

Division of Public and Behavioral Health
Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA)
Advisory Board Nomination Subcommittee

MINUTES

DATE: October 4, 2017
TIME: 2:00 p.m.
TELECONFERENCE: 888-636-38807 / Access Code: 1961091

MEMBERS PRESENT

Lana Robards
Michelle Berry
Jennifer DeLett-Snyder, Chair

New Frontier
CASAT
Join Together Northern Nevada

MEMBERS ABSENT

David Robeck

Bridge Counseling Associates

OTHERS PRESENT

Dani Tillman
John Firestone
Jolene Dalluhn
Lea Cartwright

The Life Change Center
The Life Change Center
Quest Counseling
Nevada Psychiatric Association

SAPTA/STATE STAFF PRESENT

Raul Martinez

Joan Waldock

1. Introductions, Announcements, and Roll Call

The meeting commenced at 2:01 p.m. Ms. DeLett-Snyder determined there was a quorum present. Mr. Robeck texted Ms. Robards and said that he could not make it to the meeting, but would be available by text if needed.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Approval of Minutes from April 7, 2014

Mr. Martinez reported that the minutes from April 7, 2014, were not approved because there had not been a follow-up meeting. Ms. Berry stated that those minutes were approved at the following SAPTA Advisory Board meeting in either April or May of that year. Mr. Martinez stated he would confirm it, but if that was the case, no action needed to be taken on this agenda item.

4. Review Existing Members and Confirm Members' Eligibility

Ms. DeLett-Snyder requested a list of the organization SAPTA currently funds. That list can be found [here](#). She stated she went through the list identifying what each group provided. She listed the coalitions under prevention. The second area she listed was treatment, which she organized by primary work and territory type—whether the agency was urban, rural, or statewide. She subcategorized them as being Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics (CCBHCs) or providing adult treatment, youth treatment, or Medicine-Assisted Treatment (MAT). The final column showed who was currently on the Board. She reported an informal conversation took place among some members of the Subcommittee to identify if her categories were correct.

Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated that she found terminology in the by-laws unclear. In 4.2.2, they state that members must be representatives of organizations that receive "state funding." It did not specify what type of funding. She and those she talked with assumed that meant SAPTA-funded agencies, but the by-laws do not clearly say that. In 4.3.2, the by-laws state that an organization will lose representation on the Board if it does not meet attendance requirements or if the organization ceases to receive SAPTA funding. She asked if the Advisory Board should change that to say organizations that receive SAPTA funding. Mr. Martinez was of the opinion that it should be changed.

Ms. DeLett-Snyder proceeded to go through her list. She reported that Pauline Salla-Smith has not been attending, but wanted to keep her slot. She told Ms. DeLett-Snyder that if she was unable to attend a meeting she would have someone else from Frontier Community Coalition attend. She said that Michele Watkins' agency was not SAPTA-funded; however, Healthy Communities Coalition has been happy to allow Ms. Watkins to have their seat. Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated that Ms. Watkins has been on the Board since it was started, but she is from Central Lyon Youth Connections, which is not a SAPTA-funded agency. It is a subgrantee of Healthy Communities Coalition. She expressed concern about that, deferring to Ms. Berry or Mr. Martinez for clarification. Mr. Martinez verified that Healthy Communities Coalition received funding from SAPTA and that Healthy Communities allocated funding to Central Lyon Youth Connections. Ms. Berry recalled that Healthy Communities Coalition nominated Ms. Watkins as their representative. Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated that the current director of Healthy Communities was not aware of that. Ms. Berry suggested it be reexamined. She said that Ms. Watkins had been attending meetings on behalf of Healthy Communities, but had not been attending recently. Ms. Berry said that if Healthy Communities wanted that slot, they could have someone from their organization attend the meetings. Ms. Robards pointed out that Ms. Watkins attended the last meeting. Ms. DeLett-Snyder reiterated that Healthy Communities was happy to extend that to Ms. Watkins, but she did not think the current director had been aware of that relationship. She added that Ms. Watkins appears on SAPTA documents as representing Central Lyon Youth Connections when she was actually representing Healthy Communities

