



Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2010

Radisson Hotel
500 Leisure Lane
Sacramento, Ca 95815

1. **Call to Order**

Chair Poat called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Commissioners in attendance: Chair, Poat, Vice-Chair, Poaster, Commissioners: Gould (joined group at 11 a.m.), Trujillo, Correa (joined group at 10:30 a.m.), Henning, Van Horn, Kahn, Pressley, Vega, Bray, Pating, Hill.

Eleven members were present at the beginning of the meeting and a quorum was established.

3. **Adopt Minutes of April 29, 2010 MHSOAC Meeting**

Commissioner Pating informed the Commission that he was awarded the Public Policy Award of 2010 by the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators (CADPAC). This is for the work done on co-occurring disorders which deals with patients who are the most severely ill.

1. Dr. Pating has been attending Co-Occurring Joint Action Committee (COJAC) meetings between the Departments of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) and Department of Mental Health (DMH.)
2. Under the Commission's PEI Prevention Initiatives, reports have been submitted to the Older Adults Services, Cultural and Linguistic Communities, Statewide Prevention and National Prevention Efforts on integrating substance abuse and mental health together in various forums.
3. A paper was written that was seen but not formally endorsed by the Commission on how to manage co-occurring disorders in the court system.

Commissioner Pating thanked Commission staff, stakeholders, and all those in the room for their efforts and reiterated that CADPAC really appreciated those efforts.

Chair Poat thanked Dr. Pating for his leadership in these efforts. He mentioned that this was the busiest month of the year for our State Legislature and that he didn't anticipate seeing the Commission's Legislative members at this meeting.

Chair Poat discussed Item 4 -- He asked that the item be moved ahead of schedule and presented right before lunch (around 11:45 a.m.) so as to not lose their quorum.

Commissioner Pating mentioned that a quorum would be needed for the potential vote on the Student Mental Health Initiative as well.

Chair Poat mentioned that he would not be available after lunch.

Chair Poat announced that the theme for the day would be a variety of panels bringing the Commission up to date on the first of the priorities that was established for the year. And that is to fund and execute all components of the Mental Health Services Act.

One of the goals was to make sure that funds were getting out from the reserve accounts and bank accounts into actual services. Attention needed to be given on focusing on how the money was getting out into services and on the streets.

Chair Poat updated the Commission regarding Federal Healthcare Reform Act. The Governor has established a task force to coordinate all the state agencies with respect to implementation of the provisions of the Federal Healthcare Act. Secretary Belshé is heading this task force and has assured that the Commission would be a part of the task force.

Chair Poat asked for a consideration of the Minutes of April 29th in Tab 1.

Commissioner Pating requested that on page 10, last sentence, the word “coupons” be changed to “reimbursements”. And on page 11, third paragraph, last sentence, that the last part of this sentence, “present a unified front at this time”, be changed to, “to facilitate implementation of healthcare reform”.

Commissioner Kahn brought up a point of fact that in the minutes there was a reference during the health reform discussion to many of the clients being in the newly eligible group and that they would be in the exchange. And in fact, most who are below 133 percent of poverty level will be in Medicaid and not in the exchange.

MOTION: Upon motion by Commissioner Van Horn, seconded by Commissioner Hill, the Commission approved the April 29, 2010 MHSOAC Minutes, including the changes requested by Commissioners Pating and Kahn.

4. MHSOAC Work Plan, Priority 1: Fund and Execute all MHSA Components

A. Community Services and Supports (CSS)

Chair Poat asked that Sophie Cabrera, Branch Chief, Community Programs Branch, Department of Mental Health and Bertha MacDonald, Acting Section Chief, MHSA Plan Review, Department of Mental Health come forward to present the first segment, the community Services and Supports Program. **Chair Poat** mentioned that CSS it is the largest of the programs and the “bread and butter” of the Act.

Ms. Cabrera discussed the following:

1. Brief Overview of the MHSA

- A. Created by Proposition 63
- B. 1% tax on income in excess of \$1 million
- C. Expands services and emphasizes transformation

1. Community Services and Supports (CSS)
2. Workforce Education and Training (WET)
3. Capital Facilities and Technological Needs (CFTN)
4. Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI)
5. Innovation (INN)

2. CSS Component

A. Community Program Planning

1. Provides a structure & process to Counties for fund utilization
2. Encourages all involved to participate

B. CSS Service Categories

1. Outreach and Engagement
2. General System Development
3. Full Service Partnerships

3. CSS Expenditure

1. Full-Service Partnership (FSP)
2. Outreach & Engagement (O&E)
3. General System Development (GSD)

4. Status

Commissioner Henning asked for an expansion on the actual services received and actual number of consumers touched under the Full Service Partnership (FSP) component.

Commissioner Pressley inquired as to any tracking that is being done as to where funds are actually being spent by the Counties.

