

DRAFT
MHSA TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

Behavioral Health Services
Red Oak Conference Room
2060 Campus Drive, Yreka, CA 96097
December 12, 2005

ATTENDANCE:

Behavioral Health

Arden Carr
Lauri Hunner
Kelly Samuelson

BHS Board

Wendell Seward
Donald Goldesberry
Anne Marsh

F.I.S.C.

Norma Marsh

FRC/CRC

Michelle O’Gorman – Yreka/Montague
Karen Pautz – Network Advocate
Emily Warn – Dunsmuir
Christine Gannon – Weed
Karen Derry – Scott Valley/Happy Camp
Tanya Jimmo - McCloud

Community Participants:

Linda Canning

Human Services

Nadine DellaBitta

Community Health Partnerships

Karen Preisser – Community Health Partnerships

I. Welcome and Introductions

Arden called the meeting to order at 10:36am. The sign in sheet was circulated and introductions were made. Arden thanked everyone for coming today despite all of the holidays. Arden informed everyone that he now had a new Health Assistant helping him with the grant.

II. Action Items

a) Approval of Nov 9 Minutes

Each member of the committee received a copy of the minutes from the Nov 9 meeting, and they were reviewed. Norma Marsh said she was listed under Behavioral Health and needed to be listed under FISC. Wendell Seward motioned to approve the minutes as corrected. Norma Marsh seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. Discussion Items and Possible Action Items

a) MHSA 2005 Community Services and Supports Grant DRAFT

Each member of the committee received a copy of the Grant to review. Arden Carr explained the process the grant would go through over the next few months. He also reminded the committee that the grant didn't have to be perfect the first year because there would be room for changes in years 2 and 3. He told the committee that the state said because we are such a small county; we don't need to have services and supports running until year 3. Year 1 and 2 are to be focused on organization and outreach. Arden stated that some minor changes had been made to the grant, but that they were mostly grammatical. As changes are made based on feedback, the changed parts of the grant will be distributed.

1) MHSA Services and Supports New Programs

a) FRC Grants

Arden informed that committee that each of the Family Resource Centers has submitted a grant and some minor changes were made to some of the grants, but if you hadn't been contacted, nothing was changed. However, one change that was made to all the grants was regarding goals for outreach and full partners. Arden reduced the number of full partners for the first year to 1 per FRC per age group, and 10 per FRC per age group in year 2. This is to take of pressure so that we can focus on making programs successful.

b) Consumer Involvement in Grant Process

There was a discussion regarding the amount of consumer involvement in the grant process. Linda Canning voiced a concern that there won't be enough involvement or that consumers will be left out of the process. She wants to make sure as many people are involved as possible, including people scattered all over the county. She suggested organizing transportation for consumers to public hearings. Wendell Seward mentioned that in other areas he had seen consumers who stated that even though they were asked to participate in similar processes, they felt their ideas were going to be ignored. Some suggestions to involve consumers were to put out flyers, organize transportation or give STAGE bus passes, or to tie in with NAMI to start a phone tree. Nadine DellaBitta reminded everyone that traditionally turnouts for public hearings are small and people come unprepared, which can slow down the process. Norma Marsh's suggestion was to use the FRCs as a resource to outreach to consumers regarding public hearings. The individual FRCs would better

know the needs of the community and the best way to give information to people who come into the FRCs. Emily Warn talked about how they had already engaged consumers at the FRCs and they have task force members that do outreach to people who aren't usually open to involvement in this process. Karen Derry was concerned they couldn't reach enough consumers because most of the rural population wants to be left alone and won't come into the FRC unless they're in severe crisis. Arden's final suggestion to Linda if she knew of any consumers who would like participate in MHSa Executive Committee, MHSa Task Forces or Age workgroups, to contact us with their information.

c) Arden explained that this is the meat of the grant, and he wanted the committee to go through as a group and make suggestions. He informed everyone that he had already met with the BHS leadership team on Monday and had decided to replace Wet/Damp/Dry housing with transitional housing. Wet/Damp/Dry housing will be something they look into developing later. Lauri Hunner explained that part of the reason behind this was because of the language of recovery, it would almost condone not going clean and sober into a transitional housing place. Instead we would also be looking into some sort of detox center in Siskiyou County.

Arden mentioned the other change was to the tents and sleeping bag program. Funding for this will come out of the discretionary fund, instead of the FRC grant funds.

Each item of the MHSa Services and Supports Programs was discussed and the following suggestions were made:

Item 2 – Personal Services Coordinator, Linda Canning said if the PSC has the same qualifications as a case manager, she'd rather see someone who's better trained for the position and has more qualifications than for Behavioral Health Specialist I. Arden and Lauri explained the current qualifications for the PSC position and that they'd really like to see the FRC hire consumers and having qualifications that are too high would make that tougher. There was discussion regarding what the PSC job duties would be, emphasizing that they would have support from a clinician and that they would not be doing clinical work, but social work to help people through the system. The committee suggested that the grant should be reworded so that it's clear the PSC is not a clinical position. The committee said they would like to have the resources and funding to hire the most qualified person for this position. They would also like to see appropriate training and ongoing training for PSCs. They suggested adding language to this section of the grant regarding ongoing training. The general consensus was that we add language to the grant regarding training, hiring qualifications and scope of practice.

Item 3 – Restaurant Voucher Program, Nadine DellaBitta said we needed to clarify in this section that the vouchers are for 10-12 dollars per person.

Item 4 – Motel Voucher Program, there was some discussion regarding what would happen if there were any problems or damages as a result of

motel vouchers. It was explained that we would execute a contract with each motel to account for any damages, and that each would be done on an individual basis. Arden Carr also mentioned the reason the PSC is required to check in on consumers utilizing this program is to prevent problems or recognize them early so they can be dealt with. The committee suggested we add a sentence saying ‘individual contracts with local motels will be executed.’ The committee also wanted to be sure that this program would coordinate with similar existing programs to make sure no one could abuse the system or receive benefits from two programs at once.

Item 7 – Drop In Center, there were concerns that the funding and goals for these centers were not adequate enough to be useful. The committee was concerned that people needed attention right now and couldn’t get it and that having one center for one age group in a community instead of three centers for all three age groups would limit our ability to get help to those who needed it. Also, the budgeted dollar amount for these drop-in centers was too low to establish these kinds of programs. Suggestions were that we look for additional funding or give funding to programs already being used so they can improve their services. Suggestions were that each community submits a proposal for funding and funds will then be delegated based on program needs. However, concern was that all the centers would ask for the maximum amount of money, as this is what happened with the FRC grant requests. The final decision was to use year one for organization and in year two and three, as additional funds are available, each of the FRC communities will be able to submit a grant request for drop-in center funds.

Overall suggestions - Anne Marsh noticed here the addition of ‘Ranchers and Farmers’ as a special group. Arden said that this is a special community that we need to reach out to and have trouble getting to. There was discussion regarding other similar groups such as loggers that need help as well. It was decided that ‘Ranchers and Farmers’ would be changed to ‘Agricultural Industry Workers.’ Also, the committee would like to see GLBT written out as ‘Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender’ the first time it’s used in the grant.

2) Public Hearing Documents and Presentation

There was a brief discussion about these documents. The goal is to try not to stigmatize the community member or FRC, but to give the community a general idea of what we want to do with this grant. These documents are also designed to keep discussions at a simple level and then make the full grant available for anyone with further interest.

Other

Arden told the group to email or call him if they had any further suggestions or questions.

Adjournment

The Meeting was adjourned at 11:51am.

IV. The next meeting will be January 11, 2006, 10:30am-12:00pm