

**Twin Falls Health Initiatives Trust
Board Meeting 10/15/09**

Location: City Council Overflow Room, Twin Falls, ID

Present: Curtis Eaton, Jamie Kelley-Kinyon, Terry McCurdy, Priscilla Martens, Jeff Blick, Jay Dodds, Rene LeBlanc, John Hathaway and Patty Kleinkopf.

Absent: Tom Mikesell and Robert Valentine.

Staff: Misti Lockie

Guests: Rene Avram, Mike Williams and Kelly Anderson of Zions Bank; Dean Siebel of Edward Jones

Presentation from Zions Bank

Guests from Zions Banks discussed their ideas for investment products for TFHIT. They presented a packet of information and discussed items with the Board. There was a Q&A session. Ms. Lockie collected their contact information for later discussion.

Mr. Blick had to depart the meeting at 4:25.

Presentation from Edward Jones: Dean Siebel

Mr. Siebel presented his ideas for investments for TFHIT and presented a sample portfolio. He presented the Board with a packet of information. The Board discussed items with him in Q&A session. He explained that the Board would be working with him as a team, he would not make independent investment decisions.

The full Board meeting was called to order at 4:45 pm.

Roll was taken and a quorum was declared.

Minutes from the prior meeting were reviewed. Ms. Martens moved to accept the minutes as written. Mr. McCurdy seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

The Board discussed that it would be advantageous to make sure that all changes, additions or deletions to meeting agendas come through the Board President if they occur prior to its initial publishing. It was noted that if they occur at a certain proximity to the meeting then they must be approved and voted on at the meeting. All agreed it would be fine. Mr. Hathaway moved that all changes, additions or deletions to meeting agendas should be approved by the Board President prior to its initial publishing. Mr. LeBlanc seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Eaton began with a discussion of certificates of deposit. He explained what had occurred thus far and that three had been purchased and another three were being set up.

Mr. Valentine was absent; therefore Mr. Dodds discussed recommendations from Finance Committee on the purchase of CD's. All thought that would be acceptable. Mr. Dodds moved to purchase CD's for a longer term if a one-time withdrawal without penalty can be negotiated. Mr. McCurdy seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

Ms Lockie asked if a board member could go to the banks with her to assist with negotiations of terms.

Mr. McCurdy moved to accept current disbursements. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

Mr. Dodds presented the financials for August and September. He moved to accept them as presented. Mr. McCurdy seconded the motion. All in were favor. The motion carried.

Mr. Dodds provided an update on the audit. Mr. Valentine held a conference with Steve Peterson (CPA and Attorney), and discussed the difference in opinion with auditors on certain ways of reporting. The auditors say that the initial \$15 million should be reported as income for that year, and the Finance Committee thinks that it should be reported equity. The Finance Committee recommendation is that it would be helpful to meet with Ware & Associates again to determine if they can reconsider their reporting opinion. If they are not willing to reconsider, then the Board can decide at a later date to get additional opinion.

Mr. Dodds also moves that we clarify in minutes to define that in regard to spending 90% of "net income" that it means 90% of interest income minus expenses plus accumulated income. Ms. Kleinkopf seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

The Board discussed the corpus and intent of the Board for the future of the funds.

Ms. Kleinkopf also clarified CD funds transfers: \$490,000 has been transferred to allow purchase of the first three CD's, and another \$720,000 will be transferred soon to facilitate the purchase of the next three. In addition, she reported that the form 990 was mailed on time.

The Board discussed funds and what is available currently for grants this year.

The Board discussed how to proceed with the presentations and investments information from that day. Mr. Dodds suggested that there should be some discussion on them, and that more information was needed to make any decisions.

Mr. Eaton suggested that the item be returned to the Finance Committee for further action. Mr. Dodds agreed the Committee could provide specific recommendations and restrictions on each item and then the Board can decide after obtaining more information from Zions Bank on their items.

Ms. Martens moved that the Finance Committee prepare parameters and dollar amounts for working with Edward Jones and obtains additional info with regard to Zions and brings a recommendation to Board. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

Mr. Hathaway had to leave at this time.

P&G Committee

Ms. Kelley-Kinyon began discussion of the Interfaith Volunteer Caregivers budget change request. This had been submitted previously but the numbers were incorrect. The P&G Committee recommended approving this request. There was Board discussion of the item. Ms. Kelley-Kinyon moved to approve the request. Mr. McCurdy seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried. Ms. Lockie will notify them of the decision.

