

NORTHERN REGIONAL BEHAVIORAL HEALTH POLICY BOARD

Meeting Minutes

DATE: December 1st, 2022

TIME: 2:00 p.m. to Adjournment

Meeting Locations

Meeting teleconferenced at:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83625007893?pwd=T0thbG1wQWN6SUF6RWJwdkFJVIVFQT09>

Notes to all members:

Note: Before speaking, please state your full name for the record whether appearing by phone, video, or in person. All voting members should leave their cameras on for the duration of the meeting according to Nevada Open Meeting Law. Refrain from entering any information into the chat function of the video platform.

Note: Agenda items may be taken out of order, combined for consideration, and or removed from the agenda at the chairperson's discretion

1.) Call to Order – 2:01 PM

Roll Call (Chair Taylor Allison)

Members Present:

Taylor Allison (Chair)

Dr. Ali Banister (Vice-Chair)

Laura Yanez

Nicki Aaker

Lana Robards

Sheriff Ken Furlong

Shayla Holmes

Erik Schoen

Dr. Amy Hyne-Sutherland

Members Not Present:

Dr. Robin Titus

Sandy Wartgow

During the reading of the member roll call it was explained that Amy Kegel has not sent in a formal letter retiring from the board but has expressed to the Coordinator she can no longer sit on this board and that a resignation letter will follow. Dr. Kegel did suggest she could supply some recommendations. At the time of these meetings being done the Coordinator did receive Dr. Amy Kegel's resignation letter.

Community:

Fred Pilot

Morgan Biaselli

Courtney Welch

Mitchell Moen

A Henry

Vanessa Dunn

Valerie Haskins

Michelle Bennett

Taylor Morgan

B Archuleta

Helen Troupe

Joan Hall

Elyse Monroy

Jamie Ross

April Sears

Teresa Etcheberry

Laura Oslund

Health Kuhn

Dana Walburn

Lea Tauchen

Brain Conway

Shannon Ernst

Reginald Wallace

Erin Dudley

Sarah Adler

Linda Anderson

Serene Pack

Lori Follett

Dawn Yohey

Terry Kerns

Jen Lords

Misty Vaughan Allen

2.) **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public testimony under this agenda item may be presented by a computer, phone, or written comment. Due to time considerations, each individual offering public comment will be limited to not more than **three (3)** minutes.

Robin Reedy: NAMI Nevada National Alliance on Mental Illness (Nevada's affiliate) First, off I want to thank you all for the hard work and substantial BDRs you as a board do put through every session of every year. The boards, all of the boards, do such wonderful work and collaborate with partners throughout the state. So, thank you again for all the hard thankless work you continue to do. And work on. I know this work doesn't come without a cost; funding is needed to keep these boards moving forward. My ask is that you request funding from the state's general funding so it is not a onetime funding source, and the boards can be solidified with concurrent funding every year to pay for these ongoing efforts by the boards. My background is in state financing, so I know that if we don't get solidified funding for these positions. They could eventually go away and there has been a lot of hard work and dedication to these boards in effort to see them continue succeeding.

- 3.) **For Possible Action:** Review and possible approval of meeting minutes from the October 6th, 2022, and November 2nd, 2022, meeting (Chair Taylor Allison and Board members). October and November 2022 meeting minutes passed unanimously with one change for each document to change the spelling of Story to Storey.

First Motion Ali Banister; Second Motion Lana Robards, no oppositions, and no abstentions for both sets of meeting minutes.

- 4.) **For Possible Action:** Review, discussion, and possible approval of updates to the Board Regional Behavioral Health Authority Bill Draft Request proposed language based on community feedback (Board Members and Cherylyn Rahr-Wood, Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator)

Coordinator attempted to use white board to present AB 9 on but could not get it to cooperate. Coordinator then read out loud the Assembly Bill #9, language changes and how the language could potentially read to be enabling.

It was determined that the discussions would occur during the rereading of the BDR language in real time:

Concerning section 2 item 1: referring to the sentence that states may employ such staff (coordinator, AA, grant manager, data analysis, etc.) as necessary to carry out duties. The "may" in this statement is present to allow the board to hire or not hire staff as some boards don't want this ability. So, keeping it at "may instead of shall" leaves a little bit more flexibility of who to hire.

