NAME OF COMMITTEE: CPAW Meeting MEETING DATE & TIME: Thursday, June 6th, 2013, from 3:00-6:00 PM LOCATION OF MEETING: 2425 Bisso Lane, Suite 100, Concord, CA 94520



Members attending: Kimberly Krisch, Lori Hefner, Tom Gilbert, Molly Hamaker, Dave Kahler, Annis Pereyra,

Teresa Pasquini, Kathi McLaughlin, Ryan Nestman, Stephen Boyd Jr., Lisa Bruce, Courtney Cummings, John Gragnani, Susanna Marshland, Susan Medlin, Sam Yoshioka, Tony Sanders

<u>Staff Attending:</u> Dianna Collier, Tommy Tighe, Heather Sweeten-Healy, Jennifer Tuipulotu, Doug Halpern, Roberto Roman, Jami Delgado, Janet Wilson, Kenneth Gallagher, Charles Saldhana, Gerold Loenicker, Anna Lubarov, Imo Momoh, Sandy Marsh, Taylor Stussi

Public Participants: Peggy Harris, Devon Roberts, Eileen Brooks, Ben Barr, Lorena Harth, Kanwarpal Dhaliwd

Excused from Meeting:

Staff Lead: Steven Grolnic-McClurg

Staff Support: Cassie Brown

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY PEGPONGIPLE
			RESPONSIBLE
3:00 PM	 Opening Introductions 		
Opening, Agenda			
Review,	MH Coordinator Update -		
Announcements:	 Steven: Another candidate on original list went 		
• MH	through same stakeholder process interview.		
Coordinator	Third interview scheduled with that person for		
Update (Steven	the beginning of next week. Will keep everyone		
Grolnic-	updated and thank you to all members of CPAW		
McClurg)	who participated.		
Facilitator	Facilitator Update -		
Update MHSA	 Steven: Contract amendment went through for 		
e paule Milion	Maria Pappas. She will be our ongoing		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY DESPONSIBLE
• MHSA	temporary Administrator starting in July. She		RESPONSIBLE
Financial Audit	will facilitate for CPAW and the Planning		
T maneral 7 tagit	Committee.		
RFP Update			
Ta i opaaio	MHSA Financial Audit -		
	 Steven: Deliverables are being finalized today. 		
	The audit will start next week. Deliverables will		
	become public when they are finalized, as well		
	as the results of the financial audit.		
	o Teresa: Who all is involved in setting the financial audit?		
	o Steven: The Finance Department along		
	with Behavioral Health Administration.		
	o Teresa: Can you explain why there is		
	such a delay?		
	 Steven: No I can't. There are probably 		
	multiple factors.		
	 Lori: Will you send an email when they 		
	determine what these are?		
	o Steven: Yes. Teresa will you let us know		
	where the second audit will be?		
	o Teresa: The Mental Health Commission		
	MHSA Finance Committee has charged		
	that committee to consider in a		
	transparent and accountable manner, to		
	determine the deliverables for the second		
	audit as well as selecting the auditor		
	based on all the input that has been		
	gathered over the last year. Mike Geist		
	was offered as a possible person for us to consult with. He is unavailable until		
	consuit with. He is unavariable until		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	October for a consultation. We're trying to seek out expert advice on both the deliverables as well as the auditor. I'm trying to reschedule yesterday's meeting that was canceled. There are no deliverables. There is no scope for this audit as of yet, so this is not necessarily a performance audit. There is interest in both a compliance and a performance audit.		REST ONSIDEE
	RFP Update - Steven: For the TAY and Adult FSP RFP's, they have been submitted and reviewed. By next week there will be letters sent to the organizations who had the highest scores, and then we will enter into negotiations with them. The Crisis Residential RFP that was released again this week to solicit a wider response. We are looking at all kinds of electronic ways to improve that process. Right now we are most interested in making sure it is as inclusive as possible. Not all organizations do bounce-backs so that doesn't work 100%.		
3:15 PM Public Comment	 Lisa: Annual Picnic will be June 21st from 10am 2pm at the Pleasant Hill Park. 		
3:20 PM 13/14 MHSA Plan	Steven: (MHSA Plan Document) July 11 th we are hoping to get approval for the plan. I would like to walk through the document first then answer questions that came up when reviewing the update draft. High level is		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	continuing to fund what we've approved in the		RESPONSIBLE
	past, with the addition of a couple new things:		
	Crisis Res		
	ARC		
	Sign the contract then pay license fees for the		
	EMR, which will be an ongoing cost		
	Requested and approved funding for the		