Ms. Kelley-Kinyon moved on to discussion of the comparison of all budget change requests that have been submitted thus far. She explained to the Board how the Committee worked through each request and reasons for the approvals and disapprovals. She explained that the Family Health Services budget request, which had been denied, was done so because the items were originally not approved in the initial grant process. Therefore the Committee and Board could not approve them at a later date with the budget request change. The other Grantees that submitted budget change requests did not have that same situation. There was Board discussion.

Mr. Eaton commented that this is a good comparison to complete and important information to review. He asked if FHS would be resubmitting their budget change request, as it had been decided at the last meeting that they could choose to do so. Ms. Kleinkopf stated that FHS is not prepared to resubmit anything at this time. There was discussion, and Mr. Eaton stated that the item would be on the agenda for next meeting.

Ms. Kelley-Kinyon noted that it is necessary that an agenda item be included sometime in the near future to discuss ANY criteria or ANY items that would be excluded. This should be resolved before the next grant cycle.

GRANT DISCUSSION

Mr. Eaton presented a request from the Mustard Tree for a carryover of funds. There was discussion and a consensus by the Board that this money cannot be carried forward. Mr. McCurdy moved that these funds be returned as contracted. Ms. Kelley-Kinyon seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

The Board discussed and presented questions on conflicts of interest. There was discussion about items and/or reasons there would be a conflict. Ms. Lockie read the recommendation from Tom Robertson that was presented last year to clarify.

Patty remarked that she declared a conflicted on CSI, SILC, SLMVF, Regence, and FHS.

Ms. Kelley-Kinyon clarified that absent board members need to submit any questions they might have to Ms. Lockie so she can get them resolved prior to the next meeting. Ms. Lockie will send a reminder to those Board members who are not present so that they can submit any questions they might have.

There was Board discussion on how to proceed with the list of grants; whether or not to only fund in full or to allow partial funding; and how to review. The Board consensus was to review every grant on the list, then select those that will move forward for further discussion at the November meeting for final decisions. Those that are not selected at this meeting will receive no further review and be dropped from consideration.

Grant Discussion:

The Board discussed #18 Because of Jesus Ministries. Mr. McCurdy moved to not consider this grant application because it is incomplete. Ms. Kleinkopf seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

The Board discussed #9 Jubilee House.

The Board noted that:

- This project has problems with sustainability.
- The personnel costs make it look as though they cannot sustain these positions without TFHIT funding.
- The program serves a very small amount of people.

The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #12 Girl Scouts (Mr. McCurdy stepped out during this discussion):

The Board noted that:

- This is supplanting their regular program.
- Their planning is not complete yet, they are not prepared to do complete project.
- This ends in April – therefore the funding and grant cycle is off.

The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #10 CORE:

The Board noted that:

- This project serves a very small amount of people.
- It lacks clear objectives and outcomes.
- Budget lacked detail.
- It wasn't clear on budget if they were asking for money to help clients while waiting for their benefits to kick in?

- Sustainability is unsure.

There was a vote held: 2 were in favor and 5 against. The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #13 SLMVF (Ms. Kelley-Kinyon stepped out during this discussion):

The Board noted that:

- Budget not completed.
- High cost for the number of women served.
- There is a digital unit already out there, why do they need another unit?
- A new facility is being built, so they would be buying a refurbished unit to use only for the next 18 months?
- The low-income population is being met at Renaissance Center.

Ms. Kleinkopf chose to remove herself from discussion because of conflict of interest; therefore this application could not be voted on because of lack of quorum. **This grant is selected to move forward for further review.**

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

- Why was the grant application not submitted by the St. Lukes Magic Valley Regional Medical Center directly? Is there a specific reason it was submitted by/through the St. Luke's Magic Valley Health Foundation?

The Board discussed #15 Hospice Visions:

The Board noted that:

- There is a high percentage of non Twin Falls County residents.
- The facility is actually located in Jerome County.

There was a vote held: 2 vote in favor, 5 vote against. The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #3 CASA (Mr. McCurdy stepped out during discussion):

The Board noted that:

- The budget is heavily dependent on TFHIT funding.
- If they were to focus funding in one or two areas it would strengthen proposal.

There was a vote held: 1 vote in favor, 5 vote against. The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #16 Tob/Alc Div Court (Mr. McCurdy stepped out during discussion):

The Board noted that:

- There is strong need
- Match, sustainability plan and collaboration need work.
- There are a high number of people served.

All vote in favor to select this grant to move forward for further review.

