

CSSSB

24

COMMITTEE REPORT

4/18/75

HOUSE

FINANCE

Mr. Speaker:

Date

April 20/75

The Committee on HSS has had CSSB 21

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

recommends it DO PASS

recommends it DO NOT PASS

recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR _____ AND THAT

CS FOR _____ DO PASS

"and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE _____

COMMITTEE

reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

"other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

_____ recommends:

[Signature] Chairman



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature
House

SB 24

HESS COMMITTEE MEETING

April 30, 1975

Members Present:

Beirne	Ostrosky
Davis	Parr
Hackney	Swanson
Osterback	

Vice Chairman Parr called the meeting to order. The first order of business was HB 180.

Bob Gates Dir. Div. of Retirement

This bill would provide changes in the present system. It would allow on an optional basis for the employee to make required employee contributions. The optional portion would be somewhat limited in time. Period of 3 years to collect supply of contributions. I am wondering if this also applies to supplemental contributions? It is unclear in this language.

Osterback Sounds confusing, I think the teachers already get a large enough salary. If the teachers are going to get this then so should everyone else.

Parr The intent here is that a school board might allow for employee contributions. Am wondering about income taxation here?

Gates If the intent says that no longer the employee contributions are collected if the school board pays it then it would be subject to taxation upon receipt by the member. If you have it optional you still have it to mean teachers mandatory and the teacher would report it as income and pay taxes on it. Have one or the other, this would solve the problems with this bill.

Hackney Questioned return of employer contributions.

Gates This would be reported as taxable earnings in the year they were made. Doesn't change things in the standpoint of funding, our concern would be accountability, if districts handled this separately they would all be handled differently and this would be confusing.

Parr Perhaps the Legislation needs to be redrafted but why would it cause you any more work?

Gates Rep. Parr is assuming that the contributions are fully repaid. It is possible that we would have to create two separate processes for each teacher.

Parr The intent of this legislation is that it would be a negotiable item.

Osterback I read the bill that it would cut something else in the monies to allow for this extra process.

Swanson In agreement with Osterback. Wouldn't it be simpler to say that the State pay for all employee retirement. Could we amend this bill to say 'all state employees'?

Gates No, that is not possible in that particular bill.

Van Houte Position is that if the employer "the payments not be refundable if the teacher resigns". this is an option available to him.

Commissioner Lind This would open up another area for negotiations, and I see this as a potential problem area. We would not want to see this paid entirely by the state and the employer.

Overstreet In agreement with Lind, Board members are not in favor of this bill.

Hackney Move bill be tabled

Swanson Seconded

Chairman Parr What is the vote?

Yea 3 Nay 2

Motion carries, bill is tabled.

SB 24

Schrader Div. of Mental Health

HB 311 is almost identical, minor change, it defines more specific concept of 9010 Funding for designated poverty areas. Very important Legislation and essential for the operation and development for mental health programs for the State.

Hackney What was the fiscal note for FY76?

Schrader \$590,000, \$350,000 of that for new funding in the Governors budget. the remainder is to fund programs in Ketchikan and Kodiak.

Ostrosky Inquired as to difference of the two bills.

Schrader Barrow, Kotz, Bethel, Tok, Galena, Glenallen, Dillingham, Cold Bay are all poverty areas, the total fiscal impact is not very great here.

Philip Guy Spoke in favor of the bill and offered some amendments which were decided to be unnecessary as the bill covered all these areas already.

Schrader the actual census of the area would not be relevant in one sense. This language is the standard approach to establish a poverty area.

Parr Reservations with the bill. I don't want this to be a loophole to fund any more alcoholism. Too much money is already being spent on alcoholism.

Sen. Chance As far as funding, this will be designated for MH funding.

Swanson Move bill out with individual recommendation

Osterback Seconded

Chairman Hearing no objection, so ordered.

