that 36% of the people that received the e-mail with the newsletter opened the newsletter. There is a complete history of all of the newsletters, but the thing of value here is that if someone clicks at the bottom of newsletter to unsubscribe it will take them off of the list to receive the newsletter. 73 have clicked to not receive the newsletter.

Another area that I want to cover is who should update the list of who should receive the newsletter, and to add new recipients. This list could go to the Newsletter Committee.

You pay for the number of people on the e-mail list.

His contract is very simple. He added the information that he covered today. He will sign the contract with the actual passwords to be signed and sealed. The President will be the only one besides Richard that will know the passwords. If the President ever uses any of the accounts then Richard’s liability is over. It was suggested to have the passwords in a sealed envelope that only will be opened once Richard is no longer able to use the accounts. It was stated that one of the accounts has to change the password every six (6) months. That is the only issue with giving the passwords in a seal envelope.

There was a discussion if the passwords should be in the contract or not. This would not solve our liability; it just moves the liability from Richard to the President. It was stated that the passwords should be in writing and in a sealed envelope to be opened only in the event of Richard’s death.

It was stated that this is not an issue of trust; rather we need to have access to the accounts when Richard is no longer available, or if one of the companies that we are going business with goes out of business. We can have someone download the history of the HSFo website and have them same the information at an off site location.
It was stated that we want the assurance that after Richard is no longer able to perform the duties in the contract, that all of the functions will continue under someone else.

It was suggested to put the passwords, and update the passwords when they change, and seal them in an envelope to be opened only upon his death. Then give the envelope to an attorney to be sent to whomever we identify upon Richard’s death or his incapacitation. Right now Justin has his on password to the web site, so the website is covered.

If we do not think that we will be able to come to agreement on what to have in the contract, we will need to table it for the time being.

Motion to table for a later time: Michelle Grose Bray of Alaska.

Second: Hank Fitzer of Maryland.

Call the discussion.

All in favor aye
No (one)

The contract is tabled for the time being.

We will have a smaller group meet to address the issues that we discussed and bring them to the larger group. We will try to vote on this before we leave. It was suggested to take the passwords out of the documents (contracts). And have the passwords in the sealed envelope given to his lawyer to be sent to whom HSFo designates.

We will come back at 2:00, is there a motion to recess? Motion to recess Jerry Berry of Arkansas, and seconded by Harry Roberts of Delaware.

Back in session

Melissa Lange gave the following report on the Program Committee.

Conceptually, the Program is not much different than we had discussed during the Fall Planning Meeting. We have been pinning down items that were vague at the last meeting. We also decided which sessions we would request proposals from our by corporate sponsors to present.

First I want to discuss the Sunday afternoon session. This will be an overview of all public assistance programs to give everyone a common understanding about grants, where to find the circulars, block grants vs. entitlement grants, discretionary funds vs. mandatory funds, etc. We
will use Trinity Tomsic as a resource to get the information together. We would do a last minute call for presenters and get two corporate sponsors to coordinate this session.

We moved the session “A View from Washington” to later in the day, to give a break between Charlie Miller’s session and the “A View from Washington” session. Then the question was, “What to put in-between the two sessions?” I talked to the Casey Foundation and they suggested a session on federal funding reform. The other session could be Emerging Issues in Behavioral Health.

The last sessions for the day are a double session on Cost Allocation that would be hands-on to have attendees be able to bring something tangible home. Across from the Cost Allocation session would be a session on matching client information between different eligibility systems and a session on performance indicators for programs.

Tuesday:

Dr. Kellt is a very dynamic speaker, and Brian is working with her on a session on “Innovation in Child Welfare in a Time of Scarcity, Making the Business Case”. Then the next topic would be Hot Topics for programs dealing with the Elderly. There is a session on a follow up study to psychotropic drugs among foster children. Then the first sponsor presentation on ACA and child welfare. By the way, every sponsor that submitted a proposal received at least one presentation slot.

Wednesday:

We had a lively session first thing in the morning, but the speaker that they had lined up backed out due to a conflict of interest. We are working on a replacement speaker for that session and we have a couple of prospects. After the first session we go back to the tracks; one track for grants and one track for IT solutions. However, someone could attend any of the sessions and they would not have to have attended the previous session on a particular track. The session on Grant solutions would cover what the feds are implementing for all DHHS grants.