	Innovation project		
	Requested and approved funding for Essential		
	Learning Innovation Process which will be discarded if		
	not approved today.		
	 Annis: In the future could the financial 		
	data be presented so that the digits are		
	lined up like a true financial document		
	would be?		
	o Steven: Sure.		
	 Steven: (Green Handout) 		
	The important thing to know about		
	expenditures is that they are all-cost -		
	everything fully operating as of July 1 st		
	for the entire year. The number under		
	"B" is clearly an enormous percentage of		
	our total available funding in CSS, and		
	far more than our estimated 2013/14		
	funding. The estimation is that 13/14 is going to be the base for the next couple		
	years, so that should be about what we're		
	expecting to get. If we were to spend this		
	much money in the coming year, we		
	would clearly be in a dire situation for		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	the following year. Two factors to		
	understand about that:		
	1. We are going to have to have a robust		
	conversation this coming year about our		
	priorities, what we can afford to do, and		
	what is sustainable in this program.		
	2. We won't spend \$36 million in the		
	coming year. We will generate FFP. We		
	don't know what that number is, but we		
	know it will be at least several million		
	dollars. There will be several million		
	dollars of just delayed spending.		
	3. For county staff, we never have all of		
	our positions filled. We have a process of		
	hiring people, so typically our budgeted		
	expenses are a bit higher than our actual		
	expenses. We won't know our actuals		
	until the end of the year, but it is realistic		
	to expect that we will spend between \$26		
	and \$28 million in the coming year. That		
	is still way too much ongoing, but it is		
	not as dire as looking at \$36 million		
	would be. We are still going to need to		
	have a robust conversation in the next		
	year. CSS is the area where this is most		
	concerning. PEI is not in a long-term		
	sustainable path, assuming that we spend		
	all of those dollars. For PEI, many of		
	those programs are CBO programs. They		
	tend to spend their dollars better than the		
	county. One of the programs is First		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	Hope. That is a large program. It's		RESI ONSIBLE
	budget next year is projected to be almost		
	\$2 million. We tend not to spend		
	everything that we budget to spend.		
	People should be paying attention to our		
	projected expenditures, as opposed to our		
	available allotment. We built in all the		
	costs, because I don't want people to not		
	understand what they're approving.		
	o Lisa: Can we get a breakdown on		
	the paper of what CSS, etc. stand		
	for?		
	o Steven: Yes.		
	o Molly: I thought the last time we		
	talked about this we thought we		
	had plenty of money, then we		
	thought we didn't, then we		
	thought we did, etc. Now I'm		
	confused.		
	o Steven: What I said was based on		
	actual spending, we could go and		
	implement the approved plan, as it was set. I still think		
	immediately that is probably		
	correct, but the new elements are		
	the ARC is much more expensive		
	than we thought it was going to		
	be, and that's a lot of money that		
	we hadn't projected in terms of		
	expenses. I didn't know there was		
	going to be an ongoing fee for		

Topic	ISSU	E/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
				RESPONSIBLE
		licenses in terms of		
		implementation of EMR. Third,		
		we are proposing a rather large		
		new program that we're rolling		
		out of Innovation. Until we have		
		actual funding, it's hard to know		
		exactly how dire the situation is.		
		My ballpark guess would be that		
		we would have to change things		
		in three years.		
	0	Molly: Is there an updated		
		projection on future funding from		
		the state?		
	0	Steven: This is the updated		
		projection in terms of next year. I		
		think the biggest thing that I took		
		away from last year is that we		
		cannot be sure how much we're		
		going to get from MHSA. It is		
		highly dependent on where the		
		California economy is.		
	0	Annis: How can they have		
		worked on this project for as long		
		as it's been worked on, and then		
		not be informed that there was a		
		licensing fee that is ongoing?		
	0	Steven: Part of the decision to		
		move forward with an EMR was		
		based on the fact that there would		
		be MHSA funding at that point,		
		and then deciding in terms of that.		

