



MEETING MINUTES

Monday, April 22, 7:00 PM

137 N. Cottonwood, Woodland, CA 95695
Bauer Building, Walker/Thomson Conference Room

- Members Present:** Brad Anderson; Bret Bandle; Davis Campbell; Father Michael Hebda; Caren Livingstone; Supervisor Don Saylor; Robert Schelen, Chair; Robert Sommer; Tom Waltz; Tawny Yambrovich
- Members Excused:** Richard Bellows; Robert Canning, Vice-Chair; June Forbes; Martha Flammer; Janlee Wong;
- Staff Present:** Dirk Brazil, Assistant County Administrator; Emily Henderson, Assistant Deputy to Don Saylor; Mark Bryan, ADMH Deputy Director; Makayle Neuvert, ADMH Administrative Assistant; Kim Suderman, ADMH Director
- Community Members:** Rebecca Pinto; Millie Braunstein; Leslie Carroll; Nancy Temple; Donna Bousquet; Maria Elena Vega, Pamela Martineau, Belinda Martineau; Kathy Williams-Fossdahl
- Others/Guests:** Michael Heggarty, Director – Nevada County Behavioral Health; Honorable Judge Thomas M. Anderson, Nevada County Superior Court; Carol Stanchfield, Program Director – Turning Point Providence Center

-
- 1. Call to Order and Introductions** – The April 22, 2013 LMHB meeting was called to order at 7:10 PM. Introductions were omitted in the interest of preserving time for the scheduled presentation.
 - 2. Public comment requested for non-agenda items**
 - a. The Northern CA NAMI regional walk is on Saturday April 27th in Land Park in Sacramento. 4th annual walk. All are welcome, go to www.namiwalks.org for more information. Donations requested and can be made on the website.
 - 3. Approval of Agenda – Motion:** Davis Campbell **Second:** Robert Sommer
 - 4. Approval of Minutes** from March 25, 2013 – **Motion:** Tawny Yambrovich **Second:** Robert Sommer; motion does not a pass unanimously; Caren Livingstone abstained as she was not at last meeting.
 - 5. Announcements and Correspondence** – Welcome to Michael Hebda, appointed by Supv. Chamberlin as the representative of District 5.
 - 6. Laura’s Law Presentation – Nevada County:** Presentation Given (See PowerPoint presentation and additional handouts)

Questions and comments requested from the LMHB members followed by public comment. This, with the board members’ feedback, will shape BOS recommendation.

a. LMHB Members Question and Answer

Q: For those who don't voluntarily participate and/or see the value of the treatment, what approach is taken?

A: Most people do not start out believing in the process. However with a treatment plan focused approach, the reason for referral to the program allows an opportunity for engagement. With engagement, even those that are reluctant eventually show results and the acceptance of service. Even small progress has proven some benefit and engendered more participation. There are various ways of measuring success and even if the participants don't complete the treatment plan specifically, there is some level of engagement and this is a success.

Q: What punitive measures are involved? How do you get people to comply? Is this ever considered coercive?

A: Rewards and approval from others can be very motivating. Also, sometimes coming to court is considered a hassle so it is a deterrent which convinces people to participate with treatment/medication. Some people respond very well to medication and like the response. When there is a referral, the approach is often a key component of the success including patience and support and finding a reason to engage. There are no time limits on the assessment after referral (in Nevada County.) Building the relationship that the treatment is based on is given the time it needs to progress with respect, curiosity, support, and care. The offer to meet basic needs is helpful to successful treatment participation.

Q: What about those with lack of income/housing/etc.?

A: The team will help participants to access entitlements.

Q: Is Laura's Law only for those with mental illness or could others with disabilities and substance abuse problems participate?

A: Laura's Law is only for those with severe mental illness but often co-occurring homelessness, substance, or poly-substance abuse exists.

Q: As the end of 6 months period of participation approached, how are the services phased out?

A: Participants are encouraged to consider what life will look like after the expiration of the court order. Positive experience makes for continued participation and some volunteer to continue because of the support they receive. At the expiration of the court order they are transferred to the ACT program on a voluntary basis.

Comment: Some people may recognize the potential of hope in this program when they first begin and may see a "glimmer of light" not previously recognized.

