

**MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022 - FINAL**

<b>Agenda Item / Discussion</b>	<b>Action /Follow-Up</b>
<p><b>I. Call to Order / Introductions</b>  Vice-Chair, Cmsr. Laura Griffin, called the meeting to order @ 3:37 pm  <u>Members Present:</u>  Chair, Barbara Serwin, District II (3:45pm)  Vice-Chair, Cmsr. Laura Griffin, District V  Cmsr. Douglas Dunn, District III  Cmsr. Leslie May, District V  Cmsr. Alana Russaw, District IV</p> <p><u>Other Attendees:</u>  Cmsr. Graham Wiseman, District II  Angela Beck  Jennifer Bruggeman  Dawn Morrow, Supv. Diane Burgis' Ofc  Jen Quallick, Supv Candace Andersen's Ofc  Dr. Suzanne Tavano, Behavioral Health Services Director</p>	<p>Meeting was held via Zoom platform</p>
<p><b>II. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None</b></p>	
<p><b>III. COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (G. Wiseman) As many of you may already know, we have lost two children here in the Lamorinda area, coupled with two more children we have also lost in other parts of the county. I was actually attending the Suicide Prevention Committee Meeting and we had a guest speaker from Santa Clara that actually called it out as a 'suicide cluster' and this would be the second cluster from the Acalanes Unified High School District because they have lost four children in the last 14 months. At the state level, the warnings are that this will probably get worse as we get further away from the COVID protocols being removed. It is something I, as a Commissioner, am hoping to address at the main meeting. I would like to have an opportunity if we can. One of the things I would like to have us look at is a review panel after there is a youth death within the county. Many county within the state do this and it involves, not only the County Behavioral Health Services (BHS), but perhaps the vendor--Kaiser, Sutter or John Muir (whoever may have been providing services), as well as school counselors and law enforcement to see if the youth had interactions with any of those entities. There is a template coming out of Fresno that is updated based on the San Diego model and I'd like to perhaps have a little time to share that with the full commission.</li> <li>• (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) That sounds great, Cmsr. Wiseman, thank you for sharing. How much time would you need to do that?  <i>&lt;This will be added to the June MHC Agenda&gt;</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>IV. COMMITTEE CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMENTS: None</b></p>	

<p><b>V. APPROVE minutes from April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022, meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cmsr. A. Russaw motioned to approve the minutes as written.</li> <li>• Seconded by L. May</li> </ul> <p><b>Vote:</b> 5-0-0  <b>Ayes:</b> B. Serwin (Chair), L. Griffin (Vice-Chair), D. Dunn, L. May, A. Russaw  <b>Abstain:</b> none</p>	<p><a href="http://cchealth.org/mentalhealth/mhc/agendas-minutes.php">http://cchealth.org/mentalhealth/mhc/agendas-minutes.php</a></p>
<p><b>VI. UPDATE on Site Visit Program</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Hope House Report</li> <li>➤ Crestwood Our House Report</li> <li>➤ Crestwood Bridge Report</li> <li>➤ Recruiting Commissioners</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Recruitment (Cmsr. Serwin)</u></b></p> <p>Cmsr. Griffin and Angela Beck have been the people involved with recruiting commissioners for the various site visits and it is difficult. We have the same commissions raising their hands to volunteer, but we need to reach out those who have not volunteered. The next commission meeting, I will be announcing that this is a mandatory commitment and also send an email directly to those that have not yet volunteered to let them know they have this mandatory commitment. Hopefully, it will loosen things up and we will more readily be able to fill the roles for the upcoming site visits we have this summer.</p> <p><b><u>Site Visit Updates (Cmsr. Griffin)</u></b></p> <p>We have had three site visits already: Hume Center, which was the Pilot Study; Crestwood Our House; and the last visit was Hope House and it went very well. We interviewed four (4) clients, two (2) staff and the Director. It went extremely well. Cmsr. Stern and Cmsr. Metro were interviewing and are finishing the report as we speak. We look forward to reading that. As for Crestwood Our House – Cmsr. May and her team completed their site visit and their report is complete and with Cmsr. Serwin <i>(16:54 stated she had not sent it)</i>.</p> <p>The next site on deck was Crestwood Bridge, but I believe we will put that off for a couple of months. Cmsr. Serwin can speak to this a bit more.</p> <p>We will have a site visit team meeting at on Friday and will discuss our future goals. Where are going through the rest of the year. We are talking about (and hopefully) we will get to 4C and 4D in August, which is really exciting for all of us. We will start with the children’s facilities sometime in September or October. That is a little slow, but we are making good process. The good thing, I believe we will be able to conduct on-site visits now. This will really benefit the program and what we are doing.</p> <p><b><u>Crestwood Bridge (Cmsr. Serwin)</u></b></p> <p>Crestwood Bridge has some internal issues that it is working out with BHS. They have long been considering converting their facilities to a Mental Health Rehabilitation Center (MHRC). This is not public and the message trickled down to the Program manager that it was happening imminently at Crestwood Our House and he informed staff and clients that they would be closing in it’s current iteration, to open it as an MHRC and approximately forty clients would need to leave. It was quite an uproar. BHS intervened and, for a while, there has been a discussion between BHS and Crestwood</p>	

