

MINUTES
of the
Mental Health Planning Advisory Council
Access to Child/Adolescent Services Committee
meeting on
Monday, January 31, 2011
held at
Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services
4126 Technology Way, Second Floor Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada 89706

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

Patricia called the meeting to order at 8:40 am. Patricia completed a verbal roll call. Tanya completed the sign-in sheet.

Members Present:

- Herrera, Corrie – Family Member (via teleconference in Elko)
- Peterman, Patricia – Family Member, Chair
- Phinney, Cody – MHDS
- Snead, Lydia – Family Member (via teleconference in Reno)
- Thomas, Alyce – Consumer (via teleconference in Las Vegas)
- Wilhelm, Layne - SAPTA

Members Absent:

- Norris, Rene – Family Member

Staff and guests:

- Benitez, Tanya – MHDS/MHPAC Admin. Asst.
- Crowe, Kevin, Dr. – Public representing the Commission
- Mowbray, Roger – Grant Writer (via teleconference in Reno)

2. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FROM PRIOR MHPAC ACCESS TO CHILD/ADOLESCENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING ON 9/23/2010

Patricia asked for comments and/or changes on the minutes.

Layne motioned to approve minutes as written. Alyce seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

3. DISCUSS AND FORMULATE NEW COMMITTEE GOALS

Patricia said they need to discuss and determine new Committee goals in light of the upcoming legislative session. She asked for ideas. Tanya said that Judy Bousquet had sent an email asking that a letter to the First Lady thanking her for her interest in children's mental health. Alyce said it is a very good idea and they should also let her know about the Committee and what they do. Roger said he has been involved in several meetings with the Commission and Mental Health Consortia. Pam Becker, with the Nevada Mental Health Consortia has scheduled a meeting with the First Lady on February 4, 2011. He thought it may be possible for a member of the Council attend the meeting also.

Dr. Kevin Crowe said there are two groups working on children's mental health, the statewide Children's Consortia and the Commission on Mental Health and Developmental Services has a Sub-Committee on Children's Mental Health Planning. Those two groups have been meeting regularly. The Sub-Committee chaired by Dr. Julie Beasley in Las Vegas, for Children's State Planning has been working on the Children's Mental Health Plan. They will be meeting again on February 18, 2011 at 7:30 am. They will be going over the bill draft request that was shared with the Council. It is meeting with quite a bit of discussion. It provides legal authority for the Commission to provide oversight to not only public but private providers of children services. It also puts in place a statewide policy board. Another bill they are looking at is AB48, which has been introduced by the Consortia's to continue their operation. It provides them with operation services. It would be nice if in they had access to a telephone tree of consumers and family members. For example: Diane Comeaux and Dr. Cook's budget presentations are this Tuesday. As legislation is identified that needs to be advocated for, the consumer and family groups could activate phone trees for testimonies. At the last meeting, Dr. Beasley was instructed to write a letter that will go to the Legislature that will include the fact sheet and ask for their involvement and the involvement of the Mental Health Planning Council (MHPAC) and the Consortia and interacting with the Legislators. Kevin Quint is working on the letter that is required by statute to go to the Governor. The Commission is going to activate the new list serve they have that includes the four advisory groups at the Legislature.

Ann said the bill draft that Dr. Crowe is discussing is the one that Patty Merrifield spoke to the Council on January 4th & 5th, 2011.

Corrie said at the last meeting they discussed this BDR, and they discussed doing a letter of support. Patricia confirmed. Dr. Crowe said having the consumer groups weigh in would be very good. There has been a lot of public discussion on these bills. Patricia asked for information as to how the letter of support should be addressed. Alyce suggested that Patricia, Roger, and Tanya to draft a letter and then the group look at and send to the Council for their approval and support. Layne asked if as a Council can send anything to the Legislature supporting any bills. Cody said the state employee can not participate. Alyce said she thought their job was to advocate on behalf of, so if they show support for something, they are not lobbying it. Roger said part of the reason for reformatting this Committee is to take the state employees off the Committee and put them in an advisory role, so they can be recused and the Committee will be able to speak as consumers and family members. Advocacy is one of the three federal requirements. Patricia said if they sign and consumers and family members of consumers who sit on the MHPAC, then they should be clear in protecting the state employees from any conflict of interest. Alyce said she thought they have written letters in the past. Roger said in the amount of time he has been here, the Council has not sent any letters to the Legislature. There have been a couple of other letters regarding other entities.

Cody asked as an advisory staff to the group, is it this piece of legislation that this group wants to advocate for or is it something more broad like access to services? Alyce said she was thinking something more broad about making sure they have access to services etc. She was not thinking of anything in particular because if they say they are just doing the one item, that in her mind becomes lobbying. Corrie asked if they could do both. Can they specifically support the BDR from DCFS and do a support letter for overall services? Patricia said they have to be careful when addressing the legislature, on items that have to do with a particular BDR. They can as consumers and family members support it but as the MHPAC, they can be there saying they are in an advisory capacity. Roger said he can draft a letter that would do what Corrie is asking. Roger has three items on his list at this time: letter to the first lady, letter to the legislature on access, and letter to the legislature regarding the BDR for DCFS.

