

MINUTES

CALIFORNIA MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AUTHORITY (CalMHSA)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING – REGULAR MEETING

CiMH Building
September 10, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT

Allan Rawland, MSW, ACSW, CalMHSA President, San Bernardino County

Wayne Clark, PhD, Vice-President, Monterey County

Karen Baylor, PhD, MFT, CalMHSA Treasurer, San Luis Obispo County

Maureen Bauman, Secretary, LCSW, Placer County

William Arroyo, MD, Los Angeles County (alternate)

Denise Hunt, MFT, Stanislaus County

Scott Gruendl, MPA, Glenn County

Mary Ann Bennett, Sacramento County

Anne Robin, MFT, Butte County

Noel J. O'Neill, MFT, Trinity County

Jayleen M. Richards, MPA/HAS, Solano County (alternate)

Karen Stockton, PhD, MSW, Modoc County

Mark Refowitz, MSW, Orange County

William Cornelius, PhD, Colusa County

Tom Sherry, MFT, Sutter/Yuba County (alternate)

NON-VOTING ALTERNATE

Michelle Callejas, Sacramento County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Bruce Gurganus, MFT, Marin County

Kim Suderman, Yolo County

Leslie Tremaine, EdD, Santa Cruz County

Michael Kennedy, MFT, Sonoma County

STAFF PRESENT

John Chaquica, CPA, MBA, ARM, CalMHSA Executive Director

Edward Walker, LCSW, CalMHSA Program Director

Laura Li, CalMHSA Program Executive Assistant

Maya Maas, CalMHSA Executive Assistant

Doug Alliston, Legal Counsel, Murphy Campbell Guthrie & Alliston

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Stephanie Welch, California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA)

David Kopperud, California Department of Education

Lin Benjamin, California Department of Aging

Monica Nepomuceno, California Department of Education

Stacie Hiramoto, Racial and Ethnic Mental Health Disparities Coalition (REMHDCO)

Karolyn Stein, Humboldt County

Katheryn Skrabo, Sacramento County

Al Santana, Sacramento Latino Non Profit

Will Rhett-Mariscal, CiMH

Viviana Criado, California Elder Mental Health and Aging Coalition (CEMHAC)

Kathleen Derby, National Alliance of Mental Health (NAMI California)

Norma Rivera, RS&E

Scott Rose, Runyon Saltzman & Einhorn

Sherman Blackwell, National Alliance of Mental Health (NAMI California)

1. CALL TO ORDER

8:30a.m. The CalMHSA Board Meeting was called to order.

2. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

President Rawland asked that the clerk call the roll.

Laura Li, CalMHSA staff, called roll of the board and confirmed a quorum.

3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Ms. Li was asked to review the instructions for public comment to include the process of public comment cards. It was also mentioned that public comment and stakeholder input on non-agenda items would be taking place at the end of the meeting.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AS POSTED

President Rawland asked if there were amendments to the agenda; none were made.

A motion was made to approve the agenda as posted.

Motion – Mark Refowitz, MSW, Orange County

Second – Noel O’Neill, MFT, Trinity County

Motion passed unanimously.

Before moving on President Rawland asked William Cornelius, PhD, Colusa County, to give an update on his status within Colusa County.

Dr. Cornelius indicated as of a few weeks ago he was appointed interim director, but two weeks after that he was informed that Mr. Curtis Bower would not be returning, therefore, he continues to serve as Interim Director.

President Rawland reminded everyone that Mr. Curtis was a founding member and wanted to recognize him as such. He added Mr. Curtis was in recovery from his illness.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

President Rawland acknowledged the consent calendar adding item 5F would be deferred as a separate item.

A motion was made to accept the consent calendar without item 5F.

Motion – Denise Hunt, MFT, Stanislaus County
Second – Mark Refowitz, MSW, Orange County

Motion passed unanimously.

President Rawland called for item 5F of the consent calendar, an update to the Technical Assistance and Capacity Building program.

Will Rhett-Mariscal, CIMH, indicated Sandra Naylor Goodwin was unable to attend the meeting; therefore, he would be giving the update.