Commissioner Kahn commented that he felt that the question went to the issue of characterization of the different kinds of spending that are going on within this component.

Mr. Joseph Kim of DMH stated that it differed on a county-by-county basis.

Chair Poat interjected some clarification by commenting that the question was, what are the measures of success and utilization? And this issue would be instrumental in determining the metrics going forward.

Commissioner Pating commented on the FSPs. Insofar as Outreach and Engagement tracking is concerned he inquired if there existed a form to provide detail on an individual basis regarding consumers.

And **Commissioner Henning** followed by asking if there was a unique identifier per touch.

Commissioner Vega opined that the inquiry was that DMH has a lot of information and that they (DMH) had done a good job providing a general look at component expenditures but that the Commission was interested in a more “granular” look especially for new Commissioners. He said it would be interesting for the Commission to see “annual updates” from the County level.

Chair Poat added that evaluation is one of the hallmarks of what the Commission is doing. Under the leadership of Vice-Chair Poaster the Commission is in the process of

developing the evaluation tool at the present time. The challenge is the sort of information that is collected and how it is collected.

Vice-Chair Poaster stated that it is anticipated that the recommended scope of work for the evaluation project will be in front of the Commission next month. Once approved, an optimistic timeline is a contract by January.

Chair Poat asked the Commissioners to keep this information in mind for next month's meeting.

Ms. Sophie Cabrera informed the Commission that DMH posts all of the county plans on their website for review.

Vice-Chair Poaster inquired about viewing the summary data.

Ms. Sophie Cabrera responded that the summary data isn't posted yet.

Commissioner Kahn commented that more specific, compressed information was needed in order for the Commission to evaluate the success of this initiative.

Mr. Joseph Kim of DMH gave an overview of specific dollars and plans that had been received.

Commissioner Henning asked if the \$3.0 billion as of April 2010 had actually been spent by the Counties. This would give an indication of actually how many services are getting done.

Mr. Kim stated that all Counties are required to submit an Implementation Report with specific funding information to DMH on an annual basis.

Commissioner Henning asked if Mr. Kim had an idea of how much money had actually been expended on CSS in total. Commissioner Henning wanted a differentiation breakdown between received and expended services funded.

Ms. Cabrera added if a County had only spent \$500,000 of \$1 million received then DMH would only give them \$500,000 and they would be directed to spend the money they had not spent. DMH staff will call Counties with large unexpended funds and ask them what they are doing with the money.

Commissioner Henning stated to Chair Poat that the actual dollars spent by Counties is the important number not the \$3.0 billion.

Commissioner Van Horn stated that the Evaluation Committee wanted to know that as well.

Vice-Chair Poaster stated that an update on the financial outlook would be provided to the Commissioners.

Chair Poat asked that the minutes reflect a couple of conclusions about things that the Commission is happy with and some things that needed to be worked on. This would clarify the quality of information as to when program services are actually delivered by DMH.

Commissioner Henning emphasized that he didn't want his words to be interpreted that he was fearful that somebody is squirreling money away or not expending it.

Mr. Mark Refowitz, Deputy Director for Orange County Behavioral Services Agency stated that a certain amount of money was put into prudent reserves by Counties.

Chair Poat mentioned that allotting money in prudent reserves was a good practice insofar that it allowed for some monies to be put aside to better serve people in lean years. **Chair Poat** concluded by stating that the good news is:

1. These programs are up and running
2. We have moved on to the updates

Areas for Improvement:

1. Tracking results insofar as number of individuals actually touched
2. Mine current data

Commissioner Vega reiterated that more specificity regarding CSS Programs and monies spent would be very helpful.

Chair Poat added that there is a plethora of data compiled however it may not be analyzed and presented in the way the Commission would like to see it. Another important thing will be the Commission's leadership in establishing some common measures of outcomes and successes.

Commonly accepted measures would permit the Commission to inform all of the stakeholders in this process.

Commissioner Kahn suggested that the Commission start thinking about this in two different ways.

1. Dashboard performance indicators
2. Evaluation (much more sophisticated)

Chair Poat wanted that point captured as distinguishing between data that would facilitate an ongoing evaluation or measurement of programs versus a dashboard view.

B. CSS Housing

Jane Laciste, Chief, MHSA Plan Review and Community Program Support, Department of Mental Health presented on CSS Housing.

Ms. Laciste reported the following: The MHSA Program has been a highly successful program. This program provides funding for both the capital costs and some operating subsidies to develop permanent supportive housing for persons with serious mental illness who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and who meet the target population definition. Counties assign their MHSA HP funds to CalHFA.

Commissioner Vega wanted the record to reflect that the assigned funds were in the amount of \$390 million and not \$400 million as Ms. Laciste had stated.

