

COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Friday, July 27, 2007

I. Roll Call - Call to Order

Present were Commissioners Wesley Chesbro, Paul Dobson, Linford Gayle, Mary Hayashi, Kelvin Lee, Larry Poaster, Darlene Prettyman, Larry Trujillo, and Eduardo Vega, Andrew Poat.

Absent at roll call were: Commissioners Saul Feldman, Beth Gould, Patrick Henning, Jr., David Pating, William Kolender, Darrell Steinberg

Vice Chair Gayle made amendments to current agenda. He clarified the process of public comments and further stated that in future meetings a written instruction for public comment will be available.

II. Agenda Amendment – Juvenile Justice Clarification Statement

Sherri Whitt said that in the prior days meeting, it was asked of staff to work language to discuss at today's meeting. She said she understood it to mean that the Commission would possibly make a formal motion and adopt it in regards to the language change.

- The title will now include “children and youth at risk of or experiencing juvenile justice involvement those with signs of behavioral and emotional problems who are at risk or have any contact with any part of the juvenile justice system and who cannot appropriately served through community services and supports and services to those in juvenile hall”;
- “Or other incarcerated that can only be for the purposes of facilitating discharge”. Ms. Whitt said this is consistent with the statute with respect to CSS requirements. She said the intent to make sure any youth who were having contact with the juvenile justice system, who could qualify for CSS would have that made available to them which will be used to define who the prevention population would be.

Commissioner Questions/Comments

Commissioner Lee referred to the packet. He stated that the motions that were approved at the last Commission meeting, MOTION #6, created the language that is currently being discussed. He asked if this language would supersede the language in the document. Ms. Whitt confirmed it would replace the language.

Carol Hood confirmed that the services under PEI would need to meet the criteria and when there is a treatment gap PEI funding would not be available to fill in that gap because CSS services are different than PEI.

Commissioner Vega asked about the incarceration question in Ms. Whitt's report. He expressed concern that it might be laying the groundwork for a system in which people would not actually get services until they were on a discharge list.

Ms. Hood clarified that in regards to Commissioner Vega's question, it is already in CSS regulations. If a different standard is setup in Prevention & Early Intervention than what is in

CSS, it would be confusing systematically. She stated that she understood the Commission to want consistency in PEI and CSS.

Ms. Whitt referred to a request that was made from the California Mental Health Directors Association that they work with their juvenile justice people to supply recommendations to the Commission in regards to how to best serve youth in the juvenile justice system. She suggested that some follow up be done and invited their suggestions to further inform the discussion about those youth who are actually in juvenile hall.

Commissioner Lee expressed that he would like the intent to be that the when a child is in the juvenile justice system and needs help that there is a way of serving that child and would like the language to reflect that.

Ms. Whitt suggested that another option would be that, in the second bullet, repeat the language so that the standard remains the same for those who have had any contact with juvenile justice and those who are currently in juvenile justice system. She said that would mean that for any youth in juvenile hall, or otherwise incarcerated, who is displaying signs of behavioral or emotional problems that cannot be appropriately served through CSS then Prevention & Early Intervention services be made available to them. She continued to say that she understood from the discussion to be that if the youth could be eligible for intensive treatment under CSS, than the goal was for that to be offered to them. She added that if the youth was not eligible for intensive treatment through CSS, than the Prevention & Early Intervention be made available to them.

Ms. Hood suggested that an option would be to adopt broader language so that it would state “children and youth at risk of or experiencing juvenile justice involvement, those with signs behavioral and emotional problems who are at risk of or have had any contact with, or are currently incarcerated in juvenile hall or other incarcerated settings who cannot be appropriately served through CSS”.

Emily Nahat provided some history by saying that during the discussions of Prevention & Early Intervention Committee of the OAC, there was expressed concern about placing some responsibility in the juvenile justice system for youth who were incarcerated. She said that there was more of a role definition and setting priorities for use of PEI funds. She suggested that the Committee members felt that Prevention & Early Intervention could not solve all the problems and systems as they exist now, and for individuals incarcerated that there is some responsibility in that system to serve mental health needs. She said that the general limitation for PEI funds that would apply would be Prevention & Early Intervention, which is relatively of short duration, usually meaning a year or less, and of relatively lower intensity.