Mr. Rhett-Mariscal indicated nine counties were currently participating to which initial phone calls had been made to, followed by site visits. He added seven site visits had been made with one scheduled and the other is waiting on a county staff hire. The purpose of the site visits is to review PEI programs, assess evaluation plans and develop specific technical assistance activities that support current and ongoing evaluation.

In addition, a proposed contract for FY 10/11 will be presented in October. Changes in the contract will include the need to conduct two separate learning collaboratives that are designed to cluster the counties based on county capacity and need.

Mr. Rhett-Mariscal ended with the totaling billing through September 2010 being \$36,040.18. A matrix delineating the individual counties and their participation progress was distributed separately.

President Rawland expressed the importance of ongoing updates regarding the program at all the Board meetings as other counties will look to participate in this as well.

6. NEW COUNTY MEMBERSHIP

Ed Walker, CalMHSA Program Director, indicated no new members at this time but confirmed Riverside County had received BOS approval, however, there was not enough time for them to submit their application for today's meeting so will be on the October meeting. He added MHSA staff of Fresno County had indicated going to their BOS on September 14th as well as Contra Costa County. There are ongoing discussions with some other counties.

Mr. Walker continued by mentioning once Riverside comes on board they would be at 21 counties, 20 members.

Mr. Walker was asked what percentage of the population they would be at with Riverside County and he indicated that they would be at 60% of the population, which tracks close to the allocated funding.

President Rawland asked for an update from San Diego County and their participation under an MOU.

Mr. Walker confirmed discussions with the director, Alfredo Aguirre, and administrative staff would be taking place the following week on the 14th. A written summary of the meeting will be given at the end of next week.

President Rawland stated this was the first county to execute an MOU as a JPA partner and not member.

Mr. Walker added San Diego's intent was to become a member, but wanted to start out with an MOU. In addition, they have already assigned their funds from DMH to CalMHSA thru Information Notice 10-05.

7. PROGRAM MATTERS

i. Implementation Timeline

Mr. Walker indicated notes from the previous Ad Hoc Committee meeting were included in the packet and mentioned some changes had been made to the implementation timeline to include an extension of 15 days starting in phase one in January. In addition, he confirmed the MHSOAC review for approval meeting would be taking place on December 16, 2010, after which he requested Board approval of the Implementation Timeline being presented.

President Rawland turned it over to Wayne Clark, PhD, Monterey County, who chairs the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee, acknowledging the hard work of the committee and the active involvement of the stakeholders in the process.

Dr. Clark clarified there were two items they would be talking about and asked that they address the Implementation Timeline first then the Priority of Recommended Actions. As such, Dr. Clark motioned for approval of the Implementation Timeline followed by discussions and questions.

A motion was made to approve the Implementation Timeline as presented.

Motion – Wayne Clark, PhD, Monterey County

Second –Karen Stockton, PhD, Modoc County

Motion passed unanimously.

President Rawland opened it up for discussion by members.

Mary Ann Bennett, Sacramento County, stated Sacramento County had been working with their local county office of education and has a Student Mental Health plan ready to go, which had been ready to go for some time. She noticed phase three starts close to when schools start vacation in May, therefore, not being effective until the following school year. Ms. Bennett voiced her frustration with the delay.

Dr. Clark asked if she was suggesting they change the order or do all at once.

Ms. Bennett indicated her solution would be to have two going on at once or move Student Mental Health up to phase one so that they could start contract negotiations at the end of March.

Maureen Bauman, LCSW, Placer County, commented even with the suggested timeline, they would still start the following fall, therefore, not launching a program this year.

Ms. Bennett agreed and wanted to let the record show her frustration.

President Rawland indicated they would still have to comply with the guidelines of multi- County and state wide and felt the timeline was ambitious and they were moving as fast as possible.

Dr. Clark stated that they were getting the plane built as they flew and part of that had been that they've been told it's an ambitious timeline and looking at RFPs. If it appears they could do two or all at the same time then they will go back to the committee and further discuss the timeline, but for now this gives them a sense of how they could move forward.