Ms. Laciste stated that Permanent Supportive Housing is housing with no limit on the length of stay. Homeless was defined as living on the streets or lacking a fixed, regular and adequate night time residence. Being at risk of homelessness was also defined. The

two housing models are Shared Housing and Rental Housing. There are no income limits for MHSA Housing units, just rental limits.

Program statistics provide that as of May 15, 2010 86 applications have been submitted and these are creating 4,660 units of affordable housing of which 1,342 units are MHSA units. The total development cost exceeds \$1.75 billion.

Commissioner Trujillo commented that as an ex-banker he supported leveraging. He also stated that it created inefficiencies for some of the Counties. **Commissioner Trujillo** asked Ms. Laciste how the Commission could support some of the Counties that could go out and buy something and convert it immediately.

Ms. Laciste responded by stating that the opportunity was currently available to the Counties using General System Development dollars.

Commissioner Vega asked for clarification on the last slide.

Ms. Laciste responded that \$1.75 billion had purchased 4,660 units and of those units 1,342 are MHSA units.

Commissioner Henning felt that the 1,342 units was a very important number in that it showed that DMH was getting a quarter of the housing for less than a quarter of what was spent.

Commissioner Kahn wanted to know if the distribution among the Counties was done by population, by homelessness rates or by some sort of SED calculation.

Ms. Laciste answered that there was formula developed in conjunction with the Department and CMHDA.

Commissioner Pating commented that he was very proud of this housing program and that it costs \$61,000 dollars to provide services for somebody who is homeless and on the street versus \$16,000 when you wrap around the full service partnership including paying for the rent. He also noted that the Governor had released his Ten Year Homeless Plan of which some of the recommendations might be worthwhile for the Commission to look at. **Commissioner Pating** stated that there has been a lot of discussion about how housing first works better than a transitional housing model and he was interested in how many of the programs were housing first approach versus a transitional comparison.

Chair Poat stated that the good news he was taking from today's presentation was that there's lots of people who know at least what they want to do with the money.

Commissioner Pating stated that we had made a one-time commitment of \$400 million and that it might be something that we might want to continue to make investment in.

Chair Poat responded that Commissioner Pating had put his finger on a very interesting policy question moving forward. The question really is whether we approached it from a full partnership concept that's really engendered by this Act. As far as policy issues are concerned should we set aside that we would like to suggest or number two, should that be part of the guidelines that are handed out?

Commissioner Henning added that a lot of the money was going towards operating subsidies so you're not just talking about complete build out.

Chair Poat concurred and added that the capital side of these expenses is one thing and the operating side of it is an entirely different matter.

Commissioner Henning had a question on the Counties that weren't listed.

Ms. Laciste stated that the 11 pages shown depict the applications received to date.

Commissioner Vega asked of the 1,342 units if they are permanently MHSA designated spaces.

Ms. Laciste said they were and that DMH is developing a review protocol for these units.

Commissioner Hill asked if someone knew if Counties were providing this service to homeless people coming out of the local county jails.

Ms. Laciste responded that it was one of the under-served populations. She wasn't sure if that information was available.

In summary **Chair Poat** stated that some great statistics were available and he was hopeful that they could be added to the performance dashboard. The following should be included:

1. The Housing Program is \$400 million dollars.
2. We have 86 applications.
3. There are 4,600 units.
4. There is a leveraging of 5 to 1. (over \$1 billion in funding)

There are 45 Counties with assigned funds and 7 still to go in terms of their decisions. Policy-wise, small Counties should be looked at to see if there is anything the Commission can do to help them. **Commissioner Pating** stated that former Commissioner Prettyman had some thoughts on this subject and recommended that she be consulted. **Chair Poat** stated that she would be brought into the conversation.

C. Workforce Education and Training (WET) Panel Presentation

Chair Poat introduced Mr. Brian Keefer who asked that the panel introduce themselves. They were: **Ms. Zoey Todd**, LCSW, Chief, State Level Prevention, Education and Training, DMH, **Ms. Rita Downs**, Director, Calaveras County Mental Health, **Adrienne Shilton**, California Institute of Mental Health, **Mark Refowitz**, Director, Behavioral Health, Orange County, and **Brian Keefer**, Project Manager, California Mental Health Planning Council.

Mr. Keefer gave an overview of the program.

1. Perception of workforce being ill-equipped
2. There is an unequal distribution of the workforce
3. There are fast-growing diverse populations
4. Policy-wise, a blurred mosaic of occupations
5. Not a lot of occupational analysis done

Future Trends

1. Aging Workforce
2. Increasing Diversity
3. Increase in workers with only 2 years of education beyond high school

The California Mental Health Planning Council got involved in developing the workforce. The Human Resources Committee determined that there were few financial incentives provided to potential workforce candidates. The Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) allocated \$450 million for workforce development. WET funding possibilities were created and agency collaboration contributed to its success.

