

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

FINDINGS

Finding #1: Plumas County did not submit the Annual MHSA Revenue and Expenditure Report (RER) for FY 2015-2016 and FY 2016-2017 by December 31st following the close of each fiscal year (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5899; California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3510).

Recommendation #1: Since the program review, Plumas County has submitted the Fiscal Year 2015-16 and Fiscal Year 2016-17 RERs. Plumas County must submit its Fiscal Year 2017-18 RER by December 31, 2018 and all subsequent fiscal year RERs by December 31st following the close of the fiscal year.

Finding #2: Plumas County submitted a Fiscal Year 2016-17 Annual Update to the MHSOAC that the Plumas County Board of Supervisors did not approve. The Board of Supervisors must approve all three-year program and expenditure plans and annual updates submitted to the MHSOAC (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5847).

Recommendation #2: The County must submit to the MHSOAC and DHCS an annual update that the Plumas County Board of Supervisors approved prior to the beginning of Fiscal Year 2019-20.

Finding #3: Plumas County did not assess its own capacity to implement the programs and services described in the Community Services and Supports Component of the last three-year program and expenditure plan (California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3650(a)(5)).

Recommendation #3: Plumas County must incorporate an assessment of its own capacity to implement the programs and services described in the CSS component of its three program and expenditure plan or annual update submitted to the MHSOAC for Fiscal Year 2019-20. The assessment must address all components of California Code or Regulations, Title 9, Section 3650(a)(5).

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

Finding #4: Plumas County did not report on the achievement of performance outcomes for services described in the CSS Component of the 2017-2020 Three-Year Program and Expenditure Plan (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5848). Plumas County reported achievement of performance outcomes for only one program, (First 5), in the draft 2017-2018 Annual Update which provided performance outcomes.

Recommendation #4: Plumas County must identify performance objectives and measures the County plans to achieve with each program and/or service described in CSS Component of the Fiscal Year 2019-20 three-year program and expenditure plan and annually thereafter. Plumas County must report on achievement of those performance objectives and measures in the Fiscal Year 2020-21 three-year program and expenditure plan or annual update and annually thereafter.

Finding #5: Plumas County did not report on the achievement of performance outcomes for services described in the CSS component of the 2017-2020 Three-Year Program and Expenditure Plan (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5848 and California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3755).

Recommendation #5: Plumas County must identify performance objectives and measures the county plans to achieve with each prevention and early intervention program described in the PEI Component of the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Three-Year Program and Expenditure Plan or Annual Update and annually thereafter. Plumas County must report on achievement of those performance objectives and measures in the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Three Program and Expenditure Plan or Annual update and annually thereafter.

Finding #6: Plumas County does not designate a Personal Services Coordinator (PSC) or Case Manager to be the single point of responsibility for each Full Service Partnership (FSP) client (California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3620(f)).

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

Recommendation #6: Plumas County must develop policies and procedures and/or other documents that demonstrate Plumas County is assigning, to each individual enrolled in a full service partnership, a PSC, Case Manager, or other qualified individual known to the client and/or family as the single point of responsibility for the Full Service Partner client.

Finding #7: Plumas County does not ensure that the PSC, Case Manager, or other qualified individual known to the client and/or family is available to respond 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to provide after-hour interventions (California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3620(i)).

Recommendation #7: Plumas County must develop policies and procedures and/or other documents that demonstrate the PSC, Case Manager, or other qualified individuals known to the client and/or family is available to respond 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to provide after-hour interventions.

Finding #8: Plumas County does not ensure that the PSC/Case Managers are responsible for developing an Individualized Services and Supports Plan (ISSP) with the client and, when appropriate, the client's family (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5600.2 and California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3620(h)(1)).

Recommendation #8: Plumas County must develop policies and procedure and/or other documents that demonstrate the PSC and Case Managers assigned to Full Service Partners are responsible for developing an ISSP with the client and, when appropriate, the client's family.

Finding #9: The County does not ensure its PSC/Case Managers assigned to FSP clients are culturally and linguistically competent or, at a minimum, educated and trained in linguistic and cultural competence and have knowledge of available resources within the client/family's

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

racial/ethnic community. California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3620(h)(1).

Recommendation #9: Plumas County must develop policies and procedures and/or other documents that demonstrate PSCs and/or case managers are, at a minimum, educated and trained in linguistic and cultural competence and have knowledge of available resources within the client's and/or family's racial/ethnic community.