regarding this possibility. BHS has supported the opening of an MHC and knows that it is needed and wanted, but it is needed in East County where there are so much fewer services. In addition, BHS is more focused on improvement of services at Crestwood and is where they'd like to see effort. Those conversations seem to have reignited that dialogue between those organizations and it is continuing. We know the Program Director stepped down and, perhaps it was his manager or someone senior has stepped in to fill the Program Director's role while they are able to hire. I just feel we should let the dust settle and whoever will be the new Program Director, let them get their feet on the ground and then reintroduce the site visit program and schedule the visit.

Hume Center, when the site visit team met last, we spoke about the 'test run' with Hume and went through the whole process, including authoring the report up the point of actually distributing the report and all the attachments (like the interview notes); we owe it to ourselves. We did a great job to publish that report. That's on me because I authored the report, it was reviewed by the Program Director at Hume, and finalized, so now it's ready to go to the next level of distribution.

In summary, we are conducting and these site visits, getting good at the interviewing and plowing through the reporting phase. Coordinating (multiple people) and authoring the report is never an easy job, ever. So, it is important we just push through this phase every time we do one of these projects. Right now, we have four reports sitting out there in various stages. We just have to discipline ourselves to make that final push ('We' meaning Me).

**Questions and Comments:**

- (Cmsr. Dunn) Point of clarification, when you spoke about Crestwood Our House, which is in Vallejo. I think you were meaning Crestwood Bridge (Cmsr. Serwin) Crestwood Bridge, I am so sorry. You are correct.
- (Cmsr. Griffin) Just a point of correction (for the minutes), we have THREE outstanding reports at present, not four. (Cmsr. Serwin) Right, we have Hope House, Crestwood (Our House) and Hume.
- (Cmsr. May) Just to reiterate, we need every commissioner to step up and volunteer.

**VII. UPDATE on Commissioner membership, new commissioners and open seats, Angela Beck, MHC Executive Assistant**

There are still two open seats for District III, Supervisor Burgis' District. They are the Consumer seat and the Member-at-Large seat. We have a new commissioner, Tavane Payne and is from District IV (Supervisor Mitchoff), and is the Consumer seat. I have updated all the lists and all items to be published on the MHC website have been sent to IT to do so.

Monday, I received an email from the Clerk of the Board's (COB) office that all the lists on the website need to be converted to reflect confidentiality.

They now will read:

- Seat 1 – Member-At-Large
- Seat 2 – Consumer
- Seat 3 – Family member

This is for confidentiality, we can know within our commission but needed to be reflected on the list on our website. (Cmsr. Serwin) Just to clarify, the District IV is Supervisor Mitchoff's District. There will be a vacancy to the Family Member seat in a June 30<sup>th</sup>, Cmsr. Maibaum is not renewing her appointment.

**Questions and Comments:**

- (Dawn Morrow) Just wanted to mention, we will be interviewing an applicant in the next couple of weeks. I thought we were going to change the name of the Consumer seat to something else, is that not happening? (Angela Beck) It will be 'Seat Two' and then Member at Large is 'Seat One'
- (Cmsr. May) Member-at-Large, why don't they just take off the other names? (Family member or a consumer) Why don't they just take the names off? Why do they need a title? Just District seat 1, 2, and 3. It's just discriminatory.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) That is what is happening.
- (Cmsr. Wiseman) Before moving on, the website has already been updated to Seats 1, 2, and 3.

**VIII. DISCUSS Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) 5604 regulations re: Conflict of Interest, Cmsr. Barbara Serwin**

In our last commission meeting, questions were raised regarding what constitutes conflict of interest as stated in the proposed Conduct Guidelines. Research to find the language on conflict of interest, as it came from a few sources. The main one being the WIC 5604 regulations (and Form 700), which will now be the only one that is referenced *{see Agenda packet Attachment A; screenshared during this discussion}*.