Topic	ISSU	E/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
				RESPONSIBLE
	0	Teresa: CPAW made a decision		
		to use our capital facilities and IT		
		funding to put a big chunk of that		
		funding into EMR, which we still		
		don't have and won't have for a		
		few more years. So we obligated		
		\$6.2 million to go to IT. Why		
		would that be ongoing from		
		MHSA?		
	0	Steven: Our Behavioral Health		
		sub-account is not getting larger.		
		Those dollars are obligated. This		
		is the revenue source that has		
		increase in it, and that we can		
		plan for being able to do things		
		like this.		
	0	Kathi: If there is money saved as		
		a result of things such as an EMR		
		system, we want to be sure that		
		those cost savings come back to		
		the primary funding source, rather		
		than be redistributed to the other		
		departments that may not have		
		paid their fair share.		
	0	Steven: Those dollars may not go		
		back into MHSA, but there would		
		be cost savings out of out		
		realignment dollars, because we		
		were not spending those		
		realignment dollars on those		
		costs, we would have money to		

Topic	ISSU	E/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
				RESPONSIBLE
		spend on realignment. There may		
		not be cost increase or cost		
		savings. It will be better care in		
		the end.		
	0	Kathi: It seems as though MHSA		
		funding is going to things that we		
		had not anticipated in terms of the		
		level of expense, and I would		
		want to be reassured that we		
		didn't end up losing our MHSA		
		programs if there were any cost		
		savings. If there are cost-savings,		
		it feels like we should be able to		
		look at the programs that are		
		successful, and be able to provide		
		them ongoing funding.		
	0	Steven: The goal is to have an		
		integrated system that provides		
		the right care for everybody.		
		From my perspective, we want to		
		expand our overall system.		
	0	Kathi: I don't want to see us put		
		money into prevention, and then		
		find out that we had to cut		
		prevention programs because of		
		an issue around funding. We need		
		to look at how to maintain the		
		whole system.		
	0	Steven: What I'd like to focus this		
		conversation on is this particular		
		plan update. We haven't funded		

Topic	ISSU	JE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
				RESPONSIBLE
		some things that we should be		
		doing. We have some parts of our		
		system that are really failing right		
		now.		
	0	Tony: As I recall, there were 2 or		
		3 years where the licensing would		
		be included in the upfront money,		
		but I think since there's been a		
		delay, there was money that is		
		now lost.		
	0	Steven: My understanding is this		
		was vetted before, but it is a		
		sizeable amount of money, and		
		it's important for people to know		
		that we're vetting it in terms of		
		that piece.		
	0	Teresa: I want to agree with		
		everything Molly said. Even		
		though we agreed, in concept, to		
		roll over the 12/13 plan, we also		
		agreed that there would be audits		
		performed, and budget and		
		financials provided that would		
		allow us to make an informed		
		decision. I am very uncomfortable		
		with the lack of detail that we're		
		getting here, on the Crisis Res, on		
		the ARC, etc. I didn't see detail in		
		the plan.		
	0	Steven: The detail will be in the		
		conversation today. We're just		

Topic	ISSU	E/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY DESDONSIDI E
Topic	ISSU	having a discussion today, there will be no decision. Let's walk through the plan. (Copy of plan in packet is gone over) Sixteen-bed facility which will allow for a 30-day stay. This program can prevent a hospital stay. It can also allow for a decrease in hospital stays, since it has a discharge program which is very structured. We're going to be requiring that whoever gets this contract has peer services, co-occurring capable services, and is working really strongly on	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	0	discharge plans. It will be a licensed facility that we will be billing Medi-Cal. Teresa: CSS funds are to be spent on 5600.3 target pop, correct? Steven: Yes. Since it is a 30-day stay it is not intended for individuals that are not our target population. I could see where you would want to use a crisis residential facility for someone who is not currently getting some of our higher level FSP services. So yes, it's the target population that you're describing.		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	o Susan: Is there a way that we can		
	help family members who want to		
	know how to help the individual		
	being discharged?		
	o Steven: It's something that would		
	be important here, I think it's a		
	good comment for our contractor		
	and general system. The		
	estimation is that the Crisis Res		
	building will be done in July, then		
	licensed and signed off on. We're		
	looking at programming there		
	beginning in 3-6 months. It is		
	located at 20 Allen in Martinez.		
	The ARC is not estimated to be		
	finished until January. We built in		
	for a full year. The ARC is a new		
	kind of programming for us. Part		
	of what we will be doing this year		
	is testing how it will actually be		
	used in our system. One way will		
	be a step-down from PES. This		
	will be a place for people to go to		
	enter into our system. This will be		
	a more supportive environment		
	for those individuals. Another		
	purpose is to serve as a place for		
	people to get meds who are out of		
	compliance and don't have an		
	appointment. A third potential use		
	is urgent care, same-day		

