



# Michigan Mental Health Commission

*established by Governor Jennifer Granholm's Executive Order 2003-24*

---

## **MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION MEETING SUMMARY**

September 27, 2004  
Holiday Inn West  
Lansing, Michigan

### ***Commissioners Present***

Patrick Babcock and Waltraud Prechter, Co-chairs; William Allen, Fran Amos, Beverly Blaney, Patricia Caruso, Nick Ciaramataro, Bill Gill, Beverly Hammerstrom, Rick Haverkate, Gilda Jacobs, Joan Jackson Johnson, Alexis Kaczynski, Sander Levin, Kathryn Lynnes, Milton Mack, Samir Mashni, Andy Meisner, Janet Olszewski, Jeff Patton, Michele Reid, Mark Reinstein, Roberta Sanders, David Sprey, Sara Stech, Rajiv Tandon, Maxine Thome, Marianne Udow.

### ***Welcome and Agenda Overview***

The meeting was convened at 8:50 AM. Patrick Babcock called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda for the day. The work today would be to reach consensus on all sections of the report. Co-Chair Babcock asked Suzanne Miel-Uken of Public Sector Consultants to give a brief overview of the types of changes that had been made in the draft report since the September 20 meeting. Ms. Miel-Uken stated that amendments proposed by commissioners that were editorial in nature but did not change the substance of the report had been made in the draft report and were noted as such in the compilation of commissioners' comments. Other amendments submitted by commissioners were substantive in nature and would require the approval of the commission to be adopted into the report. These proposed amendments were also noted as such in the compilation of commissioners' comments.

### ***Approval of September 20 Meeting Summary***

The commission approved the summary of the September 20 meeting unanimously, without alteration.

### ***Review of the Decision-making Process***

Mr. Cleveland reviewed the decision-making process for the day. He said that any commissioner could make a motion to amend the report. Amendments should be presented clearly and discussion of amendments should be concise. If any commissioner feels it necessary, he/she can make a motion to end debate and move to question. Once discussion of an item is concluded, two-thirds of voting commissioners present must vote in favor of an amendment for it to be approved.

John stated that the sequence for the day's review of the report would be as follows:

- The commission would first return to the Recipient Rights section of Goal 5 since discussion of that section was deferred from the September 20 meeting.
- The commissioners would then review substantive new language from the last meeting that had been prepared by other commissioners and staff.

- Then the floor would be open for any other amendments commissioners would like to offer related to goals one through seven.
- Finally, commissioners could offer and consider amendments related to other sections of the report (foreword, issues, appendix, etc.).

Once discussion of the report sections is completed, commissioners would be asked to vote to provisionally approve or disapprove the entire report. If two-thirds of voting commissioners present approved the report it would be sent back to PSC to make the changes approved by the commission today and for final editing. The final report would then be sent out to commissioners who would again have the opportunity to either approve or disapprove of the report in its entirety, or they could approve overall but object to specific items in the report. Those items to which commissioners objected would be noted in the report. If two-thirds of all voting commissioners approved of the overall report it would be submitted to the governor on October 11.

Some commissioners expressed concern with how their objections to specific items in the report would be noted. A commissioner expressed his preference for the report to state the objection and to include the reason for the objection.

Another commissioner suggested that recommendations approved by more than half but less than two-thirds of the voting commissioners be noted as such in the report.

Chair Babcock suggested that these issues be revisited at the end of the meeting.

### ***Complete Voting on Proposed Recommendations, Consideration of New and Revised Recommendations, and Consideration of Amendments to the Recommendations***

The commission followed the above process to complete voting on proposed recommendations in Goal 5 and to consider new and revised recommendations as well as amendments to recommendations proposed on the floor. The result of the process will be reflected in a revised draft report that commissioners will receive on September 30.

### ***Approval of the Goals and Recommendations***

Following voting on proposed recommendations and consideration of new and revised recommendations, the commission decided to schedule another meeting, deferring discussion of other sections of the report. Commissioner Gill moved to call to question the approval of the report in its entirety, which would have allowed no further amendments to be offered. More than two-thirds of voting commissioners voted to allow the vote, but discussion of the ramifications of a vote to provisionally approving the entire report led Commissioner Hammerstrom to offer an amendment to the motion; she moved that the commission vote only to approve or disapprove the goals and recommendations section of the report. This was agreed to by the rest of the commission, and thus a vote was taken on that section alone. The goals and recommendations section was approved by more than two-thirds of voting commissioners present.

### ***Wrap-Up, Review, and Adjournment***

The meeting adjourned at 6:17 PM. The commissioners were advised that they would be notified of the exact date, time and location of the next commission meeting, to be held the week of October 4. The next meeting will be devoted entirely to approving the sections of the report that were not reviewed and approved during the September 27 meeting.