III. Planning Discussion

Ms. Whitt and Ms. Hood presented a power point presentation with the goal to bring further clarity to previous action items which were requested to provide background regarding planning and also illustrate what the decision points were with respect to community program planning and also Prevention & Early Intervention global funding. Ms. Whitt said that in terms of the history, the Commission did agree in June 2007 that the Commission does not approve the guidelines, but that is the responsibility of the Department of Mental Health to develop them. The OAC is expected to provide guidance and high level direction to the Department to ensure that the counties are given a consistent message about what the expectations are in the Prevention & Early Intervention proposals.

Ms. Hood referred to the community planning process and suggested reminded the Commission what is currently in emergency regulation. The first version of emergency regulations that included the community planning process promulgated in late 2005, subsequently the current

version was promulgated last year with the initial public comment period being completed with which they did not get comments on the community planning process on any substantive issues. She further stated that additional public comment on the current regulations will have an additional period for 15 days and response to changes based on stakeholder concerns and those concerns were in three areas; (1) increasing the clarification of the role of families; (2) the issue of the thirty days in patient being allowable under full service partnerships and (3) non-supplant. She said the permanent regulations must be completed by 12/31/07 regarding involving primary care and other health clinics. She reported that there are many processes, other than regulations, to try to build the collaborative partnerships and to ensure there is concern that primary care has not been involved enough and CMHDA has a proposal that will be shared with the Commission.

Pat Ryan with CMHDA said they have had several conversations with the Primary Care Association about ways in which they can work together to collaborate and encourage counties when it is appropriate to involve primary care providers for the service of people who may go to the primary care clinics. She said they have discussed the process of planning a training session and suggested having primary care provider representatives at the monthly all directors meetings.

Ms. Hood discussed the timeline stating that if they get approvals today, and with a best case scenario, they can issue the guidelines for the community planning process and the counties could then submit requests for funding, they could then provide the funding as well as begin the stakeholder process, then issue the proposed guidelines for PEI services assuming the Commission approves the global funding levels and ultimately issued those proposed guidelines sometime in September 2007. She said that the counties will do planning, public hearings, and then the review process from the OAC and the Department of Mental Health, with best case scenario for initial PEI local funding can be approved for services in March of 2008. She clarified that if there is not approval today then all of the times must be extended.

Ms. Whitt said first discussion point is PEI funding levels and outlined those points to be:

- Does the Commission approve the funding levels proposed for PEI of \$25,000,000 for community planning process with additional funding being available. For fiscal year 07/08 \$90,000,000, fiscal year 08/09 \$192,000,000.
- Second decision point has to do with the community program planning, in the materials that were given to the Commissioners which included the information notice that had a form attached to that read "Request for Funding for Community Program Planning". This form includes the date, the total amount request and has a question posed saying "Please briefly describe the purpose and amount for which the requested funding will be used". She further stated that the advantage of using this form is that it was developed with input from OAC, the California Mental Health Directors Association along with the California Mental Health Planning Council and has been through the approval process at the Department. Adoption of this form would mean that there would be no changes in the proposed timeline and is user friendly for the counties. The disadvantage of using this form is that clearly more information could be helpful to the Commissioner's who will be reviewing county requests and there may be the belief that this question, by itself, will not provide enough information to approve those planning requests.

Ms. Hood clarified that it is probably an incorrect statement to say that this form was developed with input from OAC, when this is the first time the Commission has seen this form.

Ms. Whitt agreed and amended it to say that input was given that something easy and user friendly was wanted. She suggested the Department was comfortable using this form, because they did believe that there was sufficient structure to ensure the information that was needed was provided. She said that another

potential disadvantage of using this form is that if there were a form that had more questions on it, it could serve the purpose of simplifying requirements for the description of the planning process when the PEI funding requests come forward because there is a planning request then there is a funding request to actually to do the PEI work. Another disadvantage is that the opportunity to improve the planning process by being more prescriptive may be lost. She continued that by going forward with this form, there are efficiency issues at stake which would allow them to remain on timeline, by deciding that a form is needed with more detail, it would have to be revised thus delaying the money from getting to its ultimate destination, the people in need.

Ms. Whitt said that things that were shared with her regarding presentation yesterday was that Commissioner's would have welcomed more elaborate discussion about what Commissioner Feldman felt about these issues and invites Deborah Lee to discuss specifically about what it was that Commissioner Feldman thought in regards to this form and how this could potentially not be the best form for the Commission.