There was conversation had about the board members being the employer of those staff positions (coordinator, AA, grant manager, data analysis, etc.) hired by board, and it went something like; This is something that this board could have consensus on, stated by Shayla Holmes. The discussion of the other policy boards not wanting the ability to hire those position was talked

about as well as the issue of these positions becoming state employees. The understanding was that this may have to be sorted out per region and as regional boards was where the discussion ended. The purpose of not wanting the coordinator of the boards not state employees is due to conflict with salary and priorities being aligned with the counties and potentially no ties to the state specifically.

A question was stated that they were not sure how we as a board can be granted funds and not be an entity of the state.

No other discussion was had during the finishing of the rereading. Coordinator stopped at Sec 6 item number 2.

The bill was summarized. The board asked for the option to appoint staff, to receive funds, to distribute those funds, to receive support from the state to fulfill the boards duties, expand the advisory capacity to monitor, survey and have insight on the provisional services by MCO's in the board's region and receive the annual reports and strategic plans for the children's mental health consortia in board's region.

The "may" language is one of the concerns heard back from the partners and constituents so making sure we are using the may term seems like it could be used to keep the Coordinators from becoming state employees. Another concern brought up was concerning the reports we are asking for in this language. Is the capability to ask for those reports without there being enabling language already in existence? And is language being added because there is some confusion as to why we are not getting the reports already from the consortia.

Comment was made that we did not ask for this language or for this language specifically. When we requested the language for accepting funds, they wanted to tie in this language hoping to build that relationship between the boards and the children's mental health consortia. We have been and are able to ask for these reports with or without this language in the bill. But this language does start to give enabling language for that authority piece as we move forward in the future. Nothing within the consortia of whom we are asking for these reports changes how the children's mental health consortium boards work and their duties, it just gives us the necessary reports and documents to help get insight as to what the consortia are doing during each fiscal year.

An issue of the funding stream that the consortia uses and how that has worked or not worked for them was asked. How does this look on the consortiums end funding wise? Do they have issues with getting reimbursed, receiving the funds every fiscal year. Things of this nature were discussed. It was explained that the consortia/consortiums have their own budget and run it just like partners who receive state finding. They must report out to when and where the funds get spent just like most grant funded boards and committees. The concern is that we must have the funding up front, so we don't have to wait to do payouts for services rendered or provide funds for those requesting in a timely manner. It is important that if we don't have funds for appropriations, we could potentially run into some problems in paying out or recouping the funds. One concern is that licensing boards do take in monies for the licensures and other provided mechanisms, so we need to make sure that the boards can be granted funds and then write for other grants or other funding streams to enable more monies for future staff, and such. It is understood that to full fill positions for the boards with grant funding, there will need to be ongoing requests for the funding of these positions. There is a concern about if we do begin to accept monies who is oversight for the monies. Is it the boards, the Coordinators, or do the boards need to hire a treasurer to fulfill this role and oversight?

It was suggested that we look at potentially using language that the licensing boards use or at least use some of the language already used to be able to control the monies bequeathed to us via gifts, grants, donations etc. The boards concern is the amount of time it takes for the state to pay RFR's and distribute funds. When looking at the board having its own discretion for paying out funding request, signing checks and depositing of funds when received, is this something we could potentially take on? Answers brought up were: This gives the boards the autonomy to hire whom they would like and pay them as well. The staff hired could potentially get State PERS and benefits, but still be employed by the board's funding stream. It is an anomaly but doable. This is one way to move forward with this language.

The idea was suggested we look at what the language would look like if we added the board licensure language within NRS 641A.205 to see how close that might get us to get enabling language that the board is still working towards. Since this language already exists, we just need to pull a portion of it over and make it work constructively. Using this language means we don't have to recreate the wheel. If we can get the language to meet the needs of these boards structurally, by adding the NRS 641A.205, we might be able to end with some enabling language. The NRS641A was added to the chat, see end of document for comments made. Coordinator will work with LCB to look at how the licensure language can be inserted here to give the board some autonomy with taking funds.