Topic	ISSU	E/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
		appointments/assessments. A		KESI ONSIDEE
		fourth piece is another place to		
		get support as a family member,		
		etc. We will not know how this		
		will work in our system until we		
		get some testing of it. We will		
		start off by staffing it, and		
		learning and testing as we go. We		
		budgeted for full staff, but until		
		we're really clear on how this		
		serves our whole system, we		
		aren't clear on a staffing model,		
		etc. There's not a lot of specificity		
		on this, since we'll be learning as		
		we go over the course of the next		
		year. I can imagine this serving as		
		an amazing element in our		
		system. How much FFP will this		
		generate? These kinds of things		
		we don't really know yet. This is		
		why we're budgeting super		
		conservatively.		
	0	John: Under the Federal Financial		
		Participation piece, can we have		
		some sort of range where we have		
		some idea of FFP?		
	0	Steven: Yes but we are not going		
		to know until we're up and		
		running. Let's not build in a		
		number that's really built out of		
		thin air.		

Topic	ISSU	E/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
				RESPONSIBLE
	0	John: Urgent Care compared to		
		First Hope doesn't have a lot of		
		similarities. It seems like we		
		should be able to anticipate a		
		more realistic range for this		
		program as opposed to First		
		Hope.		
	0	Steven: That seems reasonable		
		John. How would that change		
		your understanding of whether		
		you wanted to approve it or not?		
	0	John: Working in PES I know		
		there's a need so I don't have a		
		problem approving this, I just		
		think there needs to be more of an		
		idea of how much FFP we're		
		anticipating.		
	0	Steven: When it's a little more		
		cooked, I'll bring it back with		
		information on where this is		
		going to be. I didn't want to make		
		a guess.		
	0	Teresa: What did we say in our		
		capital facilities plan about the		
		ARC?		
	0	Steven: We said that it will serve		
	•	children and adults, with a		
		separate entrance and waiting		
		room for each. I can send you the		
		documents if you would like to		
		take a look at them and see that		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Topic	piece. Teresa: Charles, how will the privately insured patients impact the ARC? Steven: I'm not sure. We haven't had that conversation yet. Teresa: I'm just curious how that works. I believed capital facilities projects were intended to be utilized by the whole system. So I'm thinking, who is going to be utilizing this? Annis: I would hope that someone does a cost analysis at some point in time. Steven: First off, I don't know the answer to that, but I think the point is well taken. If we staff this and it's not well-utilized, clearly we would want to look at whether or not there is the potential to		PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	or not there is the potential to have some other funding to serve it in that way. o Kathi: I think I would be a lot more comfortable with this if either the Planning Committee could take on some of this discussion, or if we reconstitute the capital facilities group or another group to look at this.		
	Steven: This is a process that will		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
			RESPONSIBLE
	go better with robust		
	conversation.		
	o John: It might say costs for the		
	ARC are budgeted to be 2.75 a		
	year (etc), however this may		
	change. That may be a more		
	reasonable way of putting it.		
	 Steven: Sure I can make that 		
	change. These are expensive		
	programs we're working on. I		
	don't want anyone to be misled.		
	We're doing this because it's		
	right. Sometimes the right thing	; is	
	the expensive thing.		
	What do you need between now	,	
	and next month so that you're		
	feeling like you have enough		
	information to be able to do this	s?	
	This year we are clearly saying		
	that we're funding this for one		
	year only.		
	o Kathi: I think what would help		
	me, would be the timeline of the	e	
	programs and what they're		
	budgeted for and how well		
	they're doing at serving.		
	o Steven: As far as I know there i	s	
	only one program we're doing		
	that with and I'm happy to repo	rt	
	that back.		

