

1. Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules – Sherry Bradley

Sherry Bradley called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Sherry said she was going to try to facilitate rather than having the cost of a facilitator. She introduced new members of the committee and announced 2 resignations, Randy Trias and Evelyn Aguilar. Attendees introduced themselves.

Laura Balon-Keleti, PEI Planner Evaluator

Sherry Bradley, MHA

David Carillo, MHA

Brenda Crawford, MHCC

Courtney Cummings, Native American Health Center

Cindy Downing, MHA

John Gragnani, Children's Services, MH Coalition

Steven Grolnic-McClurg, Rubicon

Molly Hamaker, Clubhouse

Peggy Harris, MHCSS

Vidya Iyengar, MHA

Anna Lubarov, Vocational Services

Mariana Moore, Contractors Alliance

Ryan Nestman, Consumer

Teresa Pasquini, Mental Health Commission

Michele Perada MHCC

Annis Pereyra, Mental Health Commission

Tony Sanders, LGBTQ

Elvita Sarlis, MHA

Bob Sessler, Consultant, Long-Term Care

Mickey Sherman, formerly Area Agency on Aging

Karen Shuler, Recording Secretary

Connie Steers, Patients Rights

Candace Tao, Transition Team

Veronica Vale, Consumer/Family Member/Provider

Katheryn Wade, Office of Consumer Empowerment

Vern Wallace, MHA

It was reported that the CPAW application has now been modified and is posted on the MHSA home page through cchealth.org. Applications will be accepted on an ongoing/continuing basis.

The ground rules were posted, and copies of same were distributed.

2. Agenda Review; conflict of interest declarations

Steven requested that, due to possible conflict of interest, he wanted to know who (was present at today's meeting) is being funded under MHSA. It was clarified that the following individuals have been funded under MHSA: Sherry Bradley, Vidya Iyengar, Steven Grolnic-McClurg, Brenda Crawford (MHCC), members of the Transition Team, Laura Balon-Keletti, and Debra Jones.

3. Approve Minutes from March 2009 meeting.

No action was taken.

4. Review of Draft Charter for CPAW

Draft copies of the CPAW Charter were distributed, and workgroup members were requested to review it and bring comments back to the next meeting. It was also agreed that a workgroup be formed to work on the Goals piece for the Draft Charter. The following individuals volunteered for the Goals Workgroup: Mariana Moore, Ryan Nestman, Anna Lubarov, Brenda Crawford, and Katherine Wade volunteered. *(subsequent to the meeting, Kathi McLaughlin also volunteered)* The workgroup will recommend goals, and the goals will help drive natural “goal related” groups to track items that CPAW works on. It was suggested that there already may be some existing “subgroups” that may be able to work on goals, such as the Mental Health Coalition, the Mental Health Commission, etc. Others suggested that CPAW needs to be cognizant that the workgroups are also open to the public; there could possibly be other stakeholders who need to also have the opportunity to make contributions. It was suggested that possibly an email subgroup could be created, or a website, or possibly a “blog” for vetting ideas/goals.

It was also requested that in the future, conference call availability be distributed to CPAW members via the agenda, so that folks with conflicts can “attend” or join in the CPAW meetings.

5. Use of Sub-workgroups for Tasks

Due to the membership size of CPAW, there was some discussion about forming smaller sub-workgroups of CPAW. It was suggested that CPAW wait until the Goals Workgroup comes back with recommended goals; the setting of goals will likely result in driving the establishment of subworkgroups.

6. MHSA Program Manager’s Report

- The PEI plan was approved by the MHS-OAC on March 26, 2009;
- PEI-RFP’s are due April 3, 2009, and CCMH looks forward to the review process. A total of 8 PEI projects were RFP'd.

7. Draft CSS 08/09 Plan Update

The Public Hearing for the Draft CSS 08/09 Plan Update is scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 2009, at 2425 Bisso, Concord, first floor conference room.

CPAW members received a copy of the draft CSS 08/09 Plan Update, and also received documents outlining concerns from the Family Involvement Steering Committee, the response to those concerns from MSHA Steering, and a second letter of concerns to the Mental Health Commission regarding same. It was reported that there will be a combined meeting of the Family Involvement Steering Committee and the MHSA Steering Committee to discuss the concerns/issues/actions outlined in the letters. That meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 6, 2009.

There was considerable discussion regarding the timelines around the approval process for the draft CSS 08/09 Plan Update, the Public Hearing, the combined meetings of MHSA Steering & FISC. It was clarified that in terms of approval process, the order is:

CSS 08/09 Plan Update is circulated for 30 days public comment; then MH Commission convenes the Public Hearing; public comments are documented and if there are substantive comments, MH Administration needs to respond/summarize the reason/s they have not been included in the draft CSS 08/09 Plan update. The local review/planning process used in Contra Costa County has been in place for the past 5 years. However, if the MH Commission has an action item to review the plan, and/or recommend approval of the plan, or other recommendations, that would be taken into consideration by MH Administration (the MH Director).