Title: Community Mental Health Services Act

Requested by: Genie Chance, Legislative Finance Date: _____

Return Date Requested: _____

Agency: Health & Social Services Program: Division of Mental Health

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Budget Request Unit(s) Affected: Community Operated Mental Health Centers

A. EXPENDITURES: (Thousands of dollars)

OBJECT	FY 75	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL	8.4	8.4	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.	211.7	582.5	1239.2	2002.6	2782.0	3560.4
Projections for CMHC's Ketchikan/Kodiak		(264.4)	(290.8)	(319.9)	(351.9)	(387.1)
TOTAL	220.1	590.9	1250.4	2013.8	2793.2	3571.6

B. FUNDING: (Thousands of dollars)

GENERAL FUND 90-10	220.1	590.9	1250.4	2013.8	2793.2	3571.6
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER	62.2	166.9	368.7	601.5	834.3	1068.2

C. POSITIONS:

PERMANENT/TEMPORARY	3 /	3 /	3 /	4 /	4 /	4 /
MAN MONTHS (P./T.)	36 /	36 /	36 /	48 /	48 /	48 /

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

IV. ATTACHMENTS

DATE: 3-11-75

PREPARED BY: George L. Schneider

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA - FISCAL NOTE

The present matching ratio established by policy is to fund 75% of the operating budgets of Ketchikan and Kodiak. In Fiscal Year 1975, the Legislature funded Gateway Community Mental Health Center at 138.4 and Kodiak Aleutian Center at 81.7 for a total of 220.1.

The State also has regional offices in Anchorage, Juneau, and Fairbanks, which operated mental health clinics. In Fiscal Year 1975 the Legislature funded Anchorage at 227.1, Juneau at 175.1, and Fairbanks at 205.3 for a total of 607.5.

In Fiscal Year 1975 a total of 827.6 General Funds were appropriated for community mental health programs in Alaska.

The largest community mental health center is in Ketchikan with an operating budget of 281.2 in Fiscal Year 1976. This center has the only community mental health program in Alaska which we feel has an adequate staff to serve the need of its catchment area (population approximately 20,000). This center has a staff of 5 professionals, 1 aide, 1 administrative assistant, and 2 clerical staff. Contrast this with the state-operated clinic in Anchorage of 5 professionals and 2 clerical personnel responsible for a catchment area population of approximately 158,000.

Although it is anticipated that projections of cost will be unique to each community dependent on its geographical locations, its available manpower, its present mental health and its needs, a rough estimate of the cost of a community mental health program resources for Alaska can be projected.

Assuming the Ketchikan program is adequate and by projecting the figures of 20,000 population and a budget of 281.2 to the entire State would indicate that Alaska could develop a statewide community mental health program for approximately 4,639.8. Using the matching formula in this Bill of 75%, the State's General Fund share would be 3,479.9. The State already has a 827.6 General Fund appropriation for community mental health services. Consequently, an additional 2,652.3 would be required. It has been brought to our attention that the 75% match would be inadequate in poverty areas and a 90% match would be more realistic. Below is a list of mental health planning areas and their designation as poverty or non-poverty areas. 13 of the planning areas are designated as poverty areas encompassing 44,000 persons or 13% of the total population (base 330,000).

Utilizing the 90% - 10% matching ratio in the 13 planning districts would increase the total estimated General Fund cost to 3,571.6 or an additional 92.1.

District	Poverty * Non-Poverty	District Center	July 1, 1973 Population Estimates by Dept. of Labor
1	Poverty	Barrow	2,814
2	"	Kotzebue	4,352
3	"	Bettles	461
4	"	Fort Yukon	934
5	"	Nome	5,682
6	"	Galena	1,862
7	Non-poverty	Fairbanks	52,074
8	Poverty	Tok	649
9	"	Bethel	11,784
10	"	Aniak	1,881
11	"	McGrath	585
12	Non-poverty	Anchorage	158,026
13	Poverty	Glenallen	1,204
14	"	Dillingham	4,858
15	Non-poverty	Kodiak	8,868
16	Poverty	Cold Bay	6,914
17	Non-poverty	Kenai	13,781
18	"	Seward	2,446
19	"	Valdez	3,903
20	"	Juneau	21,102
21	"	Sitka	11,095
22	"	Ketchikan	13,823

* Poverty areas are determined by 15% or more of the population falling under 125% of the O. E. O. Poverty Guidelines (Per 1970 Census Data)



STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

February 26, 1975

Document# 1. - 1975

The Honorable George Hohman
Chairman
Senate Health, Education, and
Social Services Committee
Senate
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Senator Hohman:

Please consider this letter testimony from the Department of Health and Social Services and the Office of the Governor in favor of the provisions outlined in Senate Bill 24, An Act Relating to Community Mental Health Services and providing for an effective date.