Defining Conflict of Interest as related to employment, which states:

*(e)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member of the board or the member's spouse shall not be a full-time or part-time county employee of a county mental health service, an employee of the State Department of Health Care Services, or an employee of, or a paid member of the governing body of, a mental health contract agency.*

*(2) A consumer of mental health services who has obtained employment with an employer described in paragraph (1) and who holds a position in which the consumer does not have any interest, influence, or authority over any financial or contractual matter concerning the employer may be appointed to the board. The member shall abstain from voting on any financial or contractual issue concerning the member's employer that may come before the board.*

*(f) Members of the board shall abstain from voting on any issue in which the member has a financial interest as defined in Section 87103 of the Government Code.*

**Questions and Comments:**

- (Cmsr. Russaw) This was for the purpose of the document you and Cmsr. Griffin were working on. Do you just want to put this same language in that document?
- (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) Correct. There were questions raised at the last commission meeting about this language and we want to completely sure the language references was accurate.

- (Cmsr. Russaw) I know you and Cmsr. Griffin have put a lot of work into this document, I just want to make sure, how are we rolling this out? The reason I am mentioning this, no one has time for busy work and I am wondering what sets this apart from the Bylaws and all the other documents that Angela (EA) sends. I just don't want it to get lost in the shuffle or not be adhered to the way it should be.

- (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) *{screenshot Conduct guidelines; attachment B}* Here at the top of the guidelines, you can see the purpose. Like most of the commissions and 'mini-Boards' have conduct guidelines to encourage (in our case) "...to encourage professional behavior that leads to open and respectful dialog in meetings, electronic communications and other media, and that supports effective business operations, consensus decision-making and positive action" So our bylaws define the way we are actually formed and organized, how we do our voting for officers and how we are to dissolve and recruit.

Conduct Guidelines are to direct us on how we carry ourselves in public and in dialogue with each other and the public. In terms of rolling, it out, we have recommended that every agenda includes conduct guidelines for meetings. What Cmsr. Griffin and I found when working on these guidelines is that this first section pertains to all meetings; whether in person or virtual. Things like come prepared, turn off and mute cell phones, etc. The second group are related to zoom mtgs with a third group (all meetings in person in virtual and an extra subset for zoom meetings), these will be printed on our agenda. So that everyone is clear on what we can expect, how we expect to be treated and how others can expect to be treated by any individual. That is the most common application will be our meeting, since most of our work is conducted through meetings.

Another area in which we conduct our work is emails and, in a more limited sense, text messages. It is so common and proliferate, that we found it was important to actually have guidelines for those communications as well. Some of our commissions in the past (and now) are active on social media, which is great. So, Section V is very important and has been handed down by mouth but it is really important to know when it is possible to present the commission officially and when you cannot do so. When you have to state an opinion as an independent person. Then our Conflict of Interest is very important, in terms of defining who has a conflict with the business of the commission and to not be permitted.

You can see these are quite different documents, having gone through all these sources are organizations that have 'conduct rules or guidelines' and we prefer 'guidelines'.

- (Cmsr. May) The document received in the handout does not have Section VI, Conflict of Interest. The first thing I would like to say is that no one has control over social media. We put whatever we want to on social media. It is not the Mental Health Commissions business what we put on our social media (all inclusive), as long as we are all adults and you are not calling anyone out by name and slandering them. In terms of social media, I would not agree to that. It is infringement of people's rights, free speech. (Interrupted by Cmsr. Serwin) It doesn't pertain to...it pertains only to social media posts about the Mental

Health Commission. You can say whatever you want to say about anything, but it comes to the Commission, there are some limitations/expectations.