Mr. Walker reiterated with the 15 day extension in the three phases they would be going to the Board in March with two phases. He also confirmed the OAC was aware of the aggressive timeline and urgency.

Denise Hunt, PhD, Stanislaus County commented her concern was quite the opposite and asked Mr. Walker if he had the infrastructure and ability to do this as there was a lot of work ahead of them.

Mr. Walker confirmed the temporary addition of staff with experience in writing, editing and structuring of documents such as theirs. He added they owed it to the state as a whole to move these forward as quickly as possible, therefore, they will do their best.

Ms. Hunt added she had noticed the scoring rubric process and asked if that would be available for bidders through the RFP process.

Mr. Walker confirmed they had to design the scoring rubric which would be publicly discussed as they moved along.

Ms. Hunt also indicated the OAC had done a lot of work on evaluations and believed the JPA would benefit from having conversations with OAC staff about what they may have learned in the process.

Mr. Walker indicated he and Dr. Clark had discussions regarding having a meeting or teleconference with OAC and being that she was on the evaluation committee at the OAC he would appreciate her assistance in helping set that up.

Dr. Clark stated an attempt for the timeline, project managers and other tasks to be done simultaneously and not just sequentially. He added the evaluation, RFPs, scope of work, procurement policy and all of that process would be working with the ad hoc committee in setting up that framework over the next month to six weeks and at the same time they would be doing an implementation plan, not just one at a time.

Mr. Walker indicated he would be presenting a flow chart of their work plan at the next meeting so that can have a better understanding of the process.

Mark Refowitz, MSW, Orange County, asked if they were able to move at such a fast rate due to the work already done, that being the foundation for this work now.

Mr. Walker confirmed and President Rawland opened it up for public comment.

Viviana Criado, California Elder Mental Health and Aging Coalition (CEMHAC), appreciated the work CalMHSA had done with the timeline, however, she found the timeline failed to incorporate consumers and family, which had created some frustration. In addition, she found the timeline to be very general, not specific which requires some detail. Her example was the mention of October 7 (Board Agenda, Draft of work posted), posted for what? If posted for review, review by whom and for how long? She added they were moving from summary

report to RFPs to planning and isn't sure if the families and consumers are part of the process. She reiterated the incompleteness and generic timeline.

Dr. Clark indicated they would try to distribute documents at least 24 hours ahead of time and clarified that Oct 7th is the 30 day public comment period.

Mr. Walker added stakeholder participation under the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee would continue throughout all phases and agreed to add more clarification to the timeline.

Kathleen Derby, NAMI California, echoed Ms. Criado's comments and stated her concern in the rush that errors can be made and details lost. She noted an error of the previous meeting minutes on page 36, she was miss quoted and wanted the correction to read "Stigma should be the basis for the other programs" not "Suicide."

President Rawland acknowledged comments made, moved to have the motion approved and confirmed the timeline would be updated to include more clarification by Mr. Walker.

ii. Priority of Recommended Actions

Mr. Walker acknowledged the error pointed out by Ms. Derby. As well, Betsy Sheldon had recommended a revision to the SMH section in the recommended actions of the summary report, for clarity purposes. The corrections were made to the report but meeting notes failed to reflect that, therefore, those corrections will be made.

Mr. Walker summarized the layout of the report and indicated the recommendations were not fixed or binding priorities for the Board.

Dr. Clark reiterated Mr. Refowitz comment indicating they had an opportunity to take a very extensive stakeholder process and take a subsequent 52 day stakeholder process and worked with the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee to bring this forward.

Ms. Bauman asked for clarification, they mentioned dollars would be expended in 3 years rather than 4 years and with the timing before them, asked if that was true.

President Rawland clarified the contract with the State was for the maximum amount, which is the four year amount they initially came out with in 2007,

however, the contracts terminates on June 30, 2014. What they now have to do is work with DMH to see if they can extend that contract.

Mr. Walker went through the summary report and recommended actions in detail; Dr. Clark clarified the selected priorities were not in rank order, but the Strategic Directions were.