Both the intent and the provisions outlined in this bill reflect the philosophical and operational recommendations regarding community mental health services as intended by this Administration. However, there are three suggested changes which we would like to recommend that the committee adopt.

1. Under Section 47-30-605(a), line four, the council consists of twelve as opposed to nine members.
2. The following sentence should be stricken since the Health and Social Services Advisory Board is not an official board in existence now.
3. The next sentence beginning on line seven should read no more that four memebers should be providers of direct mental health services.

Although the Administration had planned to submit a Community Mental Health bill, it is now felt that such action is unnecessary since the only provisions which would differ from those contained in Senate Bill 24 are those listed above.

The Honorable George Hohman -2- February 26, 1975

Other than those brief changes it is the Administrative recommendation that the Senate Health, Education, and Social Service Committee approve Senate Bill 24 and recommend its passage.

Sincerely,

Francis S.L. Williamson
Francis S.L. Williamson
Commissioner
Department of Health and
Social Services



GREATER ANCHORAGE AREA BOROUGH

P.O. BOX 968 99510
327 EAGLE STREET 99501
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

HB 34

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

April 4, 1975

Representative Susan Sullivan
Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801

C
L
E
A
N

A
I
R

*

C
L
E
A
N

W
A
T
E
R

*

A

C
L
E
A
N

C
O
M
M
U
N
I
T
Y

Dear Representative Sullivan:

The Board of Health of the Greater Anchorage Area Borough has unanimously endorsed SB 24, an act to establish community mental health services as a responsibility of the State Department of Health and Social Services. This bill, or similar legislation, is essential if we are to create stable support for assistance to local communities in sharing responsibility for mental health of our citizens.

A number of communities throughout the state have indicated a willingness to assume such responsibilities in cooperation with the State. Members of the Anchorage Board of Health feel that the State should establish a public policy in statute to assure continuing support as local communities move into this relatively new area of health service responsibility.

Our local administration is considering a proposal to the State for transfer of the SouthCentral Regional Outpatient Clinic to the community for operation. The passage of a Community Mental Health Services Act by the State Legislature will provide assurance of continuing State support for local participation in establishing and maintaining community based mental health services.

Your personal attention and support of this legislation is therefore very important to us.

Sincerely yours,

Hugh Gellert

Hugh Gellert, Chairman
GAAB Board of Health



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature
House

CSSB 24

Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99801
May 25, 1975

Sue Donahue
Alaska Nurses Association, District I
P.O. Box 4-1681
Anchorage, Alaska 99509

Dear Ms. Donahue:

Thank you for your letter expressing the Alaska Nurses Association's support of CSSB 24, the Community Mental Health Services bill.

Our committee passed this bill out with a unanimous "do pass" recommendation on April 30. It is presently in the House Finance Committee. Our strong support was in recognition of the need to establish a public policy in statute to ensure continuing support for local mental health programs.

Once again, thank you for contacting me on this matter and please continue to do so when matters concern you in the future.

Yours truly,

Susan Sullivan, Chairwoman
House HESS Committee

SS:1a

SB 24
In H. Finance

A.N.A. District I
Anchorage, Alaska
April 28, 1975

TO: The Honorable Susan Sullivan
Chairman, Health, education and Social Services Committee

FROM: Sue Donahue, chairman
Legislative Committee District I Alaska Nurses' Association

District I of the Alaska Nurses' Association has voted to support CSSB 24, the Community Mental HEALTH Services bill. We therefore urge your support and interest in furthering action on this bill during this legislative session.

Sue Donahue/LA