Deborah Lee concurred with Ms. Whitt and described the advantage and disadvantage of the form as completely accurate. She said that the advantage of this form was that the only guidance that OAC had was in the meeting with Commissioner Steinberg and Commissioner Feldman where the guidance was to develop a whole approach to the guidelines and to ensure all of the applications were very simple and user friendly. She said Commissioner Feldman's concern about the existing form was that it might not give enough information when reviewing the requests for the planning money to be able to assess whether or not the requirements are being followed as it was open ended. Ms. Lee further stated that if enough information was not received, the option would exist to ask for more information. She also proposed that a discussion needs to take place about what the review process would be after the form has been approved by the Commission.

Carol Hood said the goal of this form was to have the county's proceed with their community planning process, so they are very clear about what the guidelines and regulations being it was the same one as used in CSS. The thought was to have a short description, due to the county's knowledge of the requirements would suffice if a plan came in, the request, the one page form and if it did not supply adequate information, then it would subsequently go back to the county for clarification. She expressed her concern to be that if there was a standard, other than what is on the form, and which holds the county to a different level of information then that could be potentially problematic. She suggested that if sufficient information is not given, the Commission could always go back for clarification.

Ms. Whitt, in addressing the funding issues, said what should be in PEI services would be based around the principles document that was adopted in January which outlines the county and the stakeholders with respect to Prevention & Early Intervention work and the plans would be reviewed in alignment to those values going forward. She said that the intent of the principles document was to make a values statement on behalf of the Commission.

Ms. Hood suggested that the Commission, as a whole, should go through an approval process to be in agreement to be an equal partner in the process.

Ms. Whitt said that if there were changes on the form or information notice, it would cause a delay and need to go back through the legal review process. She referred to Commissioner Hayashi's perspective and she clarified that she is not taking a stand on this one way or the other. She further stated that the intent of the slide was to describe to the Commission as accurately as possible and define what steps have been followed thus far as well as address where it lies in the decision process.

Commissioner Lee agrees with Commissioner Hayashi's perspective and further suggested that the other Commissioners drill down into the issues involving the program expenditure plan in the Mental Health Services Act, referring to the document that the Commission received drafts on 7/16/07. He said that there are appendices in this document which are the basic directions as to what is going to be asked of counties to respond to. He expressed there is a need to have a full conversation about what we are asking counties to respond and in what format so that when that discussion takes place, it can be discovered what priorities are being asked of the counties to ensure what is being reported is what would be done. He said that he was unable to find the counties allocation of funds in this document. He asked for the advice and support of the Commission members and their perspectives to look at those to see if the reporting requirements match the priorities and discussions that took place in January.

Vice Chair Gayle said the Commission was uncomfortable with the process that has happened in the development and guidelines, being they haven't given any input and have not seen forms or given input as to the document. He stressed that has not had input from the OAC, as a whole, but rather a couple of members from the OAC, until today. He expressed that this oversight has put the Commission in the current dilemma and confirmed that the Commission has the right to approve and not approve if not in agreement of this document. He reminded the Commission, that making changes would result in delays.

Commissioner Poaster commented about the planning process for the CSS part has been disastrous and expressed concern in regards to the balance between getting it right or reinventing and causing a delay in services.

Commissioner Dobson asked if it is the Department's position that the Commissions approval would involve more regulatory input or are they just determining whether these applications meet guidelines? He asked if there should be more input into the values.

Ms. Hood said the position is that one cannot change something that is in the regulation, and stated that Prevention & Early Intervention is not yet in regulation. The community planning process is, so through the building the proposed guidelines, that then becomes the blueprint for developing the regulation. She suggested that if the Commission's values were stated in conjunction with the application for funding, it would have significant impact on what the local process would be. Ms. Hood clarified that they thought they were getting input from the Commission, being as they had met with Commissioner Feldman and Commissioner Steinberg and felt that with having the representatives of the OAC in which the Commissioner's asked for substantial revision in the planning guidelines. She said there has been substantial revision; work out by the staff in response to what they deemed as OAC input, which then became proposed guidelines which were posted on July 16, 2007.

Ms. Whitt offered one idea would be a way in which the Commission could actually draft a letter based on what Commissioner Hayashi has requested to ensure that counties understand the Commissions values as related to planning and to Prevention & Early Intervention, to be send out when the other materials go out, while not changing the forms to avoid delaying with legal review. She suggested it go out independently, as a Commission, based on the January principles and values.

