

Meeting Minutes

MHSOAC SERVICES COMMITTEE  
August 10, 2009

Committee Members

Beth Gould, Chair  
Sean Zullo  
Rocco Cheng\*  
Fran Edelstein  
James Gilmer  
Sandra Goodwin\*  
Michael Oprendeck  
Peter Manoleas\*  
Terri Restelli-Deits  
Janice Rollins-Dean\*  
Karen Todoroff \*  
David Weikel \*

Interested Parties in Attendance

Jamie Hannigan  
Commissioner Henning

Other MHSOAC Staff

Bev Whitcomb  
Filomena Yeroshek  
Carol Hood  
Jose Oseguera  
Renee Jackson

MHSOAC Services Committee  
Staff

Ann Collentine  
Dee Lemonds  
Vivian Lee

\* Persons participating by phone.

Michele Violet  
Nicki Mehta  
George Montgomery  
Dede Ranahan  
Catherine Campisi  
Stephanie Welch  
Stacie Hiramoto  
Zoey Todd  
Ann Arneill-Py  
Lin Benjamin

### Welcome & Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Gould. The workgroup members were welcomed, and participants, as well as interested parties introduced themselves and stated their affiliation.

### Opening Statements

Ann Collentine provided background on the PEI Statewide Projects Workgroup recommendations regarding PEI statewide project funds, and the two key policy questions addressed by the workgroup for review by the Services Committee. As explained the goal for the meeting was to take action on two workgroup recommendations regarding approval of PEI statewide project funds. Specifically the two key policy questions to be considered were:

1. What should the Commission require of counties to receive PEI statewide project funds intended for Suicide Prevention, Stigma and Discrimination Reduction and Student Mental Health?
2. On what basis should the MHSOAC review and approve/deny the three county requests to spend PEI statewide project funds on local projects?

A power point was provided for the members and interested parties that described the decision making process of the workgroup and its recommendations to the Services Committee. As described the workgroup considered four options with regard to Question 1 above.

### **Question 1 – Options Considered:**

**Option 1:** *Require* county assignment of PEI statewide project funds to DMH or a JPA.

**Option 2:** Require that local, regional and/or multi-county projects, including statewide efforts, funded with PEI statewide project funds conform only to **existing** PEI guidelines.

**Option 3A:** Require that local, regional, and/or multi-county projects that may include statewide efforts, funded with PEI statewide project funds **conform to the strategic direction** identified in the California Strategic Plans for Suicide Prevention and Stigma and Discrimination Reduction, and the concepts identified in the consensus document for the Student Mental Health Initiative **and require** that there be **collaboration** with other counties.

**Option 3B:** require that local, regional, and/or multi-county projects that may include statewide efforts, funded with PEI statewide project funds **conform to the strategic direction** identified in the California Strategic Plans for Suicide Prevention and Stigma and Discrimination Reduction, and the concepts identified in the consensus document for the Student Mental Health Initiative **and encourage collaboration** with other counties.

As described in the power point the PEI Statewide Projects Workgroup had discarded Option 2 above. While there was some support for Option 3B, the consensus of the workgroup was to support Option 3A. Option 1 also had strong support.

**Question 2 – Options Considered:**

**Option 1:** Review and approve/deny the expenditure of PEI statewide project funds in Shasta, Nevada and San Joaquin counties based on general PEI plan requirements available at the time of plan submission.

**Option 2:** Review and approve/deny the expenditure of PEI statewide project funds in Shasta, Nevada and San Joaquin counties based on plan requirements ***yet to be established.***

As described the workgroup recommendation to the Services Committee is to adopt Option 1 above with the caveat that ***this decision only applies to these three counties and will not establish precedent for other counties.***

Ms. Collentine explained that due to time constraints committee members would have priority in terms of discussion and comment. Other participants would have an opportunity for input if time allowed.

Following the power point presentation the floor was given to Carol Hood to facilitate discussion of the workgroup recommendations.