Roger suggested that this Committee come up with a new name and the information that the Committee will be doing. Patricia said in renaming the Committee they need to make note that the state employees are there in an advisory capacity only. The core Committee members are either consumers or family members who are interested in helping children and adolescents with mental health issues. Corrie said the name Roger stated sounds good. She asked if they will be working only for child and adolescents or are they going to work on advocacy issues for all ages. Patricia said when they worked on the two goals to focus on for the year, Adams House was to be for adults and the Access to Child/Adolescent Services was to be for children. She asked if the Committee thinks they should broaden the scope. Corrie said she would like to see it broaden particularly with all of the cuts on the table; it is affecting children and adults

severely. She believes they need to be a voice for that. Cody asked if the minutes from the last Council meeting reflect the broadening and if they have to go back to the Council to approve the broadening as an entire Council. Roger said they would be able to suggest this at the February 15th meeting. Patricia said if they get the approval from the Council it will allow them to be able to advocate at a different level.

Patricia said aside from the letter writing what other things should they be doing. Corrie suggested educating the general public, especially in light of recent events in the country. There is a very serious stigma. The more education they can put out there the better. Speaking on behalf of the rural areas, the stigma is pretty severe. She is not sure how it would look on a statewide level. Patricia asked Dr. Crowe to address. Dr. Crowe said one of the main things they are doing is what is being accomplished today. The question is what to do next. He said down the road, they may want to have a phone tree set up, so that it can be activated and people can attend and participate. They have a machine that counts the incoming calls for each bill before it is heard. The Legislators do look at these items. He said he would like to know how the Commission can help as well. Corrie asked if they have officially endorsed the DCFS BDR. Patricia said to her knowledge they have not officially endorsed. Roger said they may want to go back to the minutes from the Council meeting and double check.

Patricia reviewed the goals: Letter to the First Lady, Letter to the Legislature – supporting services for the mental health arena, and support of the BDR in place by DCFS. They need to go back to the Council to see if they can broaden the spectrum to advocate for children, adolescents, and adults in the current mental health climate, educating the general public regarding the mental health of Americans – especially in light of recent events, developing a phone tree so consumers and family members can contact the Legislators, and renaming the Committee to Consumer and Family Member Advocacy Committee.

Patricia asked for other discussion or ideas. Lydia asked if it would be possible to put a CD together for the schools. Corrie asked how much it would cost. Patricia said with particular mental health issues, there are groups who have done that. Lydia asked if there is a way to get free publicity on the radio. Patricia said they may be able to and there are other PSA's for all of the local television stations. When they visited Laughlin, there was a person there who met with the stakeholders, and she had some ideas about getting the word out. She was doing a piece on the Laughlin Clinic. Lydia asked if the fact sheets have been distributed. Patricia said yes, they have been. Tanya said she sent hard copies to a number of locations, and then they sent an email directing them to the website. The fact sheets are located on the MHPAC website in pdf format. Corrie asked what fact sheet. Roger sent them to her. Corrie asked if they can work with NAMI and their public education outreach. Can they ask them to do more public awareness in Nevada? In the rural areas they do not see much. Lydia said NAMI does quite a bit of public awareness; she has worked with them in the past. She thinks is

would be a good idea to speak with Bunchie and Joe to see what they can do. Lydia will contact Bunchie and see what she can do. Cody suggested looking at the National NAMI and SAMHSA website to see if any of the materials they make available may be useful to her. Corrie said she has and she will do that again. Lydia asked about inviting Joe and/or Bunchie as representatives of NAMI to one of their meetings. Roger said they can draft an agenda item request and invite them. Patricia asked about university level. Lydia said she believes she can distribute information to the University of Phoenix. Patricia said since this will be a community based service, they need to have a way of getting everyone on board.

Layne motioned to rename the Committee Consumer and Family Member Advocacy Committee and under that, they change the purpose and tasks of the group to include the letters, phone tree, bringing in outside resources to assist, and present this to the Council for approval.

Alyce seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Patricia asked for public comment. Roger gave Patricia Pam Becker's number at the Children's Cabinet. He said he sent Lydia and Corrie the fact sheets. He also sent the NAMI contact information to Lydia.

5. SET DATE AND TOPICS FOR FOLLOW-UP MEETING

Date for the next meeting to be 2/22/2011 from 8:30 am – 10:30 am. The topics would be the new goals and approval of letters.

Lydia motioned to accept the meeting on 2/22/11 and topics. Corrie seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

6. ADJOURNMENT

Lydia motioned to adjourn. Alyce seconded the motion.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 am.