Vice Chair Gayle strongly urged not to delay the process and that in the future the Commission needed to create a process of communication to avoid a reoccurrence. He acknowledged that the Commission is new and has experienced growing pains, furthermore stating that there is now an infrastructure and the Commission is gelling.

Commissioner Prettyman thanked Sherri Whitt for her cover letter idea and requested the Commission to approve it prior to being distributed. She stated that she is against slowing down the process of people getting services.

Commissioner Lee said in regards to the CSS process, the Commission has said on several occasions that starting the process without fully understanding the input or outcome is what created problems for the Commission in the CSS process the first time.

Vice Chair Gayle stated that the Commissioner's that took the lead in giving input on behalf of the OAC, did it with the best of intentions to keep the process moving and is confident they did it with knowledge, expertise and consideration. He said that there is a leadership structure currently and urged that the Commission understanding to be the consideration now lays with the people on the streets, the consumers and the family members who are diligently waiting for the Commission to make a decision. He said that the responsibility for a delay is that of the Commission.

Commissioner Poaster suggested that if the Commission gets the money on the street, it cannot be implemented based on staffing, availability and workforce. He continued that if the Commission takes longer to accomplish these actions, it will result in significant delays to getting the money to the people in need.

Commissioner Lee in regards to the independent letter, we quickly have somebody put together the wording of resolution that we can approve and then direct the Executive Officer to send that resolution out.

Ms. Whitt asked if it would be possible to have Deborah Lee work on the wording and asked Commissioner Hayashi to reiterate her thoughts.

Commissioner Hayashi proposed that the Commission approve the funding levels today and make decisions on the action items with that, have specific conditions at the next meeting to prevent lost time and thus will allow the partners to keep going while making it known there are concerns that need to be addressed. She further suggested that the Commission craft some compromise during this meeting to keep the momentum going.

Ms. Whitt said that during the input, Deborah Lee and Commissioner Feldman were of the opinion that the proposed guidelines were consistent with the principles that the Commission adopted in January. She also stated the

opportunity for comments remains open until August 9th, so if a person wanted to add other items for consideration, that opportunity existed. Ms. Whitt said that in terms of the form, she proposed to adopt this form as to maintain the ability to move forward without delay and referred to the discussion of the letter that would be added in accordance of the Commission's values and philosophies.

Commissioner Lee said that he feels the form is a hollow exercise as it states "briefly describe the purpose and amount for which the requested funding will be used" due to the many different formats that the Commission will receive due to the open ended request. He suggested the form may seem simple, but may seem more difficult during the review process and is without consistency. He also stressed that he did not feel there was enough input from stakeholders.

Ms. Whitt said the letter would be a philosophy statement of our value, not with the intent to change or giving guidelines for regulations. It's just a value statement from the Commission.

Commissioner Poat clarified that this letter does not affect the regulations and would not be enforceable. Ms. Whitt suggested that the purpose of the proposed letter is not to change regulation, but to impact action.

Commissioner Lee suggested the Commission put in writing, everything that is to be done and defer this action later in this meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Lee moved funding levels proposed for PEI as it appears before the Commission; seconded by Commissioner Poat. Motion Withdrawn and deferred to later in the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Lee moved OAC support the release of the PEI guidelines with the intent language added; seconded by Commissioner Dobson. Motion withdrawn by Commissioner Lee to continue discussion.

Ms. Whitt mentioned a past motion that was in June where the Commission would have final comments on the information that was presented to them during this meeting.

Ms. Hood said it was her understanding that the OAC does not have the approval authority over guidelines. Ms. Hood said the timeline for comments was August 9th, and any extension would extend the entire process.

Commissioner Lee suggested that the Commission make comments as a whole. However, there are Commissioners that are present that were not involved in the June discussion and proposed soliciting their input.

Commissioner Lee requested to have an item on the September agenda which allows the Commission to formally respond to the guidelines as being presented by the Department. Ms. Whitt confirmed the action item in September would reflect to adopt any OAC comments with Commissioner Lee.