The Board discussed #1 Walkin the Talk (Mr. McCurdy stepped out during discussion):

The Board noted that:

- The relationship between curriculum and health outcomes unclear.

- It is difficult to tell if the school district is on board or not?
- There is lack of collaboration.
- Statistics were not local.
- This is supplanting.

The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #11 IFVCG:

The Board noted that:

- There is a problem with sustainability – funding personnel continuously.
- They are asking for more than 50% of the Exec Director’s salary and 80% of assistant salary.
- How many TF Cty residents are actually being served? Serves many counties.

There was a vote held: 4 vote in favor, 2 vote against. **This grant is selected to move forward for further review.**

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. The grant application shows that there will be a 5-month wait before the assistant is hired, or before he/she can start the position. If there is a large need for this position, please explain why are you waiting?
2. Is this marketing position the same one that was recently approved in a Budget Change Request for last year's funding?
3. Previously, before grant funds were received from TFHIT last year, how was IVC of Magic Valley able to obtain funding?
4. Please provide a clearer explanation of how IVC of Magic Valley will be sustainable in the future?
5. How are you better in serving your population after receiving grant funding last year than in the prior years?
6. If you did not get funded from TFHIT this year, how would you obtain funding and/or continue operations?

The Board discussed that it might be important to require organizations to sit out a year if they are funded for 3 years consecutively.

The Board discussed #17 Boys & Girls Club (Mr. Dodds stepped out during discussion):

The Board noted that:

- It would have been helpful to have more match.
- The catered luncheon seemed a bit expensive.
- Is this supplanting payroll?

This grant is selected to move forward for further review.

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. How/where did your organization obtain funding previously?
2. Is your organization hiring new staff for this project, or would grant funds be supplanting a salary that is already currently being paid?
3. What is the role of the Executive Director of the Club? Would grant funds be used to pay for new duties for this position, or just help to pay for salary already being paid?

The Board discussed #14 SCPHD (Mr. LeBlanc stepped out during discussion):

The Board noted that:

- There are concerns about how clients know about services.
- How do they know this will reach the target population?
- A lot of money spent on advertising.

There was a vote held: 3 vote in favor, 3 vote against. **This grant is selected to move forward for further review.**

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. What data does your organization have to show that the target population will respond to advertising for this service?
2. How will SCPHD collaborate with other community groups to reach the target population for this service?
3. Does SCPHD screen for those patients who are just within Twin Falls County? Does SCPHD know what percentage of its clients for this project would be from TF Cty?
4. Would the tasks for this project be new duties for the staff nurse, or would grant funds be used to help pay for an existing salary and duties?

Board discusses #6 TF County SOS (Mr. McCurdy stepped out during discussion):

The Board noted that:

- This grant is not appropriate for TFHIT funding.

The Board consensus is that this is not a grant to consider funding in full, and therefore is not selected for further review.

The Board discussed #8 TF County TARC:

The Board noted that:

- Needed more budget detail.

This grant is selected to move forward for further review.

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. Are you paying TARC staff for these services with this \$40,000, or other providers being contracted in the community?
2. Please submit a more detailed, itemized budget.
3. How much is the client expected to pay for these services? If anything?
4. Where does TARC recover the recoverable? In the grant application, the statement "This is the expected unrecoverable cost of treatment" is made. Please explain what is meant by that statement.

At this time, Ms. Kleinkopf left the meeting because she could not comment on any further grants to be discussed.

The Board discussed #4 FHS:

The Board noted that:

- This is an expansion of services.
- This project is filling a gap.

This grant is selected to move forward for further review.

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. Please define the measurable outcomes in more detail. What impact will this project have on community health?
2. Is FHS aware of the Regence Dental Program and CSI SMILE program and does it have a plan to collaborate?

The Board discussed #2 Regence:

This grant is selected to move forward for further review.

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. How will Regence Caring Foundation for Children advertise these services?
2. Is your organization collaborating with any other similar programs in the area?
3. How will your organization ensure access to service?

The Board discussed #7 SILC:

This grant is selected to move forward for further review.

The Board discussed #5 CSI Smile (Mr. Eaton stepped out during discussion):

Due to lack of quorum, **this grant is selected to move forward for further review.**

The following questions will be submitted to the applicant:

1. Please explain the scholarship program; will this be based on financial need? How do individuals qualify?

The following grants (listed by number) will move forward for further research and discussion: 13, 16, 11, 4, 17, 14, 8, 2, 7 and 5 for a total of \$581,134.00. The Board consensus is to take forward these recommendations for final decision at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 pm.