There was also discussion questioning the idea of getting the funds for staff positions which seems doable; but, when it comes to receiving the funds and distributing the funds, we could potentially be limited, and the state may still make it hard to apply for funds. Another concern that came out of the discussion was the sustainability issue to keep the positions we are asking to employ – how do we as a board make sure those positions are funded without conflict and the funding is provided without using direct program funding? It seems like this is a real tough puzzle and that we are all just trying to put all the pieces together. We need to look at the funding piece. Statute already implies that the positions get funding out of general fund dollars but here we are talking about crazy funding streams paying the Coordinators as well as other potential staff. Do we need to spell it out in the bill how these positions are funded or potentially funded? It was brought up that the state's budget is already created and written so we would have to make an additional request for the funds to be moved over this year. We would most definitely have to work with the state on this to have that included or as a supplement request – we may even need to get further assistance with this suggestion. A question was posed to Fred Pilot about the funding stream. how it looked and could potentially look. Fred provided NRS 433.384

Legislative appropriations: payment of claims. Money to carry out the provisions of chapters 433 to 433C, inclusive, of NRS must be provided by legislative appropriation from the State General Fund and paid out on claims as other claims against the State are paid. All claims relating to a division facility individually must be approved by the administrative officer of such facility before they are paid. (Added to NRS by 1975, 1594; A 1993, 2716; 2013, 3008)

The concept of writing the positions into the language could potentially muddy the waters of being a state employee.

A couple of the board members stated their concerns and questions. Seems most of the board members share the same idea towards this bill of not really being able to support it as a member as well as how do we get others to support the bill. Also concerning the funding of the positions and then the question came up about how involved the boards want to be with the funding streams and awarding allocations to the providers in each board's region.

One member stated that they feel like we are trying to create two models: (1) a state backed model, (2) a stand on our own two feet model to make it happen. It really boils down to solidifying these positions moving forward and give us more leeway in working with our staff. Members of the board also suggested we look at the 641A language for the holding of funds piece. We do need to remember that licensing boards receive funds from those people applying for board acceptance so there is an incoming influx of dollars, the board may not have that luxury of receiving on going incoming flexible funds, such as licensing fees. When we talk about grant funding, we must remember it is not a sure thing, can be a short fund, and no guarantee is given when it is awarded and that it will continue to be a funding source year after year. This is the language received from LCB after meeting with them so let's be clear we should as a board be looking at it and tentatively work backwards to achieve the language we are trying to get to. How do we make the language match exactly what we want? When we look at the language you can easily see how you can get caught up in the confusion of the language. Even the Chair and Coordinator get confused on some level. Just due to some of the additions that have been made.

Coordinator will get with LCB to clarify the language concerning adding title and budget for the Regional Coordinators. Adding such language such as writing in the Regional Coordinators with a budget and the ability to subaward these coordinator positions, is the question here. And then how this will affect the positions as viable employees of the state if they are written into the language. If the position titles aren't written into the language, then potentially the state is less likely to run the coordinator positions and the board remains as is for the most part.

It was explained as to how the Coordinators are paid through four distinctive grant awards and PERS is paid through the partner that holds the funding.

The general fund aspect of funding the Coordinator positions came up with the understanding that a cost benefit analysis for the Coordinator position should be completed, we will have to show in dollars the value of the Coordinators and what they bring to the table for the boards as well as the communities and counties they serve.

Without language in the NRS concerning the Regional Coordinators, there are no real ties to the boards except to fulfill the duties asked upon them by the board. Remembering two years ago when we did the strategic planning one of the items focused on, was the Regional Coordinators, their positions and making them solidified in the NRS language.

One fear of the board is that they may lose the independence we have if we go for General Fund dollars. The question is how we maintain that quasi-independence with keeping everything else as status quo and not becoming a subject of the state. There was a discussion made about the counties funding the positions with the understand that most counties in the rural areas would not go along. But there was a statement made that having the counties pay funds could be something to look at but again the feeling of that as if we are going down the general funds funding path and we could murky the waters.

The Washoe County Regional Coordinator in attendance stated that all the regions are all a bit different. They spoke to the idea of not wanting to be a state employee that they loved being a county employee and found that Washoe County would continue to fund their regional Coordinator and Clark would as well. Washoe County Policy Board would not support this bill as written. It was mentioned that these are tough conversations to have and that we are just trying to come to a consensus of the language that works for all involved that could potentially be in place forever.

Thanks to everyone for having the tough conversation and the icky questions but that is how we move this to get to an end however that may look.