(tape was changed and picked up as follows)

IV. Stakeholder Reports

- Ms. Ryan reported that if the assumption was made that the application process for the planning money and the guidelines went out as scheduled, there would be very serious concerns about the infrastructure and the ability of the OAC to review in a timely manner. She further stated that she does not approve delaying the process and wants to start serving the people who are in desperate need of services. She reported that in a best case scenario, with the assumption that the guidelines and money for planning goes out it would take a county a minimum of 3 months to convene the stakeholder process and to complete the notices pursuant to the regulations and guidelines that are currently in effect. She stated that at that point the counties would have to collect stakeholder comments, allowing for the comment period, draft a plan, respond to the comment period and at that point get it through the Board of Supervisors. She stated that process would be an additional minimum of 3 months and the total time period being about one year for best case scenario.
- Dorothy Hendrickson, the Mental Health Services Act Administrator for Orange County, concurred with Ms. Ryan that even with the most aggressive timeline it would take about 6 months for a county to conduct their planning process which would include working with stakeholders, focus groups, community stakeholder meetings and steering committees, etc. She stated that while it is an extensive process, the counties would adhere to the requirements of the letter or regulations.
- Ms. Hendrickson reported that she has witnessed an increased interest by the press in Proposition 63 and has been contacted by major news organizations in California wanting to know how much money has hit the street and questioned the status of Prevention & Early Intervention.
- Commissioner Hayashi proposed that with respect to planning dollars and service prevention dollars;
 - -First, in regards to the planning dollars, while the regulations cannot be changed, they can work on the one page form to address the concerns and ask the counties to explain in greater detail in terms of how they are going to use the funds.
 - -Second, in regards to the \$192,000,000 service grant, she stated that because the planning process takes place prior to the service dollars going out there is a little bit more time. She proposed extending the August 9th deadline to a later date, suggesting an additional three weeks, to allow more stakeholder groups to participate in the process. She confirmed that while the opportunity does exist to influence the regulation the Commission can still participate in that process.

Ms. Hood suggested that the process consisted of releasing the guidelines and draft on the 16th of July. There would then be a three hour statewide conference call to answer questions and obtain feedback. They usually have two weeks after that because of the urgency that had been communicated by the OAC and others to get this completed. That is the standard process to try to post a week in advance and allow at least two weeks after some kind of stakeholder process. If the form is changed, it will delay the process. Adding a separate document that does not influence criteria, will not.

(Tape was changed and picked up as follows)

Ms. Nahat said with the PEI, they met about ten different times, in public meetings so people had the opportunity to participate in the policy setting. Then in April there were two face-to-face stakeholder meetings in Northern and Southern California; each of which had over 200 people and provided input on priority populations and what would be the most effective strategies to serve those populations. She reported that they contracted specifically with UC Davis Center for Reducing Health Disparities to conduct cultural, ethnic specific focus groups, and key informant interviews, of which they have conducted over 30 interviews and over 30 focus groups to get the voice of the ethnic and cultural groups. They had a special contract from transition age youth focus groups to provide input on most effective services for prevention and early intervention. She stated that when the guidelines were released, there was a telephone conference call which consisted of 120 participants. She confirmed that DMH set the August 9th date and the general practice is to provide ten days availability of a document for stakeholder input, than two weeks afterwards for written comments, phone calls, and emails. This is how the August 9th date was set. Ms. Nahat said there are postings on the MHSA website and when those are posted, there is an email notice sent out. They took it upon themselves to add more organizations that they thought might be interested in Prevention & Early Intervention. She said this went out to education organizations that included county office of education.

- Laurel Mildred, Executive Director of the California Network of Mental Health Clients provided background stating that they are a statewide organization representing people with mental health disabilities, that was founded in direct response to the institutionalization and abuses of people with mental disorders and advocate for human rights, dignity and progress of people who experience mental health problems.
 - She referred to developing a model for client participation in the MHSA, as well as touch upon the core philosophy and values of the MHSA, and the alignment of the implementation of the Act. She said that in this model they have identified one of the key needs as being infrastructure that allows for coordination, information, dissemination and administrative support. She suggested that the need existed to develop an understanding of the extreme poverty and support of the clients to aid in participation. The next step, after being able to get the clients to participate, is to make the participation meaningful by learning about the content, the process, developing a voice, and being able to give input. This is a matter of training, policy making, negotiation, mediation and positive advocacy. Client involvement means leadership, proactive lead developing proposal, leading processes, negotiating, collaborating and mediating.
 - Regarding involuntary treatment, she wants the Commission to consider this. She defined it to be institutional treatment, as it represents the values of the old mental health system, and is the most expensive of all mental health interventions and most importantly, does not work. Institutional abuse is far more common, than the public knows. She stressed that the money invested in the involuntary treatment is an investment in the institutional practices of the old mental health system.
 - She reported that SB 916 passed the public safety committee last week, and in doing so, it extends the time an emergency room can hold someone from 8 hours to 24 hours prior to initiating a 5150 hold, at which time they would be held for a longer period. The idea of holding a person longer is due to a shortage of beds in the community. The Mental Health Services Act calls for transformation of the public mental health