Ms. Zoey Todd gave an overview of State level workforce education and training activities that are being implemented through the Department.

The overall goal is to develop qualified individuals for the public mental health workforce. Three main strategies include financial incentives, expanding the capacity of psychiatrists and physician assistant training programs, and providing technical assistance to counties.

Program Summary:

1. 1140 graduate students received stipends
2. 597 mental health professionals awarded educational repayment
3. Approximately 600 medical students received training in MHSA principles
4. 45 counties implementing workforce plans

Ms. Adrienne Shilton gave a presentation on Regional Partnership Highlights. **Ms. Shilton** has been serving as a resource for mental health programs statewide to help ensure that WET Programs would be able to complete these programs and successfully implement them. Some Accomplishments of the Regional Partnerships include 1) First Rural MSW weekend program, 2) Funding of online programs and 3) All Regions looking at Core Competency Projects.

Commissioner Pating commented that this was something the counties decided on their own and that they weren't required to form regional partnerships. **Ms. Shilton** concurred and highlighted some of the accomplishments in the different regions. She then provided some local updates. A list of all of the counties that have been approved was provided.

Commissioner Hill wanted to know which counties were not on the list. **Ms. Shilton** answered that the list represented 45 counties.

Commissioner Vega wanted to recognize Ms. Shilton for her work on the consumer employment summit sponsored by Orange County.

Ms. Rita Downs gave a presentation on implementing the MHSA in Calaveras County. She thanked Commissioner Poaster for helping to get funding approved. Additional services for adults and children have been created. Ms. Downs shared a Services Career Ladder with seven peer support positions. Tuition assistance is being provided for staff persons attending classes. Supported Education Initiatives are also being provided.

Best Practices and Lessons Learned

1. Academic advisors are needed
2. Establishing rural mental health curriculum has been difficult
3. Instructor shortages were compensated by using staff guest speakers
4. Meeting with the schools is very important
5. Internship/field placement has been a struggle

Mr. Mark Refowitz made a presentation on Orange County MHSA Workforce Education and Training Program Successes. There was a real shortage of professionals however the real prize was bringing people in with lived experiences with mental illness and a great deal of energy and time has been spent to develop this component. Other components of the Mental Health Services Act have been leveraged particularly capital. Staff was extensively trained at a very early stage by The Village ISA in Long Beach.

Orange County has taken a \$60 million dollar cut in services during the last three years. Orange County makes extensive use of other counties' best ideas. Many staff members wanted help in evidence-based practice which deals with outcomes. There was an onslaught of returning veterans that needed services.

Mr. Refowitz stated that the Harvard of Southern California, Cal State, Fullerton started its own social work program. The Consumer Paid Training Program is one that Mr. Refowitz takes special pride in. Monies were allocated to be able to keep a significant number of Fellows.

In closing **Mr. Refowitz** stated that a lot was learned through the planning process. A Center of Excellence for supporting recovery, improving health and reducing health disparities has been established.

Chair Poat asked that the recommendations be read into the record.

Mr. Keefer mentioned that there were several recommendations:

1. Develop a communication plan for California's public mental health workforce development efforts: conferences, forums, state and federal advocacy venues and the success of local, regional and statewide programs.
2. Advocate to increase federal financial relief for mental health occupations, increasing eligibility for occupations that require two year of education beyond high school.

Commissioner Pating asked if MFTs were not Allied Health. **Mr. Keefer** responded that MFTs are not included in the National Health Service Repayment Program. He also stated that LCSWs are to a certain degree included.

Commissioner Hill asked if a brain drain was happening from this program due to the federal courts rulings on the prison system. **Mr. Keefer** stated that some people were moving into the prison system but that it was not a brain drain but rather a competitive strategy being used by Corrections.

Commissioner Pating thanked Mr. Keefer and the panel for providing very helpful information.

With regards to the state, **Commissioner Pating** requested some numbers on the

predicted gaps, the number of psychiatrists or social workers that are there and the number that are predicted either in one or four years in terms of the allocation of funding. **Commissioner Hill** added that EDD tracks a lot of the numbers.

Commissioner Pating asked whether the regional collaboration will coordinate with the JPA in any way. In addition, there is a role as a Commission to do something at the state level.

Commissioner Van Horn stated that we are not suffering a brain drain in that most people who want to work in Corrections don't fit very well in a recovery-oriented system.

The key for the Commission is to keep the jobs attractive and deal with the issue of burn out.

Commissioner Pating added that the brain drain insofar as psychiatrists were concerned was that the CDCR is paying about 130 to 150 percent of what the community was paying.