Coalition. Ms. Berry agreed that needed to be rectified. Mr. Martinez asked where she found Ms. Watkins as representing Central Lyon Youth. Ms. DeLett-Snyder directed him to look at attendance records in minutes. Mr. Martinez agreed that, going forward, she would be listed as representing Healthy Communities Coalition. Ms. DeLett-Snyder said she would forward to Mr. Martinez the email she received from Healthy Communities that gave Ms. Watkins permission to represent them. Mr. Martinez asked about Ms. Reed from the Las Vegas Indian Center. Ms. DeLett-Snyder pointed out that the Indian Center was no longer funded. She said all the other slots for membership were filled, so only that one slot was open. Ms. Robards said she received a request to consider Tenea Smith from Rural Nevada Counseling for a place on the Board.

Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated that Ms. Dalluhn, rather than Ms. Kamka, was at the meeting representing Quest Counseling. She also pointed out that Mr. Jimenez from WestCare did not usually attend meetings, but sent someone in his place. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked Mr. Martinez about any changes he made to the list she sent him. He replied that he added the names of those usually representing the agencies at the meetings. He pointed out that the Las Vegas Indian Center is no longer funded, so that opened a slot, and that the chair was open. Ms. Robards reminded members that the seat goes with the facility, not with the individuals, so that if Ridge House had a seat on the Advisory Council it would go to whoever represented Ridge House going forward. Ms. Berry pointed out that Ridge House still had its seat on the Board, so they only needed to replace one agency. They should be making nominations for an organization to be a member of the Advisory Board. From the membership of the Board, nominations would be made for chair and vice-chair. Ms. Robards stated that Ridge House had its seat on the Board and that anybody on the Advisory Board could be elected chair. Mr. Martinez concluded that they need to find a provider to replace the one that was no longer receiving SAPTA funding.

5. Review Services Provided by Subgrantees of SAPTA

Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated they needed to review agencies' primary work, location—urban or rural, whether they provide youth treatment or adult treatment, and inpatient or outpatient in order to see who was represented on the Board. She said she thought the reason Quest was brought on was there was no agency on the Board at that time that provided youth inpatient services. Ms. Robards said there were a lot of agencies that did youth outpatient work, but Quest was the only one that provided inpatient or residential services for male teens. Ms. Berry stated that, when they nominated Quest Counseling, they had identified there was no other agency providing adolescent services within an urban area such as Reno. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked everyone to look at the list to see if there was any area missing. Ms. Berry pointed out that CASAT would be considered an administrative program. Ms. DeLett-Snyder said youth treatment did not have as much representation as adult treatment and that most agencies on the SAPTA Advisory Board were involved in providing adult treatment. She said that the Empowerment Center attended meetings, but she did not know if they provided treatment; she thought they were geared toward sober living. Ms. Robards thought they were classified as providing transitional living. Ms. Robards pointed out that their focus had changed since they have new leadership, and she was unaware of their scope of work. Mr. Martinez said he could look into their levels of service. Ms. Robards said the only thing New Frontier has ever partnered with them on was Washoe County transitional housing for those coming out of residential treatment. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked the Subcommittee to look at the unhighlighted agencies on the list, as those were the ones funded by SAPTA that were eligible to have a seat on the Advisory Board.