Topic	ISSU	TE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
				RESPONSIBLE
	0	Kathi: Also for the newer		
		programs, to see if they're		
		reaching their benchmarks, etc.		
	0	John: As far as the Crisis Res and		
		the ARC, I think it would be		
		helpful to have more detail about		
		the budget and how it was arrived		
		at.		
	0	Steven: (refers to pink handout)		
		It was based on the maximum bed		
		occupancy.		
	0	John: If it helps the public		
		understand the breakdown and the		
		basis of the budgets, I think it		
		should be included.		
	0	Steven: I don't feel comfortable		
		adding that level of detail to a		
		public document. I can certainly		
		think about a way to present more		
		information.		
	0	Kathi: I think a way to do that		
		would be that on both of those to		
		know that this is based on 12		
		months. It clearly says in the RFP		
		for the Crisis Res that the stated		
		figure is based on the max Medi-		
		Cal reimbursement. In that regard		
		I really am uncomfortable putting		
		the full amount in.		
	0	Steven: For all of the CBO		
		contracts, they are all situated like		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	that. They are all structured in exact same way that this is	n the	RESPONSIBLE
	structured. That's not unique this.	to	
	o Kathi: Does it say that in the	2/4	
	budgeted plan? Because I dor remember seeing that and it's	;	
	very deceptive to say that it's for the Crisis Res ongoing co	st	
	for MHSA funding, when in it's not.		
	o Steven: It's the rule that we u for all programs. The actuals		
	different than the budget. o Kathi: I'm still struggling wit		
	that because it doesn't seem l what we've looked at in past	ike	
	budget reports.Teresa: That is the standard		
	template that every county us give a piece of information the		
	really not useful. o Steven: One of the document	s	
	that we're working on is a spreadsheet of everything that		
	MHSA is funding and what is purpose is.		
	 Kathi: I think it's because we looking at significantly more 		
	we discussed as a group that misleading. The fact is when		

