



**NAME OF COMMITTEE: CPAW Meeting**  
**MEETING DATE & TIME: Thursday, September 6, 2012 from 3:00-6:00 PM**  
**LOCATION OF MEETING: 2425 Bisso Lane, Suite 100, Concord, CA 94520**

Members attending: Annis Pereyra, Brenda Crawford, Courtney Cummings, Dave Kahler, John Gagnani, John Hollender, Lisa Bruce (revise email to [lbruce@cbhi.net](mailto:lbruce@cbhi.net), Molly Hamaker, Sam Yoshioka, Susan Medlin, Susanna Marshland, Stephen Boyd Jr., Thomas Sponsler, Doreen Gaedtke, Kathi McLaughlin, Lori Hefner, Mariana Moore, Steven Grolnic-McClurg, Beatrice Lee

Staff attending: Brianne Green, Cynthia Belon, Gerold Loenicker, Heather Sweeten-Healy, Holly Page, Jisel Iglesias, Kennisha Johnson, Lavonna Martin, Mary Roy, Jana Drazich

Public Participants: Devon Roberts, Glen Eugene Arnold, Suzan Imani

Excused from Meeting: Jeromy Collado, Tom Gilbert

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
1. Introductions, Agenda Review, MH Director Search Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mary Roy announced she will be transitioning from MHSA program manager to the early intervention for psychosis program - First Hope               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cynthia Belon added a meeting will be scheduled internally to discuss a specific transition plan related to the day to day workings of MHSA and CPAW</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cynthia Belon announced the MH Director search is now moving forward. 11 candidates have been selected for interviews and currently in the process of notifying and setting up those interviews. Interviews are scheduled for September 24, 26 and 28, 2012</li> <li>• Cynthia Belon gave an update on the integration process. The next phase of integration started a month ago and began looking at the integration of programs and services that comprise Behavioral</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<p>Health (Mental Health, AODS and Homeless services). First started thinking about integration, internally within the county system. A Series of design teams called Services and Program Integration Design Team (SPID) created the design team by the age categories for children, transition age youth (TAY), adult and older adult. Families will be looped throughout design team systems as we move forward. The goal is for staff from the county system to discuss opportunities for integration, evidence based practices and ideas related to moving the system forward in integrated way. Over next several months there will be meetings with a variety of partners to discuss ideas across community to create an integrated service which will include CBOs, other service providers, consumers, family members, commission, CPAW etc. CPAW as an entity will have an opportunity to participate. Please be patient as we work to make it an efficient and effective process.</p>		
2. Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No public comments made</li> </ul>		
3. CPAW Committee Overview	<p>Review CPAW Committee Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committees broader than CPAW listed have been meeting and will continue to meet. Mary Roy will continue as county staff support to Suicide Prevention</li> <li>Aging and Older Adult will be starting up again September 27. September 27 meeting will be a workgroup meeting to debrief the Aging and Older Adult celebration that took place May 2011. Meeting will be co-facilitated with Tommy Tighe</li> </ul>	<p><b>If you are a new member or wish to become a member to Aging and Older Adult it would be best to begin in October as a new member.</b></p>	

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brenda Crawford asked what is the scope of the influence with Aging and Older Adult and AOD, homeless</li> <li>• Sandy Rose is back and Housing Committee will resume</li> <li>• Planning, Innovation and Membership committees will be on hold. These committees require a fulltime MHSA coordinator role to be in place.</li> <li>• Mary Roy shared innovation committee agreed to meet once or twice a year to discuss proposals rather than ongoing basis. Currently two innovation categories were “grandfathered” in and approved in the 12-13 plan which include innovation ideas around transportation and employment. Implementation for RFP’s are on the agenda. There is no risk of reversion or rush around innovation.</li> <li>• With AB 1467, innovation plans without the 30-day posting need to go through the MHSOAC process. A template for how proposals would be rated were sent out to make it easier for us to provide support so proposals are more likely to be approved</li> <li>• Kathi McLaughlin shared that it would be helpful to know how well the innovation programs are doing. Specifically the Sexually Exploited Youth Program which was in the works for two years with a grant provided to Rainbow and other groups. Before those became a program it would have been helpful to know the planning process and result of the initial grant.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Mary suggested a program spotlight for innovation to come and present to CPAW what the innovative programs are and their status. Include this update into one of the CPAW meeting agendas. Provide an update to the Sexually Exploited Program.</b></p>	<p>Mary, Grace and Leigh</p>