6. Discuss Ideal Membership Numbers

Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated that having an even number of Board members is not optimal—if there was a split decision, someone would have to break a tie. She said she did not know the perfect number of members for this Board suggested going back to the Advisory Board to find out if they had a preference for an odd or even number of members. She understood why they moved to 16 in the

past. Ms. Berry said their reason for choosing 16 members was that with the chair holding a seat at an organization, he would often excuse himself from voting, leaving an odd number voting. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked if that was reflected anywhere in the by-laws. Ms. Berry said that it should be—if it was not in the by-laws, it should be added. Mr. Martinez read from the by-laws to point out that the by-laws do not reflect that. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked if the Subcommittee had the ability to make that decision or if the Advisory Board had to make the decision regarding wording regarding the chair not voting. Ms. Berry replied that this Subcommittee could recommend that to the Advisory Board, but the Advisory Board would have to vote on it. Ms. Robards pointed out that the purpose of this meeting was to fill the sixteenth spot. Ms. Berry said the Subcommittee could also say they were good with the current number of members and did not wish to fill the spot. Ms. Robards reminded the Subcommittee that Rural Nevada Counseling would like the slot and that the Life Change Center would also like to be considered. Ms. DeLett-Snyder recapped that there were two agencies interested in filling the seat, but she did not know if any of the other eligible agencies were interested. Ms. Robards thought that if they had not been attending meetings and were not reaching out to be a part of it, they should not be considered.

7. Discuss and Determine Any Nominations for Membership and Make Recommendations to the SAPTA Advisory Board

Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated there were agencies interested in the seat, so they needed to determine what they wanted to report to the Advisory Board. She asked if they wanted to add another agency or to recommend changing the by-laws to not allow the chair a vote. Mr. Martinez pointed out that if they wanted to change the number of members, it would have to go through the By-Laws Subcommittee. This Subcommittee could make a recommendation at an Advisory Board meeting, then it would be assigned to the By-Laws Subcommittee for review. That subcommittee would make its recommendation to the Board. Ms. Dalluhn stated that she believed the chair should have a vote. Ms. DeLett-Snyder and Ms. Robards agreed. Mr. Martinez clarified that, according to the by-laws, the chair has a vote. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked Ms. Robards to text Mr. Robeck to find out what his thoughts were. Mr. Martinez pointed out that the Subcommittee could recommend agencies to fill the vacant spots. Ms. Robards suggested they go to the Advisory Board, report that they met, what the current by-laws say, and bring up the question of whether the chair should have a vote. She was of the opinion that the chair should have a vote as he represented his agency, in addition to being the mouthpiece for the Advisory Board and for the treatment field. She added that they should report to the Board that the Las Vegas Indian Center was not currently funded, so that seat was available and that there were two facilities that would like to be considered, then ask them to decide what they wanted to do. Mr. Martinez agreed. He said he was working on the agenda for the next Wednesday's Advisory Board meeting, so he could add those items. Ms. Robards reported that she received a text from Mr. Robeck. He agreed that the chair should have a vote.

Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated they needed to decide if they wanted to keep an odd number, as it was now, or if they wanted to have an even number of members, which she said is never ideal on a board. Ms. Berry said that if they wanted to change the number of people on the Board, it would need to be given as a recommendation of this Subcommittee, but it would have to go back to the By-Laws Subcommittee. It is not something that could be voted on at the next Advisory Board Meeting. Ms. Robards stated that she also believed that even-numbered membership can backfire, so she opposed the decision to move to 16 members; however, she does not recall it ever having been an issue. She said that the problem the Advisory Board typically had was in establishing quorum. Ms. Berry said the other thing they needed to look at was the difficulty of reaching quorum with more members added. Ms. Robards said that Mr. Robeck would like to add Tahoe Youth and Family Services to the list of those being considered for the vacant seat. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked if Tahoe Youth was going to continue to receive funding for treatment. She was not sure if they were part of the block grant. Ms. Robards stated they are currently funded. Ms. Robards thought they had always

been funded, but admitted that she has been more concerned about what her agency was receiving rather than what everyone else was receiving. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked if they could go to the meeting and tell the Board there were three agencies interest in the slot, then let the Board decide whether they wanted to fill the seat. Mr. Martinez replied that is what this meeting is to decide. He said they could make a motion to approve those three agencies as recommendations to be added as members, then the Board could decide. Ms. DeLett-Snyder wanted to know if the Subcommittee could ask the Board if they would like to keep an odd number of members or they would prefer to keep an odd number of members. Mr. Martinez stated they could not do that without a change in the by-laws.

Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked if this Subcommittee would need to bring forward recommendations for chair and vice-chair. Mr. Martinez told her that they did. As that item was not on the agenda, Ms. DeLett-Snyder stated that it could not be determined at this meeting. She asked if it would also require a by-laws change to have co-chairs—one in the south, one in the north, so the state would be represented by not just one person as the chair—and also have a vice-chair. Mr. Martinez said that a by-laws change would be necessary. Ms. Berry said the by-laws would need to be changed to say that they wanted an executive board. Ms. DeLett-Snyder asked what it was considered now. Ms. Berry said currently there was no type of executive board, just a chair and vice-chair. She continued that what Ms. DeLett-Snyder suggested was a different infrastructure. Ms. Robards asked if there was an issue with the current structure. Ms. DeLett-Snyder said that under the previous chair she thought everything was very singular. She thought that if there were a couple of people who were co-chairs, one from the south and one from the north, they would get feedback from the entire Board, which had not happened for a few years. She said the people she talked to about being Board chair were not interested, but they expressed interest in being vice-chair. She thought if you had co-chairs, no one would shy away from the position. Ms. Berry thought this was a good topic to bring up to the Board. Ms. Robards said that if changes to the by-laws were going to be addressed, first should come the clarification on state funded versus SAPTA funded. Next should come talk about the number of members on the Board. She said Mr. Robeck preferred keeping the Board at 15 members. All of those would have to go to the By-Laws committee and they would have to make recommendations on changes. Ms. Berry asked if Mr. Martinez knew who was on the By-Laws Subcommittee. He did not have the list with him, but said he would send it out after the meeting. Ms. DeLett-Snyder said she felt the same way Mr. Robeck did, but did not want to make any nomination recommendations to the Board. She stated that the by-laws needed to be changed first. She hoped that could be done by the end of the year so that by the first meeting of the year they would have an answer as to how to run the meeting with a chair or two co-chairs, whether they had an open slot, and what the number of Advisory Board members would be. Ms. Robards suggested an agenda item for next week's meeting that would read, "Discussion on potential changes to the SAPTA Advisory Board's by-laws." Ms. Robards pointed out that the filling of the slots part was this Subcommittee's mission. Until the by-laws subcommittee met, made a recommendation to the Advisory Board, and they voted on it, this Subcommittee would not know whether 15, 16, or 17 members were needed. She continued that, if the Advisory Board chose to take the Board back to 15 members, there would not be a slot to fill; if they wanted an odd number of seats and decided to move membership to 17 members, there would be two slots to fill. She said everything fell in with whatever was decided at the next Advisory Board meeting. Mr. Martinez asked them to make a decision on what they want to recommend on this item. The agenda for the SAPTA Advisory Board would say that it would take action on that item based on the recommendations from the Nominations Subcommittee.

Mr. Martinez asked if they were going to vote on what the decision was in putting forth the three recommendations. At this point, the Subcommittee has discussed the issue and now they need to determine what they wanted to recommend. The Subcommittee would not be making the decision, they would just be recommending that the Advisory Board either choose one of the three or that they

change the number of members. Ms. Berry said they were asking the Board for additional conversations regarding reexamining the by-laws and changing them based on whatever the By-Laws Subcommittee recommended. If the Advisory Board chose to leave membership at 16, there were three nominations to move forward. She thought the Subcommittee's vote should be on having additional conversations regarding revamping the by-laws and on the structuring of the Advisory Board. Ms. Berry moved to postpone the nomination of those interested in joining the SAPTA Advisory Board until the By-Laws Subcommittee could meet to reexamine the bylaws and infrastructure. Ms. Robards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Public Comment

Mr. Firestone, from the Life Change Center, stated that MAT would be an asset to the Advisory Board. He said that his agency has been attending meetings and would make the commitment to attend future meetings.

There was no further public comment.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.