Board has given direction to Coordinator for January meeting:

1. Coordinator will reach out to LCB and look at adding the NRS 641A language, as well as get clarification on the titles of positions being written in and how that could potentially look considering the state employee piece. And get this question answered: Do we need to spell it out in the bill how these positions are funded or potentially funded?
2. Coordinator will reach out to individual board members to collaborate on the dialogue and some ideas of how to move forward with the language.
3. Coordinator will assess how a cost analysis of board coordinator duties would look.

This agenda item was tabled for any action until January's board meeting.

- 5.) **For Possible Action:** Review, discussion, and possible approval regarding the updated Northern Region Behavioral Health Policy Board action plan for the 2023 Nevada Legislative Session – Regional Behavioral Health Authority Bill Draft Request (Board Members and Cherylyn Rahr-Wood, Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator)

The action plan was brought up on screen to show a couple of completed tasks and updates on other objectives to be completed by board. Coordinator read through the task that have changed. Coordinator showed the meeting that exist here in Nevada. No other action was taken on the action plan.

The Coordinator brought the PowerPoint Presentation up on screen and went over the changes made as language was morphed from the last time the presentation was shown.

Only one question was brought up at the Lyon County Board of Health meeting Commissioner Henderson asked about the LV BDR.

Coordinator will reach out to Sheriff Furlong to schedule a time and date to meet incoming sheriffs.

First Motion to pass the updated action plan for AB9 and the current presentation was made by Nicki Aaker and Second Motion made by Sheriff Ken Furlong, no oppositions, and no abstentions.

- 6.) **Informational:** Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator and board members or taskforce appointee updates on behavioral health concerns, initiatives, and successes in their area of specialty or county on behalf of the local behavioral health taskforces and any current update on opioid, SUD, and any other social determinants of health – data, resources, programs, funding opportunities (Cherylyn Rahr-Wood, Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator, Board members or appointees)

Coordinator updates: Registration for the Summit on Improving Community Response to Individuals with Behavioral Health Challenges is still open for free registration. January 18 and 19 in Las Vegas at the New Orleans Hotel and Casino. Rooms are available for 69.00 plus taxes. You must speak with someone to get that rate using the Behavioral Health Response code. There

are few scholarships available if you think you may need room or flight; no meals and/or transportation is supplied to and from airport. Let me know and I will connect you with the right people. The board is putting on a Psychiatric Advanced Directive (PAD) breakout session.

State is still working on a response for the letter you supplied for the Coordinator and staff supporting positions. More to follow.

Quad-County Public Health Preparedness team and Carson City BH taskforce have had presentations on the BH EOP and are now taking the draft to Emergency Manager to get approved and adopted. The Coordinator will be reaching out to each of the BH taskforce to get on your agenda for the counties who haven't had a presentation yet. If you are needing one and haven't heard from the Coordinator, please reach out to the Coordinator she will work to provide you with said presentation.

The Coordinator's SOW (scope of work) is now completed and approved by the state as soon as budget is approved to match budget. The board will get a copy of SOW.

The Coordinator is finishing up the support letter for the Dementia Care Specialist program. She apologizes for dropping the ball on this task and it should be completed by months end.

The Coordinator is working closely with the FASTT team to complete Nevada's FASTT Manual Standards. We are just getting this rolling after completing the work with Bitfocus Clarity on the data dashboard for the FASTT teams to utilize as we move forward with the COSSAP grant deliverables.

The Coordinators have been updating and making changes slowly to the nvbh.org website. Documents are being added and new sections added such as the FASTT and MOST. It will be growing this year and our hopes are that you use this site to gain knowledge and insight to data as well as trainings and other information that is pertinent to your county concerning behavioral health.

This Coordinator is working with multiple people on the Mental Health Crisis Hold (MHCH) documents, working with the FASTT and MOST teams, and collaborating with the specialty courts to create statewide shared documents for MHCH transfers and discharges as well as other documents concerning the MHCH and these diversion programs. More to follow on this project.

Behavioral Health Taskforce updates:

Carson City: Nicki Aaker - met at Community Counseling Center which is a CCBHC's. They highlighted all the service they provide, gave snapshot of patient size and where they are at with the program. They have bought a charter middle school for their inpatient part of CCBHC, which consist of 24 two-bedroom and 12 one-bedroom rooms – they are struggling with staffing as is everyone else. It is exciting hopefully it will get off the ground in February.