Mr. Refowitz had a question similar to the previous regarding the timeline. He wanted to make sure the recommended actions and work of the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee was built upon the work that had taken place with the previous stakeholder process.

Mr. Walker affirmed it was and stated William Arroyo, MD, Los Angeles County, had recommended a foot note be added on page 56 so that very point would not be overlooked.

President Rawland opened it up for public comment.

Stacie Hiramoto, Racial and Ethnic Mental Health Disparities Coalition (REMHDCO), had concerns with the rapid way stakeholder information was effectively summarized given the timeframe and concerns with comments given not being incorporated into the report as some feel their comments were more important than their priorities. She added there was confusion as to how these programs would be rolled out. Stakeholders were under the impression if counties wanted to do a suicide project they could that with their PEI money and this statewide money was for special projects that would somehow tie together either a theme or would reach people state-wide. In addition, for those individual counties ready to bid on something, how would they know they were in compliance?

Dr. Arroyo referred to an Information Notice from DMH that was an expansion of the original county PEI allocation directing counties to use the expansion dollars for state-wide PEI projects, which some counties did. He stated he was in agreement with Ms. Hiramoto on some levels, adding Stephanie Welch, California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA) could probably cite the Information Notice he was referring to.

Ms. Welch confirmed it was Information Notice 08-37.

Lin Benjamin, California Department of Aging, had a question regarding how the information was used to form the priorities. How Appendix 3 was used to select priorities and had concerns with priorities having a high vote count on Appendix

1 and not being selected as a priority. She appreciated the added language of a life span approach, but wants to see something about state-wideness in the principles and policy directions.

Dr. Clark responded saying it was discussed at the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee—they were not counting numbers—and indicated themes were pulled to account for state-wideness and non-traditional settings.

President Rawland agreed to add the language as it was necessary.

Karen Stockton asked for clarification on Appendix 1.

Mr. Walker clarified Appendix 1 was summarized on page 56, adding submissions were tallied for everyone to see, but it was the themes that allowed them to present relative areas to prioritize.

Ms. Derby echoed concerns mentioned by Mr. Refowitz, Ms. Hiramoto and Ms. Benjamin. Her concerns were that of family members and the communication process, which appeared to be missing. She asked between the tally and responses what actually made it to the summary report and was unsure what weight stakeholder input was given and family, client input. Ms. Derby added this is supposed to be a family/client driven, not just included. The process needed to be outlined.

Her last concern was with the multi-county collaborative; she believed it was outside of the JPA if not, then family and clients need clarification on what they are referring to.

Sherman Blackwell, NAMI, asked if the stakeholder process is ongoing, to which board members confirmed it was. He continued by stating there was a need for data utilization from county mental health directors to determine how many people (Asians, Hispanics, etc.) there were so they are able to move forward. (A need to identify people)

Ms. Welch clarified the Information Notice referred to earlier was 08-27, not 08-37, and asked for clarification as it relates to Information Notice 10-06. If you chose a particular project and wanted to expend all of your funds, (4 years worth of work in two years) you could do that?

President Rawland confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Welch then stated they might want to consider a really big upfront investment and noticed in Suicide and Stigma a lot of references to media and that it could be very expensive, therefore, you could knock those out in the first two years and other parts of the program over four years.

Ms. Criado echoed comments from others adding the process was not clear and a need to add age and geography. She felt they should also be looking at rural and urban. She added collaboration with DMH and Office of Suicide Prevention to be very important and a good way to introduce some savings that can be utilized later on. She continues to see the timeline as an issue, but came here today thinking the timeline would be reviewed but when looking at the agenda it is up for approval. It was her understanding from the Ad Hoc Committee there was still room for changes and tightening that up. Ms. Criado ended with the issue of consumers and families, indicating it is not enough for them to just provide input, but what will it take to be equal partners so that they are part of the decision-making process.

President Rawland acknowledged the comments made and moved forward with the agenda.

A motion was made to accept the priority recommended actions from the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee.