- (Cmsr. May) but you still cannot run that, it is still freedom of speech, so I disagree with that on social media, people have a right to say what they want to say. It is a violation of personal rights. (Interrupted by Cmsr. Serwin) I this feeling where it says what controls what you can say, it's more about how you can say it, with respect; just the normal things you would guide yourself along, not sharing confidential information, for example not sharing confidential information about the commission.
- (Cmsr. May) There is no confidential we share as everything we speak about is posted online, along with the minutes. (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) Not everything we talk about, there are meetings that do not have minutes, emails that have discussions of people, which could be public if someone made a request for them (Cmsr. May) Then that needs to be changed, where it states about sharing personal information or sharing information discussed in the commission prior to posting
- (Cmsr. May) Second, this conflict of interest. I have a huge problem with this, as everyone knows. We do have someone that does work for the county, when they were appointed they worked for the state and the person who appointed them knew where they worked; she reviewed her application, and she knew where they were working. What are we saying there? This person can no longer be a commissioner? If that is what we are saying then I am going to definitely pull up the 'race card'. I have been the only black commissioner forever after Cmsr. Chapman passed. We finally have another Black person, as well as a brown person. It looks like we might start this. It seems to me to be racial division. "let's keep this person off' it sounds like we are getting ready to ease up to this. If that is the case, I will definitely be contacting every authority about filing some type of discrimination suit. I need clarification. Is this working up to kicking a current commissioner off the commission?
- (Cmsr. Serwin) The regulations are what they are. These regulations were written at the state level many years ago as part of an act. It is our responsibility to implement them.
- (Cmsr. May) So, as I stated, the supervisor who appointed this person knew where they were working at the time of the appointment, which fall under this; and knew this person was accepting a job and would be disqualified. Like I said, it is systemic racism. It is just getting rid of a black person. This commissioner had been very active in this commission; attended meetings; and just active, active, active. To me, it is just saying this is another racist act and looks like an act of racism. This is very fluent in this county of eliminating someone black.
- (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) Cmsr. May, you are absolutely entitled to your point of view. This is actually something for now to be handed back to Supervisor Mitchoff (District IV), it is in her hands.
- (Cmsr. May) Who brought this up, in the first place. Where did this start from? It is just surprising that all of a sudden this has been brought up, where did it start from? (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) We have been working on the conduct guidelines for quite a while now.

When you go through and look at the guidelines of other organizations, one of the standard topics that is covered is conflict of interest, and transparency for public boards, one of the key elements is whether or not there is a conflict of interest. There was no seeking out this WIC code, it is in our training, the county advisory handbook. It is in the regulations.

- (Cmsr. May) But I am just stating it is very funny that all of a sudden this came up. This hasn't been discussed (I've been on the Commission since 2017) it has not been brought up. (Interrupt Cmsr. Serwin) Actually this has been brought up with, Cmsr. Wiseman, do you want to speak to this yourself?
- (Cmsr. Wiseman) Yes, Michael Coyle was appointed by Supv. Mitchoff and there was a clear and glaring conflict of interest and, so as Chair, I went back to the Supervisors office to let them know and also discussed it with Mr. Coyle himself. When he read the state laws, he recused himself. He is not an African-American woman, it was not targeted based on those criteria. It was targeted on him as there was a clear conflict of interest to which he admitted to. If there is another commissioner that is in a position where there is a conflict of interest, they should recuse themselves and not make it the responsibility of the commission.
- (Cmsr. May) Michael Coyle was appointed after this commissioner of which I am speaking. I am saying there was no problem with this commissioner being on this commissioner, and all of a sudden, here we go with this. They have been on this commission since 2019 and now it is all of a sudden a problem? There was some discussion about, which I brought to the attention and it was a big blow up with the county because I sent an email out about this. There was an obvious discussion and I feel it is discriminatory. This is just another example of singling out a black person to attack.  
(RESPONSE: Cmsr. Serwin) If I could just respond in terms of your question of when the commission became aware of it, I think Supv. Mitchoff may not be aware of these regulations because this isn't the first time these appointments have been made under here, but I'm just guessing, I don't see why she would appoint someone if she knew there was a conflict of interest.
- (Cmsr. May) Supv. Mitchoff has been appointing people for a long time, and knows exactly what she is doing. To say she is not aware...  
(Interrupt: Cmsr. Serwin) I just said I don't know if she knows or doesn't know, the first time it came to my attention was when you raised it at a commission meeting and the Supv., when they send information about someone being appointed, we receive very little information and oftentimes the new commissioner just comes to the meeting and there is a new face at a meeting and we are like 'oh a new commissioner has been appointed'; it is not like we are getting a rundown on their background. So, until you brought it up, I wasn't even aware of it.
- (Cmsr. May) That piggybacks on what I have been fighting for, as well as several other commissioners; we used to have responsibility of reviewing every applicant's application. It could have been caught at that time if we had reviewed them, but those duties were stripped from us (really unlawfully, by someone on an ego-trip) but if we had been reviewing, we would have caught this. That is another reason

why we should have the responsibility of reviewing every application of all those wanting to be on this commission instead of the Supervisor saying 'no, it is our responsibility, you have no say and we are going to do what we want to do.' Now it has blown up to this and it will be blown up further.