D. Capital Facilities and Technology Presentation

Ms. Jane Laciste and Ms. Patricia Preciado, DMH, presented on the Capital Facilities/Technological Needs (CFTN) component. **Ms. Laciste** stated that this component provides infrastructure monies. The current distribution of monies is 50 percent to Technological Needs and 37 percent to Capital Facilities with a 13 percent undecided segment.

Ms. Preciado spoke about technology. Two goals were stated:

1. A focus into a client and family empowerment.
2. Modernization and integration of transmission systems.

Ms. Laciste noted that the Commissioners had a printout of what has been received so far by county.

Commissioner Henning stated that he had been struggling with capital facilities. When he sees the amounts of money that haven't been spent he becomes very concerned. **Ms. Laciste** responded that everything was based on local needs and local decisions. **Commissioner Henning** reiterated that there must be a local need for capital facilities. He was having trouble understanding why there was such a problem getting these monies out to the counties. **Chair Poat** added that it was not the responsibility of the presenters. **Commissioner Henning** responded that it must be a systemic problem but that the Commission was looking at a reversion that was going to happen within four years.

Commissioner Kahn added that to the extent that this was being tied up in trying to create electronic medical records et cetera he didn't know how tied up it was. He was trying to look down the list and see. This is something that the Commission should seek answers on.

Commissioner Trujillo commented that it also appears to be a different way to use money. There are soft costs and major costs associated with this component. This might cause a delay on how the monies were being spent.

Commissioner Henning responded that he had no evidence for that.

Commissioner Trujillo said he would find out what was causing some of the delays and see if the Commission can address them. He stated that he wished to sit down with the presenters and hash it out.

Chair Poat thanked Commissioner Trujillo for his efforts.

Vice-Chair Poaster stated that Commissioner's Trujillo's question as to what the issues involved were is a legitimate question and inquiring as to whether the Commission could help was a good thing.

Public Comment

Kathleen Derby thanked the Commission for the information presented at the meeting. Integrating the values of the MHSA was more critical than ever due to the budget crisis.

Ann Arneill-Py commented on a proposal made by the Commissioners regarding developing a dashboard for evaluating the Mental Health Services Act. The Planning Council is working on exactly that in collaboration with the Commission's Evaluation Committee. Three domains have been identified: employment, housing and justice involvement. Indicators for the County Mental Health System have been developed.

Commissioner Pating thanked Ms. Arneill-Py for coming to the Service Committee and supporting Brian Keefer's work.

Steve Leoni wanted to bring to the Commissioners' attention that public transit to the current meeting site was not very convenient. **Chair Poat** stated that the normal meeting place was not available and that this site was only because of that circumstance.

5. Closed Session

[The Commission went into Closed Session to discuss various personnel matters, per Government Code Section 11126(a).]

6. Approval of Submitted Plans

Ann Collentine presented four plans recommended for approval:

1. Amador County PEI Plan (\$417,195.00 - requested amount)
2. Madera County Intervention Plan (\$854,297.00 - requested amount)
3. San Francisco Innovation Plan (\$4,200,900.00 - requested amount)
4. Sonoma County Innovation Plan (\$1,723,769.00 - requested amount)

Commissioner Vega had a question on "Adapt the Wrap" because it is a privately owned, copyrighted program and he wanted to know if it was going to be purchased from the owner since no mention of it was made in the plan.

MOTION: A motion was made by Vice-Chair Poaster, seconded by Commissioner Hill and the Commission unanimously approved the four plans.

7. MHSOAC Work Plan, Priority 1: Fund and Execute all MHSA Components (continued from before lunch)

E. Prevention and Early Intervention Presentation

Ann Collentine presented the Prevention and Early Intervention update and the update on

PEI statewide projects.

1. PEI Today

A. 56 Plans Approved

B. 17 PEI Prudent Reserve Requests

2. PEI Trends -- 223 Programs from 32 Approved Plans

3. Critical Issues

a) Regulations

b) Annual Update for 2011/12

c) PEI Evaluation

d) Slow Implementation of Plans

e) Staffing Priorities

Commissioner Vega wanted to know why only 59 percent of disparities are listed. **Ann Collentine** responded that it was because there was a specific program called, A Disparity In Access Program whereas all categories are in an overlay that has to reduce mental health disparities.

Chair Poat wanted to know if the plans would make it to the Commission in July. If the deadline could not be met Chair Poat asked Ms. Collentine to inform him of such. He mentioned that the Commission was not fully up to speed on what's going on with the counties.

Commissioner Pating stated that with regards to PEI it was a little bit more complicated because there really isn't an evaluation matrix. He suggested that the Evaluation Committee start thinking about two problems: (1) For PEI, the results are going to be hard to show the impact of prevention; and (2) what would be the measures.