system through developing alternatives to institutional practices and solutions such as crisis, residential, and wrap around services. She suggested the OAC align their philosophies and values into the larger mental health system.

- She discussed the legal issues of Sierra Vista, in which 2 people have died, one of which has been deemed a homicide. She stressed the importance of addressing abuse in institutions.
- Commissioner Prettyman announced that the Client Family Technical Resource Group was supposed to meet and bring paperwork, however she is the only one left on this Committee. She contacted Commissioner Gould and Commissioner Vega and they will be meeting during August. She stated that she needs their input and approval and will be bringing a report back in September.
- Vice Chair Gayle stated that they are playing catch-up with TRG. It has been very important to the Commission to have consumers and family members input in order to have a strong voice on the position that the OAC is heading.
- Dede Ranahan, Mental Health Service Act Policy Coordinator for NAMI California requested to put on the OAC agenda the two tiered system and the term underserved as previously discussed. She reported that;
 - NAMI Peer to Peer program, through MHSA funds, has been able to expedite and increase the momentum by which they are allowing affiliates to offer this program to their NAMI consumer members throughout the State. There have been 9 classes that have been completed, taught by consumer mentors. These mentors receive training prior to teaching the course and then it is offered to other consumers to teach how to advocate for themselves, how to manage their illness, how to get support. These 9 classes have been in rural areas which are; Hemet, Palm Desert, Chico, Sacramento, Santa Clara, Fresno, Visalia, Tehachapi and Petaluma. She brings the consumer graduates up to date on the MHSA. They learn how they can become advocates and participants in the process. She spoke about the different types of people that participate in the program from suicide survivors, different age groups, people who need housing, people who have not left their homes in over two years. All of the graduates that have email have accepted the invitation to be on the NAMI advisory pool.
 - Brenda Scott added that she is in agreement in regards to the consumer voice and consumer empowerment. She reported that in the Peer to Peer course in the Hemet area, 25 consumers showed up, all on time. She stated she went to the Hemet graduation class and was amazed at the feedback from graduates. She expressed that the graduates are very excited about being part of the advisory pool and their input is going to make a difference.
- Oscar Wright, CEO for United Advocates for Children and Families said that Laurel Mildred's example of a clinic under investigation really hits home being that he has a daughter who has just been released from this clinic, a paranoid schizophrenic, does not talk to people and stigma and discrimination issues. However having been at Sierra Vista, she is contemplating writing a book about her experience there to step forward to explain her account of what is happening in many of these institutions. He urged the Commission to be aware of that empowerment. This is a very serious subject. UACF advocates for family youth and children and provides empowerment by training and

education, peer to peer training, work force development training, public policy determination and in the process of doing that, part of the critical role is the voice of the parents. Establishing a statewide training center, a regional family network, put out a survey to parents and caregivers and he is receiving feedback. The results are that 71% of family and caregivers state that temporary relief from the stress and the strain of having to deal with children with long term chronic illness is their largest concern. He suggested that giving temporary relief for caregivers is a preventative strategy and is cost effective.

- Ann Arneill-Py, the Executive Officer of the California Mental Health Planning Council, provided an update on the work the Council is doing relating to the Mental Health Services Act. The Council has responsibility generally for the oversight of the education and training component of the Act. Specifically, to review and approve the five year plan, which is also the blueprint the Department has for implementing all of the components of the education and training part of that Act. She reported that the CSS Plan Committee had a concern regarding components of the plans that related to implementing recovery and resiliency aspects of system transformation. The concern was that all of the plans talked about the need to do this type of transformation, and the fact that the counties would need to be trained in how to do this, but there was no common definition as to what constituted recovery, resiliency and wellness. The Council's Human Resources Committee is putting a task force on what constitutes standards for recovery and resiliency training. They have the task force underway to develop a consistent understanding of wellness, recovery and resiliency that can be used to create standards and core competencies for mental health occupations. It will also identify training and curricular based on these core competencies which will enable the county mental health programs, and other providers, to select training and education programs to meet established standards and competencies. It will also enable oversight entities, such as OAC and the Planning Council, to evaluate whether mental health staff is being trained so that standards and core competencies have been established.