Finding #10: Plumas County does not dedicate at least fifty-one percent of funds allocated to the CSS component toward full service partnerships (California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3620(c)).

Recommendation #10: Plumas County must develop and implement policies and procedures to ensure that at least 51% of the money the County anticipates spending on programs and services within the CSS component of the three-year program and expenditure plan and/or annual update is for full service partnerships.

Plumas County should develop and implement accounting and cost allocation policies and procedures that will allow the County to allocate costs to each Full Service Partnership Program identified in the three-year program and expenditure plan and/or annual update.

Finding #11: Plumas County did not report the estimated number of clients the County plans to serve in each FSP targeted age group for the Fiscal Year 2017-18 three-year program and expenditure plan or annual update (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5847(e) and California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3650(a)(3)).

Recommendation #11: Plumas County must report the estimated number of clients the County plans to serve in each FSP targeted age group in its Fiscal Year 2019-20 Three Year Program and Expenditure Plan or Annual Update.

Finding #12: The County did not furnish evidence showing that 51% of PEI funds were allocated to individuals 25 years or

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

younger (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5846 and California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Section §3706(b)).

Recommendation #12: The County must develop and implement policies and procedures to ensure that at least 51% of PEI funds are used to serve individuals 25 or younger.

The County should develop and implement accounting and cost allocation policies and procedures that will allow the County to allocate a majority of PEI funds to serve individuals 25 or younger.

Finding #13: The County does not have a designated WET Coordinator that meets the job specifications set regarding coordinating WET programs, acting as a liaison to the department and incorporating MHSA General Standards Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5898 and California Code of Regulations, Title 9, Sections §3320, 3810).

Recommendation #13: The County is required to designate an individual to act as a WET Coordinator and ensure that the individual meets the job specifications set regarding coordinating WET programs, acting as liaison to the department and incorporating MHSA General Standards.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

Item #1: Without a current RER, DHCS cannot evaluate that expenditures are consistent between the MHSA funding components and the currently approved Three-Year Program and Expenditure Plan (Plan) and/or Annual Update (Update). The RER Summary Worksheet is used to report the expenditures of each MHSA funded program for each component.

Suggested Improvement #1:

1. DHCS recommends listing out all programs, like CSS and PEI; on the RER Summary Worksheet by component. For example:
 - a. All CSS programs should be listed out individually by program name, not grouped together and listed on the worksheet as 'CSS programs' or left blank.

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

- b. The individual listed programs on the RER should match the program names as identified in the Plan, in addition to the program names on the Plan's fiscal budget pages.
2. DHCS recommends identification and separation of funding components; like CSS and PEI programs.
3. DHCS recommends establishing a system of tracking expenditures for FSP's and for each MHSA funding component.
 - a. The majority of CSS funds (51%) should be used for FSP's.
 - b. At least 51% of the PEI funds should be used to serve individuals who are 25 years or younger. Programs that serve parents, caregivers, or family members with the goal of addressing MHSA outcomes for children or youth at risk of, or with early onset of a mental illness can be counted as meeting this requirement.

**Suggested
Improvement #2:**

1. DHCS recommends the county develop and implement a defined MHSA program. Such program should identify processes and supports including:
 - a. Policies and procedures that incorporate MHSA general principles
 - b. Requirements and components (CPPP, CSS, PEI, INN, WET and CFTN)
 - c. Funding and reporting requirements
 - d. Plans and updates
 - e. Other needs such as staffing, performance objectives and outcomes
2. The program should also address how the county will evaluate the effectiveness of services/programs they deliver and their on-going quality improvement strategies.
3. DHCS recommends staff education on MHSA program training for all mental health employees and service providers involved in the complete delivery of services to recipients of MHSA programs; and documentation of annual training.
4. DHCS recommends MHSA program training to all new employees; and documentation of annual training.

**MHSA Performance Contract Review Report
Plumas County Program Review
FY 2017-18**

5. DHCS recommends MHSA program training to the board of supervisors; and documentation of annual training.
6. DHCS recommends the county evaluate their service provider contract deliverables at least quarterly to confirm the scope of work has been performed and that the measureable outcomes are consistent with the goals and objectives of the services/program of the currently approved Plan and Update.