Q: What kind of impact does this program actually make?

A: The numbers have been calculated based on New York's experience with Kendra's Law which reports that 1 person out of 25k would qualify. Based on population numbers, Nevada County participation is on target and Yolo County would have approximately 8 participants per year, keeping in mind the ebb and flow.

Q: Why have no other counties enacted this law, besides money?

A: The top 5 reasons we've heard are: 1) the program is too expensive, 2) we already have 5150/conservatorship, 3) we already have voluntary outreach services, 4) it is unethical/immoral to coerce people into treatment, 5) with the lack forced medication it is considered ineffective because of the belief that medication is the only means to recovery.

Q: From MHSA funding, will there be cuts to other programs that will result if Laura's Law is added?

A: Nevada County is unique in that Laura's Law was part of their initial MHSA program roll-out. No other county will be able to do it that way, so will have a more complicated time if they use MHSA dollars for the program portion. It would be part of the overall planning process but it is important to keep in mind the demonstrated savings.

b. Public Comment

Card 1 – Q1: What is the Hammer if the consumer doesn't comply with the treatment plan?

A1: The judge can order them into the hospital for up to 72 hours or until assessment is made. Kim clarified, that this law exists already as an available sanction, that the judge can court order the assessment, which may only take up to 72 hours.

Also, the court can offer less coercive measures such as changing or increase the number of court dates to encourage compliance. Respecting them engenders cooperation.

Q2: If the consumer has private HMO insurance that will not reimburse the county? Will you still provide service?

A2: Nevada County made a policy decision to serve those as well, and is using MHSA funds.

Q3: A recent report prepared by the Senate office say the law has been invoked only 4 times, please explain the discrepancy in numbers.

A3: Since Nevada County was the only one that implemented Laura's Law, no one at the Department of Mental Health knew how we were supposed to comply with reporting our data to them. 2009 or 2010, Nevada County was directed to turn in a report but with-out direction so they reported that there were 4 court orders, which is what they had at the time. But it turned out that they were supposed to include settlement agreements and so the true

number was 25 not 4. The old incorrect numbers continue to be used in rhetoric despite efforts to update and subsequent correct reports.

Public Question: Q: A member of the audience asked questions about the flow of referral:

A: (See handout, flow chart) Screen = basic review of referral by Nevada County Behavioral Health Department staff to confirm they meet criteria. They are handed off to Turning Point to do the Outreach and Assessment portion. Next, during the creation of the treatment plan, this is honed during the assessment phase with the client.

Card 3: Comment: Troubled individuals use significant resources and are troublesome and unpleasant. She suggests having a person/friend/advocate for each individual chosen by the individual to assist them based on her experience with a person.

Bob Schelen paraphrased this suggestion: If Laura's Law is implemented, then a person/friend/advocate could refer a troubled individual to the program.

- c. **Supv. Saylor expressed thanks to the presenters.** Additional comments should be emailed for consideration by the LMHB.

7. Board of Supervisors Report – Don Saylor: Tomorrow the BOS is having a development session in the afternoon after the regular meeting continuing the work in a similar fashion as the recently completed strategic planning process. Tactical goals and objectives are being worked on within a strategic plan as well.

8. LMHB Chair Report – Bob Schelen, Chair

- a. At the May meeting the board will discuss and vote on the recommendation they will make to the BOS regarding Laura's Law and potential implementation in Yolo County.
- b. Strategic Plan – Passed out hard copies and asked for comments and feedback by 05/15/13, comments will not be considered beyond this date. RDA will receive the comments on the plan on 05/16/13. On approx. 05/22/13, the actual final plan will be emailed to members and adoption will be put to a vote at the May meeting.

Follow up: Email the Draft Strategic Plan to all members.

- c. Next meeting day change due to holiday

9. Department Report – Kim Suderman: meeting agenda next month will include the ADMH budget which goes to the BOS for approval in June.

Follow up: Kim will Email the ADMH budget to all members for review prior to meeting.

10. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 PM **Motion:** Davis Campbell
Second: Robert Sommer

11. Next Meeting Date and Location – ****DAY CHANGE DUE TO HOLIDAY****

Tuesday, May 28th, 2013, 600 A Street, Davis, CA 95616 – Community Conference Room