Vice-Chair Poaster asked Chair Poat if his question was around the slow implementation or was it something else. **Chair Poat** responded that he just wanted to make sure the Commission is aware of any barriers that might exist to moving forward and, if so, if it's something the Commission can deal with then it should.

Commissioner Van Horn stated that the barriers that exist are because these are complicated plans and are new things that haven't been done before. A joint subcommittee between services for establishing a baseline for evaluation of PEI would be a good idea.

Commissioner Pating asked Ms. Collentine if she was suggesting that there is data that the Commission could already get out of the annual reports or the way the Commission asks for information in the annual reports could provide the necessary data. **Ms. Collentine** thought that both were possible but in terms of looking at the upcoming 2011/12 Annual Report we need to be more thoughtful about what type of data the Commission can get and to make sure that the data is useful to the Commission and the counties.

Chair Poat asked what the difference was between the annual reports and the overall

evaluation effort put together by Commissioner Poaster. **Vice-Chair Poaster** thought that this would become a component of the overall evaluation. Insofar as evaluation of PEI, the first thing will just be implementation data. **Commissioner Pating** stated that the actual head count data would be very difficult to come by because of nebulous global prevention efforts.

Chair Poat suggested that in the interest of precision of wording that the Commission note that the "Slow Implementation of Plans", he wasn't sure that he would express it in that way. He would express it by saying that "the start up time has been considerable," the distinction being that if it's just slow implementation that would mean something different to him than the fact that programs are being ramped up. **Ms. Collentine** agreed and stated she would rephrase it as, "Start Up Has Been Difficult".

Chair Poat asked if there was anything the Commission could do to help in the process to ensure that the start up is catching up with the money. **Ms. Collentine** commented that there was information available that could be mined a little bit to see if there were any significant trends. **Chair Poat** responded that he would park this particular issue with a fall check up to make sure adequate progress was being made. **Commissioner Pating** stated that he had spoken with Pat Ryan and asked if she would be willing to provide a sample. **Vice-Chair Poaster** commented that the Commission had the capacity of mining the data. **Chair Poat** asked what the decision was, to ask for something next month or to park it until fall. **Vice-Chair Poaster** responded that he understood Ms. Collentine to say that it would take the summer to do the analysis so October would give the Commission a good idea.

Stephanie Welch, California Mental Health Directors Association, said that she wanted to reiterate that in the Commission's review of the annual plans this information is looked at and she would encourage the staff to do that level of analysis.

Chair Poat parked the item until October.

Commissioner Vega added that prevention and early intervention is transforming the world and that the Commission is leading the country and the world in this area. **Chair Poat** commented that Commissioner Vega made an excellent point and that the Commission was trying to give visibility to some really good things going on right now.

F. Innovation (INN)

Dr. Deborah Lee, MHSOAC Consulting Psychologist, made a presentation on Innovation. The MHSA states that county mental health programs shall develop plans for innovative programs that serve the four purposes of:

1. Increase access to underserved groups
2. Promote interagency collaboration
3. Increase access to services
4. Increase quality and outcome of services

Currently there are 16 Innovation Plans approved and four additional ones in-house right now for review. The top innovation category trend is innovation in peer services including crisis responses. The major success so far is that counties and communities are

innovating. There are many challenges associated with innovation and three things must happen: 1) Support for the learning, 2) Support to communicate the results, and 3) Support to sustain the successful innovations.

Critical MHSOAC Actions are as follows:

1. Approve county innovation programs
2. Staff approval of additional county funding through annual updates
3. Adopt Service Committee recommendations regarding regulations
4. Adopt Service Committee recommendations regarding training & technical assistance

Commissioner Van Horn commented that the innovation plans are time limited and that there is a reversion problem. **Chair Poat** concurred and stated that it was an excellent point.

G. PEI Statewide Programs Update Presentation

Ann Collentine made a presentation on PEI Statewide Programs Update. PEI funds were set aside for four years for a total of \$244 million. Five PEI Statewide Programs have been identified.

MHSOAC Critical issues:

1. Within the next month the Commission will design a review tool for the statewide programs
2. Staff will be dedicated to providing training and technical assistance to the counties regarding the guidelines and to collaborate with the Department of Mental Health and the JPA.

H. Student Mental Health Initiative

Commissioner Gould and **Ms. Carol Hood** made a presentation on Student Mental Health Initiative. This is a non-controversial issue but in the interest of transparency it has been brought back before the Commission. **Ms. Hood** stated that the guidelines issued were out of synch with the Student Mental Health Paper because the paper that had been approved by the Commission was issued with an assumption that all of the statewide PEI funds would be assigned to DMH and that DMH would handle the grant process for the Student Mental Health Initiative. Since that situation has changed the Commission has looked at making the minimum number of updates that it could.