Торіс	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	approved the funds for other		RESPONSIBLE
	programs in the past, we		
	approved what MHSA was		
	funding. That wasn't what we		
	saw as CPAW. We're not		
	overseeing AOD funding or any		
	other pieces. We're just		
	overseeing how much we're		
	providing to various programs out		
	of MHSA funds.		
	o Steven: I heard a clear request for		
	a little more detail in terms of		
	funding and I will do that piece. I		
	think ballpark it's a couple		
	million dollars of FFP within all		
	the programs. If there are other		
	things that folks come up with		
	upon reflection, please email me.		
	o John: (pink handout)		
	Is the bed occupancy a low		
	assumption?		
	o Steven: We want to make sure		
	that the people going in are going		
	to have an excellent chance of		
	being able to get the total amount		
	of money that they can get. We		
	want to start off by making sure		
	it's sustainable.		
	 John: Is this ballpark to what we 		
	give ANKA to run Nyreka		
	(spelling?) House?		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	 Steven: No. It's ballpark to what the rates are and what is typical to the field. 		
4:20 PM Break			
4:35 PM	Kathi: (Innovation handout)		
Innovation Committee ARFs	There are 3 pieces we wanted to change: 1. We are talking about becoming an open committee from June-September in order to		
Revisions to	recruit additional members.		
Committee's Charge	Changing the language in our charge to "review and revise as needed."		
Process for Reviewing Innovation Projects	 Steven: A requested amendment would be to change the word to MHSOAC since it doesn't go to the state anymore. 	> Change term to MHSOAC	Kathi
Sustaining INN01	 3. Removing the liaison with the Data Committee since the Data Committee doesn't exist. On our committee we have subject matter experts to fix areas where we don't have enough CPAW members to address issues. Anyone who is interested in being on the Innovation Committee should be aware of the time commitment. It is very significant and there is a lot to read and digest and go over. o Anna: What does help is that we have people from the programs who provide clarity. o Kathi: We meet on the 4th Monday of the month from 2-4pm at 1340 Arnold in the large conference room. We currently have 7 or 8 members. 		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
			RESPONSIBLE
	o Devon: I want to learn more about		
	CPAW but I'm a little confused.		
	 Kathi: It's a very specific pot of money 		
	designed to fund innovative programs		
	and see if you can take research and		
	apply it to an actual program to see how		
	it turns out.		
	o Teresa: Are there family members on the		
	committee who have adult children in the		
	system of care?		
	o Kathi: Not that I'm aware of.		
	o Tony: That's what we're recruiting for.		
	It's really just open.		
	o Teresa: It's important to remember that		
	there are significant issues for family		
	members of adult children in the system.		
	We need to invite those members of the		
	community who have been suffering for		
	a long time to be a part of this process. If		
	you're not outreaching to people who		
	have that perspective, then you won't be		
	considering those kinds of programs.		
	o Sam: What is your racial/ethnic mix of		
	that committee?		
	o Kathi: Caucasian primarily, and that's		
	why we're recruiting for other interested		
	members. We're opening it up on		
	purpose so that we can get more folks to		
	come on board.		
	o Steven: There is a period where they are		
	soliciting new membership at which		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY DESPONSIBLE
	2 4 21 4 1 2		RESPONSIBLE
	point they will then close it.		
	o Kathi: We're asking CPAW members to		
	come, and once we see who comes from		
	CPAW with a particular expertise, then		
	those people may not stay. O Susanna: Are we ever able to offer		
	stipends for consumers attending? Kethi: We offer \$15 gift early to		
	 Kathi: We offer \$15 gift cards to attending consumers. 		
	o Steven: VOTE		
	No one strongly opposed.		
	All but one in approval.		
	APPROVED		
	o Ryan: (Refers to Innovation handout in		
	the section after the Appendix)		
	Review of the charge of the committee.		
	Asking for approval that we can add this		
	to our charge.		
	o Tony: Innovation doesn't usually address		
	sustainability.		
	o Kathi: It's important to realize that		
	Innovation money cannot be used for		
	sustained funding.		
	 Sam: What percentage of your target 		
	population would be considered seriously		
	mentally ill?		
	 Kathi: We're not targeting a specific 		
	percentage, but rather who we are		
	catering to.		
	o Steven: VOTE		
	No one strongly opposed.		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Topic	Majority approves. APPROVED Tony: Introduces partners of LGBTQ Collaborative. (Reviews LGBTQ section of Innovation handout) The Innovation is based on a new ideanot just working with the youth specifically, but with those that surround them – peers, family members, faith leaders, etc. The four areas that these materials have focused on are: 1. The actual projects 2. Goals from each tier 3. Lessons learned from each of these activities 4. A proposal based on lessons learned about sustaining some funding for targeted pieces of the project. The \$586,00 requested does not include the FFP.	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	
	o Tony: The match is 95%. o Steven: It's not that way anymore. It's 50/50.		
	 Kathi: There are leverage funds in there of \$92,000. Ben: What we've displayed is the PEI funding, which is \$164,000. We're asking for money to sustain those 		
	components that are the strongest and		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
			RESPONSIBLE
	should be sustained and continued. There		
	is a second proposal, the majority of		
	which we will be asking for FFP funding,		
	with CSS and MHSA matched to		Partners of
	maintain it. It sounds to me like we do		LGBTQ
	need to go back and look at the numbers.		Collaborative
	o Steven: Yes we do. The Medi-Cal billing		
	dollar amount requested – half of that		
	would have to come from MHSA and		
	half from FFP.		
	o Ben: We need to have more conversation		
	because when we did our budget and		
	proposal, that's the guidance we got from		
	your staff.		
	 Steven: We get our total allotment from 		
	the state. That's all we get. We are now		
	responsible for that and any new match		
	comes from MHSA. We no longer get		
	45% from the state. I want to make sure		
	that people understand what we're		
	approving. We need accurate information		
	to know how much we're approving for		
	that piece. What we need to change is the		
	funding split – what's MHSA and what's		
	FFP?		
	o Molly: What is the total cost?		
	o Tony: On page 5 - \$678,830 minus the		
	leverage.		
	o Steven: This needs to go back just to get		
	the dollar figures correct.		
	o Molly: It's \$293,140.	Go back and review	