She is in the process of developing the five year plan drafts and the three year expenditure plan drafts. They have been reviewed and the basic principles in looking at these drafts are to ensure that it relates to increased diversity in the mental health system. Additionally, they will look at diversity in its broadest sense, and to ensure it produces increased multi-cultural and multi-lingual staff for the mental health system. She stated there has been advancement in consumer and family member employment.

Planning Discussion Revisited

Ms. Whitt reported on the proposed motions to provide a sense of how they fit together;

- Proposed Motion #1 is that the OAC moves to approve funding levels proposed for PEI and it would be in the amounts as provided to the Commissioners.
- Proposed Motion #2 for Acting Executive Director to post the following statement on the OAC letterhead and this letter would be sent to the counties along with the information notice and enclosure to, it does allow for it to be sent under separate cover if for some reason if there is some delay proposed from a DMH perspective. Statement will be "MHSOAC will be reviewing requests for planning money from the following perspective";
 - (1) Does the planning request approach being described on enclosure to #1, indicate how outreach and appropriate incentives supports and approaches to maximize access will be utilized;
 - (2) Describe how lessons learned from CSS planning process will be applied

(3) Describe how the plan will accurately reflect the perspective of diverse and representative stakeholders and is it consistent with the DMH draft intent language dated 06/26/07, which is provided for you, which is a summary of what was contained in the principles the Commission adopted in January.

Ms. Whitt said there is a companion to the motions, a motion having to do with the guidelines stating the OAC would support release of the DMH draft PEI guidelines with addition of this draft intent language. She said those were the motions crafted from what she understood it to be from the Commission throughout the day.

Ms. Hood clarified that there are two separate issues going on at the same time, the first being the draft community program planning guidelines, which has the one page form how did you get the initial \$25 million, then there is the guidelines for the PEI services, that's the larger document to get the larger amount of money.

Ms. Whitt clarified that the draft guidelines have been released for comment, but have not been issued to the counties as the final guidelines. Under the current timeline, the comment period would close August 9th and the intent would be to disseminate those guidelines to the counties as their instructions in September.

MOTION: Commissioner Lee moved that the OAC approve funding levels proposed for PEI and it would be in the amounts as provided to the Commissioners; seconded by Commissioner Poat. Motion carried.

MOTION: Commissioner Lee moved that the OAC support the release the information notice regarding county funding requests for Mental Services Act Prevention & Early Intervention community program planning funds, seconded by Commissioner Vega. Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: Commissioner Lee moved that the MHSOAC support release of enclosure 2, Prevention & Early Intervention Request for Funding in Community Program Planning Form; seconded by Commissioner Hayashi. Motion carried with 1 abstention.

MOTION: Commissioner Hayashi moved to have the acting Executive Director place the following statement on OAC letterhead that will be sent to counties under separate cover stating "MHSOAC values the following and encourages counties to consider the following in the implementation of their community planning process for PEI"; seconded by Commissioner Prettyman, Roll Call vote requested; Commissioner Chesbro - Yes, Commissioner Dobson - No, Vice Chair Gayle - Yes, Commissioner Hayashi - Yes, Commissioner Lee - No, Commissioner Poaster - No, Commissioner Poat - Yes, Commissioner Prettyman - Yes, Commissioner Trujillo - No, Commissioner Vega - Abstain. 5 Yes's, 4 No's, 1 Abstention, Motion Carried.

"MHSOAC will be considering requests for planning money from the following perspective; Does the planning request approach being described on enclosure to indicate how outreach and appropriate incentives supports and approaches to maximize access will be utilized; Describe how lessons learned from CSS planning process will be applied;
Describe how the plan will accurately reflect the perspective of diverse and representative stakeholders, and is it consistent with the DMH draft intent language dated 06/26/07 which is based on MSHOAC principles

adopted on 1/26/07 ” As well as a statement that this will not be part of review criteria.