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kathi expressed that with the absence of a MHSA coordinator it seems appropriate for the planning committee to meet because the planning committee focus was to create and plan CPAW meetings. At the last meeting we voted to go back to our committee structure and it hasn't happened.</li> <li>• Membership Committee's role was to look over the development of training and support for members. There are new people who don't know the process. It would be good to have trainings.</li> <li>• Grace Boda explained since there is transition at the state about what will be included in 3 year plan so we can't launch into planning 3 year plan until State is clear. There is a big transition of leadership, so there is hesitation of coming up with a new structure without someone coming in and getting their finger print on it. We are waiting for something solid to take place to move forward. The next several meetings will be discussion on design team recommendations.</li> <li>• Sam Yoshioka feels there is deficiency in the input process to development of the agenda. We need a formal process of having stakeholders involved in creating the agenda.</li> </ul>		
4. Age-related Committees	<p>Review ARF: Age Related Committees handout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Idea came from membership committee to have a committee for each age group targeted (Children, TAY and adult) and how our planning efforts align with the integration.</li> </ul>	<p>➤ <b>Lori Hefner requested a copy of the ground rules adopted by Social Inclusion to take into each of the committees.</b></p>	Susan Medlin

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data committee will be folded into a function into all the committees. Any committee can make a request for data and have data brought for concrete planning discussion</li> <li>• Steven Grolnic-McClurg expressed that there is a no pipeline coming from stakeholders to administration and we need to figure a way to solve that</li> <li>• Mary Roy explained anyone who has a particular kind of interest in these committees can be on the committee. Committees were originally structured based on what was needed at the time. We need to move the system forward and determine what makes sense in providing meaningful input.</li> <li>• Molly Hamaker pointed out there difference between the design team recommendation and then there is a difference between getting input from people in those age groups versus getting input from people who are interested in that age group and possible need to do both</li> <li>• Lisa Bruce asked for clarification on who stakeholders are and how they provide information to us. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A stakeholder is CPAW member, anyone with a concern or has something they want to input</li> <li>○ Brenda expressed that we have people in the room who don't understand the structure and we call them stakeholders. People shouldn't be brought into the room unless they can have input in framing the whole process</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Vote: Initiating 3 new committees specific to Children,</p>	<p><b>Email to Grace</b></p>	

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	TAY and adult All members present voted YES- they can live with the proposal		
5. Implementation Update on 12/13 Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first Request for Proposal (RFP) will go out. This RFP is for Personal Service Coordinator for children’s FSP. Expected to go out within the next week.</li> <li>• The RFPs will roll out on a regular basis but not stacked to help providers bidding on multiple RFPs</li> <li>• A list of the RFPs will be provided to give people opportunity to decide what they will bid on and the ability to make an informed decision</li> <li>• Simultaneously looking at the Children’s Evaluation Team which came as a result of the Children’s Full Partnership Re-design. Next RFP to roll out for multi systemic therapy working with Juvenile Offenders and Their Families. Also an RFP for multi-dimensional family therapy with adolescents with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse issues. Administration looking at the priorities for the rest of the things.</li> <li>• With the absence of a contractors’ meeting Steven Grolnic-McClurg commented as a member of the public and not a stakeholder. He requests that because some of the RFPs will not get contracted till very late and with the new funding he asked administration consider using unexpected dollars they will have for this year to supplement existing MHSA programs for one time costs. Consider use of that money this year and we will have fresh dollars for next year.</li> </ul>		Mary Roy

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kathi Mclaughlin shared that it feels like we are stalled on process, not content. We need stakeholder input on content on what is going on with each of the constituencies. This could be happening at a greater in-depth level. This CPAW meeting should be discussing more broad based issues. We had a discussion and it was left to talk about the next time. She suggested we have the committees meet, determine what their charter and membership is and bring it back to larger group. We need to address how the committees are staffed</li> </ul>		
6. Summary of Survey Results	<p>Review handout “Survey Response Summary: Alignment with Design Team Recommendations and PowerPoint slide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were asked if they wanted to accept the recommendation as it stood, liked the recommendations but had some suggestions or medications to think about or absolutely didn’t like the recommendations</li> <li>• 13 people responded to the survey</li> <li>• Alignment means yes I agree with it where it stands or I agree but have some recommendations</li> <li>• Comments about the survey results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mary liked how much alignment was present and consensus on important things</li> <li>○ Steve said the survey could have used more stakeholder input in the questions that were asked. In his opinion two existing tensions weren’t asked: Tension between how much county representation is going to be at</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Kathi recommended for the CPAW composition we need to include family of Older Adults too because that is another constituency with very significant differences</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Steven G. It would be helpful if we were asked what tensions we saw</b></li> </ul>	