A question was asked regarding the Plan going to the BOS for approval. It was clarified that when the local review process was originally laid out in Contra Costa County, the BOS reviewed the initial implementation of MHSA, and subsequent that time, once an MHSA plan/plan update is approved by the State and/or the MHS-OAC, the MHSA Agreement is amended (by the State DMH) and then sent back to the County for BOS approval; that's when BOS approval takes place.

There was then discussion about comments that are made during the public comment period and the Public Hearing scheduled to take place April 9th. Sherry clarified that if there are comments that are substantive, and the result is a revised plan, that can be re-circulated, but doesn't require another Public Hearing. MH Administration is required (by the State) to provide documentation regarding all public comments received during both the public comment period and the Public Hearing. MH Administration must also include in that documentation whether or not any plan revisions were made as a result of the comment. It was suggested that in thinking about the good and positive use of the CPAW body, after the Public Hearing, if there are substantive comments, perhaps MHA could respond and bring that to this full body or a representative sub-group. Some members of CPAW were puzzled on the time frame, stating that the fiscal year is over in three (3) months. Sherry stated that CCMH does not have the funding for FY 08/09 because of the delayed planning process. An example included the fact that there are no more housing vouchers available, and that's the result of not having an approved plan for FY 08/09. It was also clarified that State DMH did not get the CSS 08/09 Plan Update guidelines issued until April or May of 2008, which wasn't enough time to plan for 08/09. Sherry said that when she started as the MHSA Program Manager in October 2008, she realized there was no 08/09 plan. However, given that there were already three MHSA plans in progress, the priority was to get the three plans through the approval process. Simultaneously, planning was started at the end of December 2008 to develop the CSS 08/09 Plan, hence the urgency. However, it is recognized that with the issues that are being presented, does it make sense to push out the 08/09 when next month 09/10 will be presented. There was a question about whether or not the County has the option to carry over dollars and come up with a consolidated plan with 09/10, and Sherry said no, that can't be done with the way the State issued the guidelines.

Concern was expressed about rolling out the 08/09 plan update because there are decisions being made that will affect future positions; these are not trivial decisions. It was acknowledged that there is a diverse group of stakeholders, and with the County and stakeholders not agreeing, as well as stakeholders disagreeing among themselves, it's difficult to keep the process moving. Sherry was asked who makes the "final decision"

about the draft CSS 08/09 Plan Update, and she stated that the Mental Health Director has that responsibility. The MH Director has a lot of responsibilities that are statutorily driven or delegated to her by the BOS. There was a question about what happens to the approval process when anyone can complain anonymously about the plan, and it was stated that it's imperative to resolve issues. Sherry clarified that State DMH is following "grievance or issue resolution process" that's interim right now, and Counties are getting more direction from the State about how to handle this.

There were also concerns about the possibility of "sweeping" MHPA funds from counties if Prop 1E is approved. Sherry clarified that if Prop 1E is approved by the voters, State DMH will determine how it will be implemented. In the meantime, CMHPA (California Mental Health Director Association) has written a principle paper recommending that if Prop 1E is approved, State DMH consider first taking from any funds at the state level that have not been expended, or from any statewide initiatives under MHPA. CMHPA also included in the principle paper that the funds NOT be taken from programs which are already funded or in place, such as CSS, PEI, and Workforce Education & Training. It is possible that the Innovation funds could be impacted.

It was suggested that CPAW might want to look at the original consumer data and/or comments during the CSS planning process. While this can be accomplished, that might mean having to do that for all stakeholder groups. It was recommended that CPAW look at key priority areas, however, there was concern that the consumer voice wouldn't be included in that. Sherry clarified that the priorities were based upon the input of all stakeholder workgroups, and are listed in order of importance for each of the component planning groups. This data would need to be reviewed and condensed. It was suggested that perhaps a sub-workgroup could do that. The following CPAW members volunteered to review the consumer comments and data from the previous CSS planning process: Ryan Nestman, Kathryn Wade, Connie Steers, Peggy Harris, Courtney Cummings.

There were further questions and concerns about the local process of Public Hearings, and the question was raised about whether or not adoption of the plan by the Mental Health Commission is required. Sherry stated that the past practice by the MH Commission has been to conduct the Public Hearings and to review plans. This was the local review process utilized. She also clarified that the local process includes: a 30-day public comment period, followed by a Public Hearing (conducted by the MH Commission), at the conclusion of the Public Hearing, there is documentation of comments received/addressed during the public comment period and the public hearing. If there are substantive comments which result in a revised plan/plan update, it is changed and it's sent back out. A public hearing on the 2nd draft is not required, but the 2nd draft has to be circulated. No time frame is required by law. The draft plan/plan update then goes to the State DMH, including listing of all comments received from beginning of the public comment period, and documents that explain what we did and why.