- (Cmsr. Russaw) I don't have anything else to say and fall back on this comment. And Cmsr. Wiseman, they are speaking about me, obviously. I was working for the state when appointed and I am no longer. I am in the process of in between jobs and now this has come to the attention, I am upfront with you all with what is going on. I am still questioning what is happening. I guess at this time, I need to step down.
- (Cmsr. Wiseman) If I may, Cmsr. Russaw. There are provisions in there to recuse yourself from funding and which may affect you. So, it is not a requirement you step down. (Cmsr. Serwin) It depends on what the relationship is, if you are consumer you can hold the role and recuse yourself from financially related business. If you are member at large or family member, you simply cannot be appointed.
- (Cmsr. Wiseman) Cmsr. May, the comment that Supv. Mitchoff knows what she is doing, actually Michael Coyle was appointed by Supv. Mitchoff and that actually was the person and she did approve someone that had a clear conflict of interest, and if you may remember, when we raised that, you and I talked extensively about it. The responsibilities of the Commission to put together an ad hoc committee to review applicants. The result was that bylaw was changed on us by the Board of Supervisors (BoS) and was not an action that was recommended, we actually fought against that on the MHC, we believed it important that we have the ability to share with new commissioners the roles and responsibilities, but that was taken away from us. That was the result of going back to the supervisor you have put forth an unfit candidate and were penalized for that. As I understand your frustration as former chair when that was going on. As for Cmsr. Russaw, if this is something that has come up and needs to be addressed, this is the forum to address it.
- (Cmsr. May) I don't feel like it is going to be addressed as is this is embarrassing to her, embarrassing to me as a black woman and especially since she has been serving this long. I see the head nods (here she goes again) I don't care and I am going to speak my voice: THIS IS WRONG. This is VERY wrong. The timing, for whatever reasoning, but I do know that any acts of racial discrimination, and any acts like this where there is public embarrassment, it is uncalled for, there are laws against this. For her to have served this long and then all of a sudden it's an issue? And all of a sudden these conflicts of interest are being brought up? It is a violation of our civil rights and the federal law takes jurisdiction of state, so let's just see how far we can take this.
- (Cmsr. Russaw) And actually, Cmsr. Serwin, the reason this came up was because there was someone that felt it was okay to promote some personal business on the Commission meeting and that is why this conflict of interest came, not because of my situation. I do want to get that correct. I just made a comment, "hey, then I can promote the book my son and I wrote over the pandemic, if it is just a free for all like



that.” And I know that it’s not. I felt it was not appropriate for that commissioner to project what they were doing on the side and that’s why the conflict of interest came up.

- (Cmsr. Serwin) Well there are multiple kinds of conflicts of interest and the one we are talking about with respect to yourself, Cmsr. May raised in a commission meeting. I just want to say, it is not fair to the commission or to me to be the ‘police officer’ here. This is not my ... this all resides at the BoS level, specifically Supv. Mitchoff to make appointments according to the WIC regulations that are legitimate. It is not for me to have to say that you need to resign, that’s not my role.
- (Cmsr. Russaw) Okay, then I need to take this up with who I need to take this up with so I can move on to the next step because I don’t want my name tarnished forward, as I do want to do work like this and I do want to volunteer on commissions and now I feel everything is tarnished because I wanted to accept a job where I am unhappy now.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) Supv. Mitchoff is where this responsibility resides.
- (Cmsr. May) We are not asking that Cmsr. Serwin. We know it is Supv. Mitchoff’s responsibility. Where did all this come from, recently? That now it is all of a sudden an issue?
- (Cmsr. Serwin) Cmsr. May, you are the one that brought it up. You brought it up in a meeting.
- (Cmsr. May) It was brought up in that other meeting again. I found out, I received a message and I brought it up in an email. I didn’t bring it up in a meeting, it was email. We both know what this is about
- (Cmsr. Serwin) Actually, I will not accept an accusation about me going behind back doors or knowing what is going on ... *(Cmsr. May/Serwin speaking over each other, unable to hear conversation clearly)*.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) The reason, I can say, Cmsr. Griffin and myself developed conduct guidelines which we started quite a long time ago and a standard part of conduct guidelines are conflicts of interest. We presented it to the commission. You raised Cmsr. Russaw’s name and then, there is where the conversation flowed from.
- (Cmsr. May) Like I said, there was no problem then all of a sudden there is? You only took over in January. So, we have been busy working on everything else, I don’t even know when there was time to work on rules about conduct and we mentioned it one time and heard nothing since. Like I said, I am not going through the song and dance, I can see what happening and it has been going on, there proof, minutes, there is proof in terms of the racial division, the racist remarks, the things done on this commission for the last four years of documentation.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) As I’ve said, it’s not the Commission’s job, it is the BoS and County Counsel. I’ll let it go. I just wanted to share with everyone from the conduct guideline standpoint, this is where the language comes from and what we need to go with. Any concerns or issues about any one commissioner is not the role of the commission to decide, it is for the BoS. It is also for the County Counsel to implement should there be any issues with the BoS. So, I apologize to Cmsr. Russaw, in terms of the overall situation and for entering a situation where this might come up. You didn’t have information that you needed before when you applied for the role and these regulations