The session “IT Getting the Most Out of Your IT Vendor” is self-explanatory. Two other sessions on IT are, “Modernizing IT System” and “Mobile Technology” (does it save us time and/or money). Finally there will be a session on return on investment (ROI), which will mainly deal with Public Health ROI. Business meeting will be on Wednesday afternoon. There might be a problem with the Clippers ball game that evening and having the Business meeting Wednesday afternoon.

To help with the potential problem with the Clippers ball game, we could take out a session on Wednesday, or move the Business meeting to another day. The question was asked could we start the Business meeting at 3:00? Or we could shorten the State-to-State session and move the Business meeting from Wednesday afternoon to Thursday afternoon. Or we could move the Business meeting to Thursday afternoon and put one of the Wednesday sessions in the Wednesday afternoon block where we have the Business meeting. By doing this would that run
the Business meeting into the Banquet on Thursday evening? The question was asked if having the Business meeting on Wednesday afternoon last year help with attendance?

Another possibility would be to have the motivational speaker on Wednesday morning only do a single session rather than a double session. The Arrangement Committee felt that they could work with that change.

There are many options to look at concerning the schedule on Wednesday.

Thursday’s schedule:

There will be sessions on “Medicaid Expansion”, “Health Insurance/Benefit Exchanges”, followed by some breakout sessions. The breakout sessions will deal with child welfare, Medicaid and long-term care issues.

After lunch there will be a session on ACA and cost allocation issues – eligibility systems. We left a spot near the end of the agenda to have a dynamic speaker to be a good bookend to the conference and then the State-to-State and fed-to-fed be the last session.

Melissa Lange moved for acceptance of her report.

Seconded by Harry Roberts of Delaware.

There was a discussion on ACA Cost Allocation (Thursday) and the Monday afternoon session on Cost Allocation seamed to be very similar. Need to change the title of IT solutions on Monday afternoon. There also is the possibility of a session on what Ohio is doing concerning performance management, which is more of a general topic. It was also suggested that we could switch the topic on aging Hot Topics and the Ohio performance management session. There was a discussion on what sessions were on the different tracks.

The discussion went back to Sunday afternoon’s session. It was suggested that we try to find second session for Sunday afternoon, because the current session really would be only of interest to newly hired employees. Maybe we could add something on Medicaid or time study tools methodologies. If we did that, we would need to issue a new request for presentation, because we could not just assign that session to one of our corporate sponsors. The current session would only attract newly hired staff that work on public assistance programs. It was suggested that we could also have the Ohio Performance Institute do something on Sunday.

If we like the idea of a second session on Sunday afternoon, we should ask the Program committee to come up with something. The question was asked, “What is the concern about offering two sessions on Sunday, is it to try to enrich the pool of attendees on Sunday?” The question is do we have the time to get a good quality session ready for Sunday afternoon? If we plan on getting the registration for the conference out in a couple of weeks we do not have time. It was stated that we could list the session as “to be announced”. It was stated that in the announcement for the conference, you only list the highlights and do the full grid at a later date. It was decided that we should try to get the Ohio group to do a session.
It was asked for a summary of what we are asking the Program Committee to do. The response was to look at having a second session on Sunday, see how we can make the business meeting on Wednesday and still make the Clippers ball game, and get out a highlight of the conference ready for the registration.

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

The report as accepted.

President Fitzer reminded the group that the one other area for this afternoon was the tabled item on the Internet contract.

Suggestion: Richard should put the log in information for all of the computer applications for which he has access on one side of a piece of paper, put the passwords on the other side of the paper, cut the paper in half, put them in two envelopes, and give them to the Board. The Board should then decide who receives them.

Motion to amend the contract with the above information made by Jerry Berry of Arkansas, and seconded by Stan Mead of Louisiana.

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

Motion passes.

That concludes the Business meeting, is there a motion to adjourn? Motion by Harry Roberts of Delaware and seconded by Deena Brown of Oklahoma.

Vote:
   Those in favor say: Aye
   Opposed: Nay (none)

We are adjourned.