Douglas: Daria Winslow – Douglas County will be working on their needs assessment in the next couple of months, Taylor and Cherylyn (Coordinator) will be helping with this. Coordinator will be presenting on the BH EOP as well as the AB9 bill presentation at the next Douglas County BH Taskforce meeting.

Churchill: Shannon Ernst - no one to report

Storey: Erik Schoen – Spoke to ongoing needs of Storey county - economy, affordable housing, services, behavioral health staff shortage. Saw an increase this year with people asking for holiday meals (turkeys, fixings for thanksgiving meals) things of that nature. He was able to tour the empowerment center in Reno NV and saw how they were able to construct very well affordable developed housing units, and also was able to get some insight as to how they funded the project. All this and more on the top of people's minds.

Lyon: Shayla Holmes-not exciting not much done finishing up loose ends will need to get with Cherylyn to train on Columbia-Suicide Severity Ratings Scale (need dates); the needs assessment was approved by the Board of Health so it is out there to be read and studied, they approved our first-year opioid litigation plan and so we will be moving forward with creating a Behavioral Health Unit within the County Health and Human Services Dept.

7.) For Possible Action: Discussion/Approval of Future Agenda Items.

1. Other Regional Boards BDR presentations. Clark County Prezi in Jan (Sarah Adler, Char Frost). Working on getting the other boards to present.
2. Cody Phinney and Shannon Bennett to present on funding streams for behavioral health in the state of Nevada in Jan
3. Medicaid to present on the Quadrennial Rate and Review (QRR) in February (Sarah Dearborn and/or Kimberly Adams)
4. Rural and Washoe county BDR presentations in February?
5. First Motion to approve future agenda items was made by Shayla Holmes and the Second Motion by Sheriff Ken Furlough, with no oppositions, and no abstentions

8.) Informational: Next meeting is on January 5th, 2022, at 2:00 PM until adjourned.

9.) PUBLIC COMMENT

Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for a later meeting. Public testimony under this agenda item may be online, by phone or by written comment. Due to time considerations, each individual offering public comment will be limited to not more than **three (3)** minutes.

10.) Adjournment – 3:52: Erik Schoen - Moved to adjourn

AGENDA POSTED AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

4600 Kietzke Lane Suite I-209

4150 Technology Way, Carson City, Nevada

On the Internet at dpbh.nv.gov/Boards/RBHPB/Board Meetings/2018/northern-regional/

and the Department of Health and Human Services Website www.listserv.state.nv.us.

and at Nevada Public Notices: <https://notice.nv.gov/>

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to call into the meeting. In the event of Microsoft Teams application has technical difficulties, the meeting may be conducted by teleconference from the same location. If special arrangements are necessary, please notify Marcelle Anderson at 4126 Technology Way, 2nd Floor, Carson City, Nevada 89706 or by calling (775)-684-4095 up to three days before the meeting date. Anyone who wants to be on the advisory council mailing list can sign up on the listserv at www.listserv.state.nv.us/cgi-bin/wa?HOME.

If you need supporting documents for this meeting, please notify Marcelle Anderson, Bureau of Behavioral Health Wellness and Prevention, at (775)-684-4095 or by email at m.anderson@health.nv.gov

Chat conversation verbatim:


- NRS 641A.205 Deposit and use of money. All money coming into possession of the Board must be kept or deposited by the Secretary-Treasurer in banks, credit unions, savings and loan associations or savings banks in the State of Nevada to be expended for payment of compensation and expenses of the members and employees of the Board and for other necessary or proper purposes in the administration of this chapter.

-  Erik Schoen58:06

This is from NRS 641A establishing MFTs and CPCs, and the board.

-  Fred Pilot01:03:29

NRS 433.384 Legislative appropriations; payment of claims. Money to carry out the provisions of chapters 433 to 433C, inclusive, of NRS must be provided by legislative appropriation from the State General Fund and paid out on claims as other claims against the State are paid. All claims relating to a division facility individually must be approved by the administrative officer of such facility before they are paid. (Added to NRS by 1975, 1594; A 1993, 2716; 2013, 3008)

-  Dorothy Edwards01:33:10
Absolutely understand!