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<p>CPAW. Also conversation about what is a meaningful stakeholder process. How do we have consumers have a strong dominant voice in the group without it being an issue of stakeholders not knowing enough where they don't bring up issue they want to bring up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brenda Crawford discussed consumers who are staff members of county or CBO's taking a seat of a consumer or family member seat. It is a different experience being a consumer who has a salary and insurance who is not using the public mental health system and being a consumer who does.</li> <li>• Molly Hamaker feels defining family members by age may not be in the best interest. For example someone whose child has been in the system since a child and it now 25 years old versus someone who has a child who is 25 years old and has just entered the system</li> </ul>		
7. CPAW Input to Stakeholder Redesign Discussion	<p>Review Survey Response Summary and the Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lavonna Martin shared that feedback from the CPAW stakeholders has been shared with administration who are looking forward to getting your thoughts and ideas on what the stakeholder process should be. We will have a process you, the stakeholders, will feel good about and administration will feel good supporting you</li> <li>• Think about what is the right process and crafting final recommendations for the 8 areas of strong alignment to be taken to the executive team. In the 5</li> </ul>		Grace Boda



TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<p>areas of with little alignment think about what things are important so that we can build consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Molly requested to see the individual answers to see what people’s issues are. Depending on the issues affects how we will proceed.</li> <li>• CPAW has evolved overtime because hearing, seeing, reading some opinions can temper or evolve our personal opinions.</li> <li>• John Gragnani shared his opinion on 3 alignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do we want to have certain consumer folks participating in MHSA programs as a part of CPAW as well as the public mental health system?</li> <li>○ In establishing a youth council do we want them broader than CPAW or do we want to restrict youth council to MHSA programs. We agreed to move forward with a children’s committee with children input from the MHSA programs. Consider does youth council fit under MHSA or on a committee broader than CPAW</li> <li>○ Can we get an update on regulations regarding substance abuse and homelessness in relation to MHSA programs? I also heard further discussion at the state about right being revised and visited. I would like an update on that as well.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Thomas Sponsler suggested take each of the items on the blue sheet, wait for more questionnaires, print out a summary of the comments, go through it line by line and take a vote. Reaching a consensus will not work so we should have a full debate and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Molly proposed that we have discussion as a large group rather than breakout into smaller groups</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Steve Grolnic-McClurg suggested as a process to have members of the re-design group to include many of the members of the CPAW, plus a group that doesn’t involve CPAW. These topics could be brought to the larger group.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Talk about it all as a large group to benefit dialog</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Reconvene the planning group</b></li> </ul>	

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<p>majority vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Molly would like to consider continuing the use of Survey Monkey as we go along with the process. As the discussion gets more focused we can do another round of survey monkey on some or all of it. This is a good way to get a snapshot going into the next round</li> <li>• Lisa felt she was not prepared to do this today. We need to have a percentage of how many surveys we want before we continue.</li> <li>• Steven would like a list of what are the widest range of possible ways to solve this for consideration. He would like ideas just for options.</li> <li>• Kathi shared it would be helpful for the planning group to look at the 8 areas of alignments and how we implement those. We need to talk as a large group of the 5 areas of divergent concerns, specifically a provider council</li> <li>• Consider a retreat of some sort for the large group discussion because it will take more than 2 hours. High level of discussion is difficult to do at the end of the day</li> <li>• 8 areas of strong alignment (by 12 respondents) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Convene new group (6)</li> <li>○ Planning Committee (8)</li> <li>○ Large Group (1)</li> <li>○ Survey (0)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 5 areas of divergent thinking (by 12 respondents) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Convene new group (2)</li> <li>○ Planning Process (11)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Kathi recommended that the planning group meet, design a retreat and look at the alignments, what to discuss and move forward</b></li> <li>➤ <b>A Survey link will be sent out by facilitators the deadline is next Friday- Sept. 15<sup>th</sup></b></li> </ul>	

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Large Group (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Planning Committee will meet- September 20, 2012 3:00-6:00</b></li> </ul>	
8. Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No public comments made</li> </ul>		
9. Close	Meeting adjourned Next Meeting : October 4, 2012		