MH Admin was applauded for the open process and comments, and it was acknowledged that there are several proposals about how to move forward with any recommendation by CPAW regarding the draft CSS 08/09 Plan Update. Two workgroups were proposed: (1) the goals workgroup, and (2) a workgroup to go through the consumer comment materials. Given the questions around the timeline (i.e., Public Hearing scheduled for

4/9/09, the combined meeting of FISC/MHSA Steering, possible additional changes/comments to the draft plan), the consensus of CPAW was that perhaps having planning materials ready for the FY 09/10 review is more realistic. It was agreed that CPAW will want to look at family input as well as consumer input as it moves forward with planning for the 09/10 Plan Updates. Because there appeared to be consensus around the timeline issues for the CSS 08/09 planning, CPAW would observe the feedback process for the 08/09 planning and work on improvement of the process for the 09/10 planning.

Several members expressed their concern if the CSS 08/09 planning process is held up, and that the money will be lost. There was some discussion about how this has occurred and Teresa stated that it's important to consider the FSC's concerns, and that those issues need to be resolved, and also that the integrity of the process be preserved. Concern was expressed over making the same mistakes if the PEI and CSS plans if the issues aren't addressed.

There was agreement about continuing to go forward and the need to respect the previous stakeholder's hard work and advocacy for the plan. It was pointed out that there's a disconnect between forming and building a new group and suddenly making momentous decisions, and whatever decisions come out need to be qualified by some of the circumstances where things were decided on before CPAW came together. It was clarified that CPAW "came into being" at this time, and there are already some processes in place before CPAW was established. Sherry stated that CPAW is a recommending body, therefore the "decision" regarding CSS 08/09 is not on CPAW.

It was suggested that CCMH may want to recognize the progress, growth and transitions amongst the whole county, including consumers in leadership positions, returning to school as students, etc. Several CPAW members stated that they didn't want to see the county lose funding and stop what is being done because there are problems. It was also suggested that it would be useful and concrete to see a list of what has changed so far, and to let folks know about all of the things that have been funded by MHSA. It was also suggested that it would be compelling to tell the stories of real people to let folks know what's going on behind the scenes.

Sherry stated that she was hearing that it isn't "fair" to put any decision making on CPAW regarding CSS 08/09; that it would be really hard for the group to have to do that. She added that the original workgroups haven't sunsetted as yet, so they are still involved in the current planning process. She acknowledged there are gaps in the planning process, and it is disconcerting, but there's still time to work with it. Everyone agreed that no one wanted to risk the funding, so every effort will be made to keep moving forward and keep folks involved. It was acknowledged that it's important to keep issues out there, but it's also important to figure out how to keep things moving.

Sherry summarized as follows: she will work to get the two groups together sooner (FSC and MHSA Steering) if that's possible; will try to get all or some of the CPAW members together to review and vet issues more; and heard that the group would prefer to get more "intense" with the 09/10 planning process.

8. Innovation Component – Process for Consideration

Sherry reviewed the process for implementing the innovation component (powerpoint papers distributed).

- Option 1-Review all previous planning experiences
- Option 2-Focus on developing transformative innovation planning
- Option 3-A quality community planning process (CPP)

Next steps:

- Suggestion: Create an Innovation Planning small workgroup to formulate recommendations about the Innovation Process
- Suggestion: Postpone any planning process until after May 18th
- Suggestion: Make a recommendation to the Mental Health Director about other?

Sherry asked the CPAW to absorb it and give feedback in the interim between this meeting and the May meeting. This will be taken up at the next meeting, and work will be started on the 09/10 planning process.

9. Open Forum

Sherry asked for comments on any matter of interest.

Connie: I want to Bridges-to-Home feedback; Sherry suggested Connie talk to Steven.

Molly: Regarding accountability, if we want to minimize repeating our mistakes, we need to see outcomes and learn from other counties.

Steve: Several counties have adopted the village as a way to determine what level of service people need and how to assess how far along people are in their recovery.

Someone mentioned that Lynn Benjamin at the California Department on Aging has developed some tools

Anna: DMH has a powerpoint on performance measurement

Sherry: Is anyone interested in meeting more frequently? [Raised hands indicated yes]

Question: Do you want to bring a facilitator back? [No] What I will expect is that when you're ready to move on to someone else, you'll let me know.

Molly: We need to support Sherry if we're going to do it this way.

Sherry: If anyone knows anyone who would do it for free or very inexpensive?

10. Announcements

On May 27th - Disability Day will be marked between 10-3 on the west steps of the Capitol.

Brenda: I want to say I am always harping on the silence of the consumer voice, but the consumer-driven voice was not always up to par to be at the table.

11. Next Meeting: May 6th

12. Adjourn.