Anne Robin, MFT, Butte County, asked to amend the motion and include a values statement acknowledging state-wideness and other comments brought up so that it is clear in the report.

Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bennett indicated the continuous theme of consumer and family-driven and how it is not included in the report and asked staff to respond to how they came about the priorities, what was done, and how they included stakeholders to make it a driven process.

Mr. Walker responded stakeholders first asked the board to ensure there was stakeholder participation in the Implementation Ad Hoc Committee process, to which the board granted. Information was published in the meeting of September 3rd. How they came to the priorities was summarized in the text of the report, but Mr. Walker explained staff advised Board members of starting with a blank slate and asked member to go through their own exercise, looking at using Appendix 1 and rank order the recommended action they thought would merit priority status, which they did. This was done before the meeting on

September 3rd and committee members (Bauman, Arroyo, Baylor and Clark) held discussions about those, some suggested adjustments were accepted by Board members, one or two were not. The report reflects the result of the stakeholder reactions to the initial draft of September 3rd.

Ms. Bennett was satisfied with Mr. Walker's responses.

John Chaquica further clarified staff did not gather all data effective August 31st and summarize in three days. The summarization process started when the first submission was received in the house, at the end of July, it was summarized, edited, and added to the matrix so it was a continuous process for at least 52 days.

Mr. Walker indicated input was posted on the website at the end of each week as it came in. Board members read what was available as of September 3rd, as the last two days they had approx 29 submissions and there wasn't enough time to get those posted. Members read all input available to help in their exercise.

Dr. Arroyo reiterated each strategic plan was very inclusive in their development. He participated in two of them and each had more stakeholders than county personnel, therefore, since inception stakeholder input was given for each of them and this is the basis from which they worked in recent past.

Ms. Bauman added as it relates to state-wideness, some of the projects will have to be less than state-wide actual implement, particularly if you are doing anything related to services. The state wideness criteria need to be applicable to the whole state or replicable, therefore, needing to really define that criteria.

Dr. Arroyo quoted they had Cadillac plans and bicycle budgets which is a reality and there was only so much state-wideness they are going to be able to achieve.

A motion was made to approve the recommended actions to include a value statement reflecting state wideness, non-traditional and the foundation of stakeholder process that has preceded us.

**Motion – Wayne Clark, PhD, Monterey County
Second – William Cornelius, PhD, Colusa County**

Motion passed unanimously.

President Rawland acknowledged comments from stakeholders which would be taken into consideration.

8. Administrative Matters
a. CalMHSA Bylaws

Mr. Chaquica explained the JPA Agreement had the distinction of voting by majority, however, they could go through a weighted voting process, which was not reflected on the Bylaws. The Bylaws before them reflects the JPA language on the voting mechanics.

President Rawland added the voting structure parallels that of CSAC's structure for counties and they did not want to deviate from that since the BOS had already approved it and being that they represent the BOS they wanted to be consistent. His research indicates they have never actually used weighted voting.

A motion was made to accept staff's modification to the Bylaws.

Motion – Denise Hunt, MFT, Stanislaus County
Second – William Cornelius, PhD, Colusa County

Motion passed unanimously.

b. Draft Purchasing and Procurement Policy

Mr. Chaquica indicated the Procurement Policy was submitted in draft form as the previous was very general and in moving forward with the planning stages and RFP process felt the language needed to be expanded. He added some input had been provided and look to them to provide additional input on the draft, which would then be re-drafted and submitted to the Board for approval at the October meeting.

Doug Alliston, Legal Counsel, Murphy Campbell Guthrie & Alliston, added he had highlighted areas where he needed direction from the Board.

Ms. Bauman commented they should establish as they do with limits of authority, such as with expenditures, etc. She added decisions like this should only be done by the Executive Committee, which is already in place, unless they have intentions of establishing a Fiscal Committee.

President Rawland acknowledged that there would be discussion on a Fiscal Committee further down on the agenda and opened up for public comment.