**Question 1 Discussion**

Carol focused the committee on the workgroup recommendation on Question 1 and asked if committee members were prepared to make a motion to adopt Option 3A as proposed by the workgroup so that the question could be open for discussion.

Mike Opredek made a motion to adopt Option 3A as the Services Committee recommendation.

Janice Rollins-Dean provided a second to the motion.

**Committee Discussion Re: Motion to Adopt Option 3A**

One committee member expressed disagreement with the material presented and questioned whether there was really consensus about Option 3A. He felt there was equal or greater support for Option 1.

Commissioner Gould indicated that she thought consensus on Option 3A was very clear.

Staff indicated that they had reviewed the tally votes from the previous meeting, and confirmed the outcomes.

Staff explained that regardless of whether the majority of this committee supports Option 3A or Option 1, both positions will be documented and provided to the Commission in preparation for their decision to be made at the August 27 meeting.

A committee member asked about the opinion expressed by Rusty Selix that statutory authority was not required to implement Option 1.

MHSOAC legal counsel indicated that while the Commission has clear statutory authority to approve or deny county PEI plans, they do not have authority to require counties to assign their PEI statewide project funds to DMH, a JPA or some other entity. The MHSOAC provides for counties individually or acting jointly to implement the Act. Legal counsel indicated that Mr. Selix has in public confirmed that he agrees that the Commission did not have authority to require counties to assign their PEI statewide project funds to another entity. While not intending to speak for Mr. Selix legal counsel stated that she understands Mr. Selix's argument is that since the OAC has the authority to approve or deny county PEI plans, the OAC can deny the plans unless the counties assign the funds. Legal counsel indicated that the OAC can not deny plans based on counties not complying with a requirement that the OAC has no authority to require. The result of such action would be a stalemate.

Some committee members commented that their goal would be to see guidelines developed that lead to furthering knowledge and learning across the state.

As a result of a member's question it was confirmed that adopting Option 3A would not set any precedent for requirements associated with the Ethnically and Culturally Specific Programs and Interventions Project (reducing ethnic disparities) still under development.

A member asked for clarification about the difference between requiring the assignment of funds and requiring that plans conform to strategic direction identified.

MHSOAC legal counsel explained that the Act identifies the counties as responsible for implementing programs but indicates that the MHSOAC is responsible for the development of PEI principles and guidelines. Requiring counties to conform to the strategic direction identified is clearly within the authority given the MHSOAC by the Act.

Member comment in support of strong guidelines along with the acknowledgement that CSS requirements made a distinction between small and large counties.

Member comment that discussion among the workgroup indicated that elements of Option 1 may be achieved by adopting Option 3A.

Member comment acknowledging strong support for Option 1, but indicating that they could live with Option 3A if guidelines are very specific and provide a framework to maintain statewide efforts.

Carol Hood clarified that as proposed county plans that conform to **any** strategic direction contained in the consensus documents identified for Suicide Prevention,

Stigma and Discrimination Reduction and Student Mental Health would meet the requirements whether they propose local or state activities.

Member comment that requirements should not prohibit local services.

Member comment that the feelings of committee members who want guidelines to emphasize furthering knowledge should be communicated to the Commission.

Some discussion of the need to draft guideline principles that will direct guideline development. These principles would have to include a definition of **collaboration as required**.

Member suggestion that county assignment of PEI statewide project funds to DMH and/or a JPA would automatically meet the requirement for collaboration. This suggestion was supported by the committee.

Member comment that recommendation should include a clause that guidelines are developed with stakeholder input and that recommendation will not apply to other statewide projects.

Member comments in support of Option 3A if it stays true to statewide projects. Some concern that by offering latitude to counties, the result will be to move away from statewide goals. Opinion expressed that flexibility at the local level should not be at the expense of statewide goals.

CMHDA comment that their PEI Policy Committee will also bring forth a recommendation that would address assignment of PEI statewide project funds to a JPA or other state-level contractor.