Some Changes Made:

1. Eliminate out-dated timelines
2. Update language
3. Make minor revisions for clarity
4. Change evaluation from state to JPA or multi-county collaborative
5. Recommended funding all three higher education systems
6. Eliminate matching requirements for higher education initiatives

7. Add language from PEI guidelines encouraging leveraging

Commissioner Gould stated that she thought the Commission would see some projects rolled out fairly quickly and she recommended that the Commission adopt the revisions. **Vice-Chair Poaster** congratulated Commissioner Gould, Commissioner Pating, Ms. Hood and all the staff and recommended that the Commission adopt the recommendations.

Public Comment

Serena Clayton, Executive Director, California Schools Health Centers Association, stated that they were involved in the original group that formulated the Student Mental Health Initiative. She voiced their support for the revised concept paper.

Commissioner Pating said that one of the principles of the MHSA is to do whatever it takes and he thanked Commissioner Gould and the staff.

Chair Poat added his thanks to everyone involved and asked for a verbal vote.

MOTION: Upon motion by Commissioner Trujillo, seconded by Commissioner Pressley the Commission unanimously adopted the Updated SMHI Paper.

Chair Poat needed to excuse himself from the meeting and after announcing a brief break stated that the Vice-Chair would continue the meeting upon his departure.

Vice-Chair Poaster asked Commissioner Correa given the state budget hearings if he was planning on being at the meeting for awhile.

Commissioner Correa commented that insofar as the state budget is concerned this summer was going to be a long one and asked those in attendance as voters to raise their voices for those things that were important to them.

Public Comment

Vice-Chair Poaster announced that the Public Comment Section covering a whole variety of issues in Tab 2 would be entertained.

Mark Refowitz commented that Orange County has taken about \$60 million in reductions. If the Governor's realignment passes it will mean an additional \$35 million in reductions. This is the wrong direction and the wrong way to go. The counties have been very innovative in terms of developing housing. The rules currently don't allow rental subsidies for long term guarantees for clients.

Vice-Chair called Rusty Selix to comment on the state budget. **Mr. Selix** reported the following: Both houses have rejected the proposed reduction of \$6 million out of realignment on a bipartisan basis. The proposal to transfer the AB 3632 Program for mental health services for special education children to the schools has been put into conference committee. A work group will be formed to see what can be done.

Commissioner Kahn commented that the servicing of the newly eligible and the waiver is going to be a challenge insofar as their mental health needs are concerned.

Commissioner Pating asked Mr. Selix where the Commission should be. With regard to the 1115 waiver. **Mr. Selix** responded that the Commission should be concerned that the whole mental health community understands this issue.

Steven McCormick, California Network of Mental Health Clients, stated that his observations and comments were strictly his own. He stated that MHSA was working well however one of his concerns had to do with the future.

Delphine Brody, California Network of Mental Health Clients, wanted to echo Mr. McCormick's comments and to note that in many counties they are seeing a significant amount of MHSA dollars now being used to shore up core services. As far as CSS Housing is concerned some qualitative data coming from the perspective of the tenants is absolutely needed. She was very pleased to see the many developments in PEI and innovations. Ms. Brody thought that not enough funding had gone to consumer and family member empowerment.

Ms. Stephanie Welch, California Mental Health Directors Association, wanted to add a third recommendation to the Workforce, Education and Training and that was an assessment is needed as to what was being achieved with the state-level investments in the stipend programs. Regarding the Housing Program **Ms. Welch** commented that currently Rita Down's county is unable to find a qualified developer that meets the CalFHA standards.

Stacie Hiramoto, REMHDCO, thanked Commissioners Senator Correa and Assembly member Hayashi for having the legislative briefing. Regarding CSS, **Ms. Hiramoto** stated that the evaluation of the full-service partnerships should include how they are a challenge for people from racial and ethnic communities. When PEI is evaluated people from racial and ethnic communities really look to PEI as their best hope to get the new and different types of services that are appropriate for their communities.

Gwen Foster, Director, Mental Health Educational Stipend Program, CalSWEC, addressed the update on WET Programs. A handout showing the past year's activities that addresses most of the outcomes was provided to the Commission. A set of core competencies has been developed and every school has implemented a curriculum to address those competencies. Progress is being tracked as the programs unfold. **Commissioner Vega** asked if in the curriculum review the MHSA-type programs, such as recovery-oriented programs have been made a part of the curriculum revision. **Ms. Foster** answered in the affirmative and stated that they are part of the core competencies and also a module has been developed so that faculty can use that module specifically around recovery and discrimination and stigma reduction.

Kathleen Derby, NAMI California, commented that one of the critical issues regarding training and technical assistance is that the TA be delivered in ways other than just through the traditional systems of support. The future focus of TA needs to become more community focused and reciprocal in nature.

Commissioner Pating commented that this issue had been addressed at the Services Committee and it was decided `77to possibly do an inventory but no position at this point has been formed.

