MINUTES

of the

Mental Health Planning Advisory Council
Rural Monitoring Committee

meeting on

Tuesday, October 19, 2010

held at

Substance Abuse Treatment and Prevention Agency
4126 Technology Way, Second Floor Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada 89706

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS –ALYCE THOMAS, CHAIR

Alyce called the meeting to order at 8:45 am. Verbal roll call completed by Roger. Tanya completed sign-in sheet.

Members Present:

- Norris, Rene – Family Member (via teleconference in Las Vegas)
- Peterman, Patricia – Family Member (via teleconference in Reno)
- Phinney, Cody – MHDS
- Polakowski, Ann – DCFS (via teleconference in Las Vegas)
- Thomas, Alyce – Consumer (via teleconference in Las Vegas)
- Willingham, Bryce – Consumer (via teleconference in Laughlin)

Members Absent:

- None

Staff and guests:

- Benitez, Tanya – MHDS/MHPAC Admin. Asst.
- Mowbray, Roger – Grant Writer

2. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FROM PRIOR MHPAC MEETING ON 9/14/2010

Alyce gave the floor to Roger. Roger asked for any comments, changes, and/or additions.

Rene motioned to accept the minutes as written. Bryce seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MESQUITE RURAL MONITORING REPORT

Alyce gave the floor to Roger. Roger said the response is on pages 19 – 21. Elaine Krows did most of the response. Through out the report there were points that Roger had missed. For example: he mistakenly identified one of the consumers as adolescent instead of adult. She also suggested some changes that did not reflect the opinions of Kathy Scott, the Clinic Manager that was there during the actual visit. Roger said the report reflects what was happening on May 18th & 19th when Kathy was there.

Roger went through the responses for the recommendations. Roger said one of the questions Elaine asked is if the Rural Monitoring Committee does follow up visits. They may want to consider doing this. Roger continued with the collaboration with NAMI. Bryce confirmed that NAMI has a support group that is meeting regularly again. Roger said on recommendation five in regard to the racks for the brochures, he put in the incorrect response. He will amend the report with the correct response. Roger continued with item six. Roger said in recommendation nine, the response was that they do not employ staff certified in play therapy and so need to be careful about buying and advertising that they provide such a service. Ann said they do not need to be certified to do play therapy. They have to have some training and skills. The licensure/certification for play therapy is expensive and extensive. Roger asked for confirmation that there is a certification for play therapy and that it is not necessary. Ann confirmed it is not required. She said the last time she checked; there were only a small amount of registered play therapists in the State of Nevada. Cody said maybe the question they should ask is what type of training have they had and what to they need. Ann concurred. Cody said she likes the idea of a follow up visit to see if they have made further progress and if the caseload goes up. Ann asked Cody what her vision of a follow up would be. Cody said maybe one staff and one Council member visiting. They can get information on the caseload and the service units without anyone going to the facility. Alyce said she agrees that one staff member and one Council member going to the site for a follow up. This way, it shows they are committed to what they started. She believes it is more personable. Roger said maybe a half day visit with a smaller approach. Possibly

contact the clients and some of the staff that they spoke with at the prior visit and see how things have changed.

Roger will make corrections and bring the report to go through one more time before taking to the Council for final approval.

Cody motioned to table the approval of report to make changes noted above. Rene seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

4. PLAN LAUGHLIN RURAL MONITORING VISIT IN JANUARY 2011

Roger has some of the caseload information. The information shows a duplicated count of clients receiving the various primary services. Med-clinic, med-clinic nursing, and outpatient counseling are the primary services. This goes back to last October. Starting in June there is Psycho-Social Rehabilitation (PSR) that appeared. There were ten and in July, 19, and in August as far as the data they had, it was up to 20. They started a Psycho-Social Rehabilitation primarily for adults. The other item is the number of adolescents and children is relatively low. The average caseload over the eleven months received in the report was 74 unduplicated adults and an average of two adolescents and five children during this time period. These are very small numbers for the adolescents and children. He noticed their waitlist has relatively low numbers around 12 from October to July. Then in July there was a waitlist of 38 for service coordination when before there was zero. Roger asked Bryce if they lost a Service Coordinator. Bryce said they lost a case worker a year ago. She will be back on December 1st. Bryce met with Elaine on Saturday and they are also going to add a Ph.D. and they have a Clinical Therapist – private contractor who has come in. This clinic will be back up to full strength again as of December 1st.

Roger asked how much value the pre-study material is prior to the visit. He referred to page three for the information they request. He asked if there is other information that would be useful prior to visiting the Laughlin Clinic. Bryce said the information they receive pretty much covers the information needed. Alyce agreed.

Roger asked about a date for the visit. The Council quarterly meeting is on January 4, 2011. There is a holiday on the 17th. Cody asked about the drive. Bryce said it is about two hours. Roger said an issue they ran into in Mesquite was the excessive stakeholder meetings. Bryce said he does not believe they will find the number of stakeholders showing up in Laughlin that they had in Mesquite. Roger asked if they have any regularly scheduled stakeholder meetings. Bryce said they attempted to a few years ago, he followed up about two months ago attempting to contact stakeholders and he has not had a very good

response. Roger did ask Elaine if there were any opportune times in January. She said any time would be fine. Bryce said Wednesday and Thursday would be good because the consumers from NAMI will be there on Thursday. The consensus is January 12 and 13, 2011. The team would be Roger, Cody, Bryce, Ann, Rene, and Alyce. Cody may need to send a designee.

Cody motioned to have the Rural Monitoring Visit to Laughlin on January 12 and 13, 2011. Ann seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Alyce asked for public comment. Cody thanked Roger for all of his hard work on the report. The Committee concurred.

6. SET DATE AND TOPICS FOR FOLLOW-UP MEETING

Final approval of the Mesquite Rural Monitoring Report, plan for the Laughlin visit, and follow up visits. November 16, 2010.

Cody motioned to have the next meeting on November 16, 2010, at 9:30 am. Bryce seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

7. ADJOURNMENT

Rene motioned to adjourn.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 am