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY
	G W 11 d 11	6 1. b.	RESPONSIBLE
	o Steven: We could potentially approve the	funding figures	
	PEI section. Let's take the counseling part back and try to move forward with		
	the PEI conversation.		
	o Courtney: As a community member, I		
	support this program. As a member of the		
	Native American community, we refer to		
	our LGBTQ community as Two Spirits.		
	Can we add that verbage? It's important		
	to reach out community in the schools as		
	well and be culturally sensitive and		
	appropriate.		
	o Ben: I think one of the ongoing		
	challenges is that the youth programs		
	have begun starting to call their groups		
	the alphabet groups. It's the challenge of		
	being inclusive. How we identify		
	ourselves will be an ongoing discussion.		
	 : How do we move the work and meter 		
	on reducing stigma for people in the		
	system?		
	o Teresa: I'd like to know what percentage		
	of membership of these programs is		
	coming from the county? How many		
	people from our county programs are		
	utilizing these services?		
	o Tony: There is a project at the West		
	County Children's Mental Health Project		
	I would like to talk about.		
	o Ben: The programs we are talking about		
	are youth programs. We need to identify		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSIO	ON ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	
			RESPONSIBLE
	the youth that need to b		
	county that aren't. It's		
	recognize the youth that	•	
	have serious mental he		
	get them the services th	•	
	taken a couple years to	-	
	caseworkers and the sy		
	where they are understa	-	
	We are trying to preven		
	from committing suicion	de and trying to	
	identify the risk.		
	o: There are youth at We	•	
	are LGBTQ or allies, a		
	provided stipends to the		
	in an art project. One o		
	have identified through		
	health system in the co		
	LGBTQ/IS2 youth area	-	
	fully identifying as suc	ch. We also had a	
	project with MHCC.		
	o Ben: What we know is	* *	
	bullying and harassmen	<u> </u>	
	safe environment for ev		
	 Steven: I would like to 		
	the PEI projects (LGB)		
	want to be clear that we		
	prevention here, and th	nat's what this	
	funding is about.		
	 Kathi: One of the requi 		
	state is that it be used to		
	underserved population	ns.	

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	 John: It is very important for us as a county and contract providers to work together to serve the population. Conversations and partnerships do have to increase. Tony: TAY started a weekly poetry slam in Central, East, and West County. Anna: PEI funding was specifically to have projects in the community to prevent people from entering into the system. Teresa: I want to make it really clear that I've read the law, and was a PEI stakeholder, and I just asked a legitimate question. I wasn't trying to be disrespectful to anyone. Steven: Discussing strictly the \$164,000 that would be funding the two PEI components – VOTE: None strongly opposed Majority approved One abstained APPROVED 		All

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
		 Please submit any questions and concerns regarding plan update to Steven ASAP before next CPAW meeting 	
5:20 PM Discussion about CPAW membership	 John: Three hour meeting for June 13th in Planning that will be focused on membership. We wanted to get a baseline of currently active members of CPAW, as well as talk about bringing on new members. Steven: My recollection was that this went a little broader and that there were a number of 		

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	pieces that had gone forward regarding a number of different issues, such as what membership should look like, etc., and that the Planning Council was going to ask CPAW for specific permission to continue that work. Kathi: There was also a conversation about if we were still asking about attendance and participation in committees. Molly: A number of small meetings were held that lots of people participated in where we discussed a variety of issues. We brought a lot of proposals back to the larger group and had a lot of things that we were still trying to resolve. The idea that we talked about this last Planning meeting was rather than starting from scratch, see how many of those things still make sense and do a synopsis to bring back to CPAW to see how to proceed from there. Lori: I would like for us to meet prior to Thursday's meeting to bring in a scribe on Thursday so that we have a document. I'd be interested in seeing the document from Grace and Leigh. Stephen: I think that the smaller groups should meet and hash those things out. Several questions that should be asked should be: How long should membership last? Is there a time limit? Who should the stakeholders be? Is there a certain level of participation that should be required?		REST ONSIDEE

Topic	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	What if someone's role changes?		
5:35 PM Discussion of MHSA Subcommittees	Deferred due to time constraint		
How and when will subcommittees report out to the Mental Health Director and CPAW? Should monthly report outs be made standing items on CPAW's agenda?			
Subcommittee Updates			
5:55 PM Public Comment	■ None		
Next Meeting Date	■ Thursday, July 11 th , 3pm – 6pm		
6:00 PM Close	 Meeting adjourned 		