Comment in disagreement with contention that Option 1 would require additional statutory authority. Also expressed belief that counties would include PEI statewide projects in their PEI plans as intended rather than see the funds revert if they were required to assign funds to DMH.

Deleted: but acknowledging that such a requirement would likely lead to a stalemate with counties.

Additional comment in support of approving projects that further knowledge without cutting services. Although services may be funded the funds should not be used to supplant.

Comment in support of Option 3A but acknowledging concern that this option may result in certain populations being left out of individual county plans.

CMHDA comment in support of the JPA and its ability to work at a state level noting that something has to be done before the Legislature takes notice and the money disappears.

MHSOAC staff clarifies that the intent for developing guidelines is not to change what is in the strategic plans but to start the process of defining how projects “conform to strategic direction”.

A vote on the motion was called re: Question 1, Option 3A.

Member question about what would happen if the majority of the committee votes no.

Carol Hood clarifies that if the committee voted no on this recommendation we would need to develop another recommendation.

**Committee Vote as follows:**

**Adopt option 3A with revisions**

No	Yes	Abstained
Rocco Cheng	Fran Edelstein	Karen Todoroff
	James Gilmer	
	Sandra Goodwin	
	Peter Manoleas	
	Mike Opredek	
	Terri Restelli-Deits	
	Janice Rollins-Dean	
	David Weikel	
	Sean Zullo	

MHSOAC staff confirms the motion is carried.

Member comment that we should make sure certain age groups are not left out

MHSOAC staff will contact this committee member to ensure that this sentiment is captured.

**Question 2 Discussion**

Carol Hood called for a motion to approve the workgroup recommendation.

Mike Opredek made a motion that the Committee adopt Option 1: Approve/deny the expenditure of PEI statewide project funds in Shasta, Nevada and San Joaquin counties based on general PEI plan requirements available at the time of plan submission and stipulate that this decision only applies to these three counties.

Sean Zullo seconded the motion.

Committee discussion about the importance of not allowing this recommendation to set precedent for other counties.

Question about how other counties might feel about this decision.

County representative indicates that while not speaking for all counties they feel that this decision would be fair.

Member comment that what is fair is different than what is reasonable and equitable. The recommendation that approval be based on the plan requirements seems fair.

**A vote on the motion was called re: Question 2, Option 1.**

All 11 committee members participating voted in favor of the recommendation with revisions.

<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Abstained</b>
	James Gilmer	
	Sandra Goodwin	
	Peter Manoleas	
	Mike Opredek	
	Janice Rollins-Dean	
	Karen Todoroff	
	Sean Zullo	
	Fran Edelstein	
	David Weikel	
	Rocco Cheng	
	Terri Restelli-Deits	

**Minutes of June 17, 2009 Services Committee meeting:**

James Gilmer made a motion to adopt the minutes and Sean Zullo seconded the motion.

Minutes of the June 17, 2009 committee meeting were adopted.

Carol Hood discussed 'Next Steps' with Committee.

Next steps may include: (This is dependent upon action of the Commission on August 27)

1. Drafting the principles that will direct guideline development including defining collaboration.
2. Possibly share draft principles with Services Committee by mid-August.
3. Services Committee to take action on guideline principles at meeting September 9, 2009.
4. If Committee approves principles then presented to Commission at September meeting.

5. If principles adopted by Commission then guidelines will be developed.
6. October MHSOAC meeting – first read on guidelines
7. November MHSOAC meeting – second read on guidelines.

Member asked for clarification as to when staff would have the draft developed and requested that recommendations get out as soon as possible.

Member comment that they want the ability to provide input, and hope members will be heard in the process.

Member comment that there should be full disclosure of the comments/input provided to Committee members.

Some concern expressed about process used to develop principles.

CMHDA suggests that we identify a set of principles that will apply to most of the PEI statewide projects.

Comment that staff strategy presented should be a good place to start.

Commissioner Gould comments that the time for input will be relatively short so responding in a timely way will be very important.

**The meeting was adjourned.**