Mr. Steve Leoni stated that affordable housing is not necessarily supported housing. What a lot of consumers need is simply affordable. Services should be attached to the person and not the housing. In the WET Plans the idea of the MHSA principles being included in the curriculum was positive and the best way to do that is to follow the Act. In

terms of people and consumers being trained that concrete career ladders are needed.

Ms. Lin Benjamin, California Department of Aging, commented that she would address PEI and WET. Regarding PEI, CDA reviewed the 53 PEI Plans that had been submitted to the OAC as of February 26th to determine the extent to which PEI funding is benefitting older adults. CDA will send a copy of the report to the Commission. Regarding WET **Ms. Benjamin** stated that because MHSA is funding age-specific mental health services across the lifespan the Department wants to ensure that MHSA WET funds are used to educate and train persons working in the current and future public mental health system with age-specific knowledge skills and competencies, including cultural competencies with diverse age-specific populations. The WET Issue Paper approved by the Mental Health Directors Governing Board provides guidance to counties, regional partnerships and statewide strategies regarding mental health and aging specialty training that includes mental health and aging competencies.

Commissioner Pating stated he has seen the official report and requested that it be calendared for the Commission meeting in one or two months because it represents a success of the PEI on how older adults have been served: it would be nice to have it formally entered into the minutes.

Ms. Pat Ryan, California Mental Health Directors Association, reported that it's been a busy week budget-wise. The good news is that even though the proposal was about realignment dollars much of the testimony was about the effectiveness of MHSA dollars.

8. MHSOAC Work Plan, Priority 3: Address Period of Financial Volatility: 2010 through 2014.

A. Updated Financial Report

Ms. Janna Lowder and Carol Hood presented on the updated financial report. **Ms. Lowder** reported that in April 2009 the Commission was presented with a financial framework overview. This presentation updates the January Financial Report including a May Revision Fact Sheet. The proposed motion will be that the Commission adopts the updated Financial Report (Tables 1, 3, 6 and 9) and the FY 2010/11 May Revision Fact Sheet as presented by the Mental Health Funding & Policy Committee.

Commissioner Van Horn wanted to know what happens to the unspent administrative money. **Ms. Lowder** responded that the unspent administrative money would revert back to the General MHSA Fund after two years.

Commissioner Pating wanted to know if the reversion funds from the component programs come back to us or go to the General Fund. **Vice-Chair Poaster** responded that none of it goes back into the General Fund it just gets re-distributed.

Commissioner Vega asked that if the funds are not used in the year in which they are budgeted then two years later they're going to revert to the General MHSA Fund. **Ms. Lowder** stated that you have one year to expend them then they revert within two years after that.

Ms. Hood clarified that the difference between the amount budgeted and the amount available actually reverts at the end of that year and what Ms. Lowder was talking about

was the difference between the amount that was budgeted and the amount expended.

Commissioner Vega used the example of: if there was \$40 million budgeted and \$30 million expended in one fiscal year you would have to by the end of that fiscal year possibly spend that difference. **Ms. Hood** responded, not if it's budgeted and expended. **Commissioner Van Horn** stated that you have the first year and then two more years to spend it out.

Commissioner Vega asked that if the Commission had purview over unexpended administrative dollars within the time prior to reversion. **Ms. Lowder** stated that each state department identifies how much they want in their budget and then they report after the end of that year how much they've expended. And for MHSOAC's budget the Commission would know how much was going to be expended and what would go unexpended and we would try to make efforts to expend the amount appropriated. But as far as other departments unexpended dollars the Commission does not have any control or any ability to dip into them.

B. May Revision of the Governor's Budget

Ms. Lowder made a short presentation on the Governor's Budget.

Commissioner Correa commented that this year's budget is going to be subject to very hard negotiations.

Vice-Chair Poaster wished to amend the proposed motion by changing that the Commission accepts rather than adopts both of those documents.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Pating, seconded by Commissioner Van Horn to accept the updated Financial Report and the FY 2010/11 May Revision Fact Sheet and the Commission unanimously adopted the motion.

Public Comment

Steve Leoni wanted to comment on the situation with the finances. He stated that the 1115 Waiver offers some relief. Mr. Leoni said that this is a crisis of one or, at the most, two years duration and asked the Commission to not let vulnerable populations die of starvation on the way to this banquet.

9. Future Commission Business

Commissioner Vega stated that he would love for the Funding Committee to come back with an analysis of opportunities for us to provide discriminatory direction on unexpended state level administrative dollars.

Commissioner Pating said that it could even be the whole reversion dollars because that might be what we'll be looking for in terms of having to float the next two years.

10. General Public Comment

There was no general public comment.

Vice-Chair Poaster introduced Ed Walker the New Executive Director of the JPA.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.