Ms. Hiramoto referred to page 97 as it relates to the review panel. It wasn't clear to her as to who would appoint the member to the review panel, but strongly requests that a review panel include an expert on cultural competency and reducing disparities and hoped they would consider consumer/family member representation and representatives that are knowledgeable about issues across the life span.

President Rawland indicated her comments would be taken into consideration.

Ms. Bennett asked for consideration if they are delegating to a committee for purchases that a limit of dollar amount be established and anything over the limit would go back to the Board for approval.

Members confirmed it was already included in the draft policy under section 5.

c. Draft Participation Agreement

Mr. Chaquica indicated they were still working on getting the draft agreement completed, therefore, nothing was provided.

President Rawland this may be something to be deferred to the Fiscal Committee if established.

d. Draft Core Values

Mr. Walker confirmed he and Karen Baylor, PhD, San Luis Obispo County, had worked on the Core Values and indicated there was reference to some of the values s being the same as the MHSOAC core values, therefore eliminated that reference and just stated the values.

Ms. Derby cited bullet 7 and felt children and youth should have a voice in their own care as well in that it just says family-driven which seems duplicative of bullet 6. It seemed they were setting out children and youth aside from others but were including them in bullet 6.

Ms. Benjamin recommended changing the first bullet to read "Systems and services which strengthen and transform community mental health and reduce disparities in access, utilization and outcomes by age, race, ethnicity and gender." She felt reducing disparities is at the core and there was no language regarding reducing disparities. Also noted was that they are addressing some workforce development issues and she doesn't see anything related to that specifically through Training Technical Assistance and Capacity Building and

there is certainly training and education within Suicide Prevention and Stigma & Discrimination Reduction. She recommended some language in a separate bullet qualifying cultural competency and diverse workforce, something to that effect.

Dr. Arroyo indicated he was looking for fiscal accountability, but was satisfied with accountability as already stated.

Noel O'Neill, MFT, Trinity County suggested adding a bullet to give some recognition to unique geographical locations.

President Rawland asked the board's approval to defer this back to Dr. Baylor and Mr. Walker so they may re-draft to include comments made from members and stakeholders then bring back to the October meeting. All members agreed.

Mr. Walker asked Ms. Derby and Ms Benjamin to send him emails to confirm their comments.

9. CalMHSA – General Discussion
Report from CalMHSA Executive Director – John Chaquica

Mr. Chaquica noted four items for discussion starting with the fact that due to the increase in membership a new budget would be presented at the October Board meeting. Relative to the signing of the JPA Agreement, they are still in the process of completing that tabulation which they hope to have completed and finalized by the October meeting.

President Rawland added he had received inquiries from counties who would like a copy of the complete process of signed agreements so they can move forward with their process.

Mr. Chaquica confirmed it was a high priority for staff. He continued by adding it had been discussed in the plan development steps there is an important fiscal part, which is the development of the three year plan. It was suggested they add a Finance Ad Hoc Committee to deal with the allocations and formulas. As such, he asked the Board if they wanted to establish that committee at that time.

President Rawland added it is something needed and would have the consultant, Mike Geiss, work with the committee along with Mr. Walker and Mr. Chaquica. Adding he would chair the committee and asked Tom Sherry, MFT, Sutter/Yuba Counties, and Dr. Clark to participate in the committee then opened it up for other members to volunteer their participation. Dr. Arroyo and Scott Gruendl, MPA, Glenn County, volunteered to participate as well. President Rawland

confirmed the members of the committee and acknowledged he wanted the same process as the other committee with stakeholder input, for transparency.

Dr. Clark added the need for the committee to start meeting rather quickly.

Mr. Chaquica lastly brought up that the November scheduled CalMHSA meeting is on Thursday, November 11th which coincides with CMHDA's calendar and noted in November is the strategic planning session for CMHDA in Napa. He realized that not everyone was involved in that meeting and would like to try to schedule the CalMHSA Board meeting around that meeting. The CMHDA meeting takes place on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday morning. He added the need to not lose site of the timeline giving motivation to meet that week possibly Friday afternoon in Sacramento or Napa.