Vice Chair Gayle suggested a change in the language to express the philosophy which would inform the counties processes as opposed to a definition of review criteria.

Ms. Whitt suggested using this language “MHSOAC values the following and encourages counties to consider the following in the implementation of their community planning process for PEI and will be reviewing requests for planning money from the following”.

Vice Chair Gayle said the guideline process that the OAC is wanting should be agendized in order to fully discuss it. He stated the issue is with delaying the release of the guidelines so that counties could not start the process of putting their proposals.

Commissioner Poaster raised the point that this policy was adopted as a product of past business and suggested that it should be able to be dealt with now by requesting the acting Executive Director forward the letter.

Vice Chair Gayle proposed drafting a letter depicting the philosophies of the Commission, and choosing language that does not suggest that if it is not followed, then it is not approved. He does not want to delay the counties..

Commissioner Lee suggested extending the August 9th timeline until September.

Vice Chair Gayle said that delaying the guidelines would delay the entire process and bring the Commission back to square one at the expense of the people in need.

Commissioner Hayashi stated that if the Commission does not discuss some of these items at this time, it could delay the review process. She suggested that sooner or later it must be discussed, and respectfully asked a modest extension so we are giving groups an opportunity to participate in the process.

MOTION: Commissioner Lee moved to extend the August 9th timeline to September; seconded by Commissioner Hayashi. Roll call vote requested. Commissioner Chesbro - No, Commissioner Dobson - No, Vice Chair Gayle - No, Commissioner Hayashi - Yes, Commissioner Lee - Yes, Commissioner Poaster - No, Commissioner Poat - No, Commissioner Prettyman - No, Commissioner Trujillo - No, Commissioner Vega - No. 8 No's, 2 Yes's. Motion does not carry.

Public Comment

Carey Temple urged the DMH to have a review process to find out what happened during the planning process. He further urged them to look at this transforming, look at it carefully to ensure that it has been done. He provided his definition of stakeholders to include any person or community organization that is affected.

Fred Smith, adult member within the county mental health movement for older adults, would like to have continued recognition in reference to housing, counseling and integrated care with all aspects to the medical and emotional aspects. Says older adults are still, working, volunteering, consulting and have expenses and pay taxes, and urged the Commission to keep that in mind.

Stacie Hiramoto, with the Mental Health Association in California, represents a coalition that served traditionally underserved communities in California. She said she is speaking to the

Stigma and Discrimination Report, and she provided a letter about the coalition's concerns and requests. She gave some background on who is involved in the coalition. She said she hoped to hear more and she supports the Cultural and Linguistic Competency Technical Resource Group Report.

Dorothy Hendrickson said she is a family member with a son with dual diagnosis of bi-polar and drug addiction and has served as an administrator for the Mental Health Services Act. She stated that since Orange County has implemented the CSS plan they have implemented 20 new programs across all age groups with two intergenerational programs for education and training and housing. She said they recently received approval for the CSS Growth funding plan expanding 4 programs and adding 4 programs and is currently serving over 2,473 clients that were not served before. She reported that in their education program, they have engaged over 2,821 mental health stakeholder clients throughout the community; secured 27 unit affordable housing projects in the city of Santa Ana which is the first affordable housing project dedicated only to the mental health community.

Andrea Gordon asked the Commission to ensure that children and youth are adequately represented when they have mental health issues. She clarified that some people thought if a child was in the juvenile justice system that they were "locked up", most of the kids are not detained but are usually in the community with their families.

Shebuah Burke works with the MHSA office and as a member of the planning council, thanked the Commission.

Chris Reilly thanked the Commission and said he hopes that this Commission becomes strengthened and empowered to actually really oversee the types of services delivered.

Georgia DeGroat stated she is a consumer and a family member with multiple disabilities had a son who passed away due to depression, in regards to older adults feels that it is despair that older adults do not get enough care. She urged the Commission to remember that the senior citizen have needs.

Elaine Des Roches said that older adults that should be included. She stated her concern is the starting of programs before the planning and before the acceptance of the guidelines take place. She said she's been a retired teacher the problem is in the wellness centers, two decisions were made through the Department that did not go through the stakeholders meeting that affect us delivery of services. She urged the Commission to include stakeholders in planning and decision making.

Zula Reeves encouraged everybody to voice their opinions.

Meeting adjourned.