President Rawland reiterated it was a meeting not all members attended and in addition wanted to be sensitive to people's travel plans.

After ongoing discussion with members, a motion was made to hold the Board meeting the afternoon of Friday, November 12, 2010, in Napa.

Motion – Wayne Clark, PhD, Monterey County
Second – William Arroyo, MD, Los Angeles County

A member called the question, as such President Rawland confirmed the question had been called and asked for a raise of hands of those in favor of the motion. Ms. Li confirmed 7 were in favor and 5 were opposed with some members not voting.

President Rawland then confirmed the motion to hold the Board meeting on Friday, November 12, 2010 in the afternoon in Napa.

Motion passed unanimously.

President Rawland asked staff to survey the Board in attendance to ensure a quorum at the November meeting.

Dr. Clark asked staff to explore the capabilities and legalities of teleconference.

10. Public Comment

Ms. Hiramoto stated with the conference line issue, the OAC meetings were available to the public via teleconference and unless it was a commissioner's

meeting, then the public did not weigh in. She felt it important to have the availability for people to listen in.

President Rawland clarified the request for the current meeting came in late and did not allow for Brown Act compliance as call-in information must also be posted 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Ms. Benjamin echoed Ms. Hiramoto comments adding not knowing how long stakeholder input would be kept on the website but hoped it would be available through the implementation process and asked if it could be linked to the OAC website. It was also recommended the Office of Suicide Prevention do a presentation to this Board about what they are doing.

Mr. Walker added the Office of Suicide Prevention, under Zoey Todd and staff, were putting together a matrix display which would show how they feel they could participate and link to CalMHSA Implementation. That matrix is expected to be complete in a couple of weeks.

President Rawland asked if there was a possibility the organizations present could link to the CalMHSA website as well?.

Ms. Robin asked if it made sense adding it to the Network of Care and have discussions with Trilogy to that regard.

President Rawland agreed to it being a good idea.

Mr. Chaquica confirmed CalMHSA had a record retention policy.

Ms. Derby indicated Ralph Metzger at the MHSA Partner meeting had a concern that the continuity of the state records being kept, some history would be lost. She also echoed Ms. Hiramoto and Ms. Benjamin's comments. Ms. Derby asked members to reflect back on the phrase on the Value Statement of "Client and Family Driven." She gave a metaphor of a driver in a car and how there were passengers, back seat drivers and how they could advise the driver where to turn but the driver not having to turn there if he didn't want to. She asked they think about that for a moment.

Ms. Criado echoed the teleconferencing capabilities.

11. New Business

Mr. O'Neill asked at the October or November meeting he would like the agenda to include a section that will speak to providing financial assistance with travel for Board members that may need it and could this possibly come out of the training allocations.

President Rawland confirmed and asked staff to prepare a report and bring that information back to the next Board meeting. He also acknowledged and thanked Mr. Refowitz for representing CalMHSA at the NAMI conference.

Ms. Robin asked if by assigning their funds to CalMHSA they would be protected from reversion.

President Rawland confirmed it did not and added they had revised the clock to 2014 as a compromise. He would continue to have conversation with DMH to that effect.

President Rawland added he had received a request from John Cullen, Executive Director of CALSWAC, to make a presentation to the Board in the next couple of months and asked for Board comment.

It was agreed to have Mr. Cullen wait until the beginning of next year. Mr. Gruendl asked that part of Mr. Cullen's presentation should include how they organize all pots of money so students can access at one location.

Ms. Bauman asked for a general information update and whether there was a role for the JPA.

Dr. Arroyo echoed Ms. Bauman.

President Rawland stated he introduced himself to Herb Shultz, Region 9, and shared information about the JPA, which Mr. Schultz was very interested in. He asked Mr. Walker to provide him with more information relating to the JPA.

Hearing no further comments, a motion was made to adjourn at 11:04 am.

Motion: Wayne Clark, PhD, Monterey County

Second: Karen Baylor, PhD, MFT, San Luis Obispo

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,



Ms. Maureen Bauman, LCSW
Secretary, CalMHSA

10/28/10
Date