should have been known to Supv. Mitchoff and you shouldn't have been placed in this position in the first place.

- (Cmsr. Russaw) I should have because I worked for the State of California then. I was rightfully owed a place on this commission like I was given by Supv. Mitchoff, things have changed since I have been on the commission.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) These regulations are written by the state and have been in place for years.
- (Cmsr. Russaw) Correct, it said you can't work for the Department of Health and Human Services. I didn't work for that Department of the State of California when I applied to be on this commission. I rightfully was owed a place just like I applied and interviewed with everyone else. Let's not tarnish my name or embarrass me in this meeting by anyone.
- (Jen Quallick) I'm going to speak on behalf of Supervisors Anderson and Burgis. Right now, I think everyone is a little bit heated and I will say, when these guidelines were first brought forward, Cmsr. May, just because I know it was brought to everyone's attention that there were a lot of sidebar conversations going around, there were chat discussions, and I think it was a means in which to really keep dialogue and keep meetings focused. Absolutely zero disrespect to Cmsr. Russaw. I am going to offer a heartfelt apology to Cmsr. Russaw at this particular point in time, not knowing the backstory on this all. I see a lot of hands raised here but I do want to offer that and perhaps there is another discussion that needs to be had offline. I would like to offer where are team was first brought into the discussion of guidelines and that.
- (Cmsr. Russaw) That's fine. As much as you all want to silence Cmsr. May, this is exactly what she is talking about, what is going on right now. I am definitely accepting of what occurred and what happens after this, but again I am not going to continue to be embarrassed and ashamed by anyone on this call today.
- (Jen Quallick) I absolutely understand and I agree with you Cmsr. Russaw. I do not believe that to be the intent of any member sitting on this board at this particular point in time. Cmsr. May, I do hear the sincerity and passion and what it is that you are bring forward and do want that noted as well. It is a bigger and grander discussion and anything that is going to be tackled in this hour at 4:42, I'm going to hand it back over, again there are a lot of hands raised but there is a lot of emotion going on here. I will talk to my supervisor, and Dawn is going to speak to Supv. Burgis. In the interest of everyone on this call and has taken the time, no silencing is interested here. So Cmsr. Serwin, I'm going to hand it back here and continue to move forward.
- (Cmsr. Griffin) Like everyone else, I feel for Cmsr. Russaw. Just to clarify, when we were writing these guidelines, the reason we went into the conflict of interest, basically when we looked at Form 700 and read through all those stipulations, it led us to the California WIC regulations'. And that is how it all came up and why we wanted to put it in the guidelines. At that point, we had no idea of any commissioner that would fall under this (at least from my point of view). That was our reasoning at that time.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Cmsr. Serwin) Absolutely. We saw it and went out and researched the different conduct and rules and guidelines for all these different organizations that are referenced in the conduct guideline document, they all included conflict of interest statements. We were modeling ours on all these others.</li> <li>• (Cmsr. Russaw) That is understandable. You shouldn't be taken out of the running, just because you work for the county doesn't mean you should be ineligible for the commission. So, I have qualms with that form as well. Maybe it will come up at a later time.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>IX. UPDATE on MHC Orientation Curriculum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Options for distribution of MHC Orientation Modules</li> <li>➤ Module topics and number of modules</li> </ul> <p>I would just like to look at ways we can distribute the Orientation Modules. We have always assumed we would have print copies and there are logistics around that and makes it a little challenging. We also had assumed we would have six modules and have a table of contents. What has happened is that we have provided more detail in certain areas.</p> <p>Our introduction to BHS was initially one module and it will now be going to be three modules. The first module is an overview, which Dr. Tavano provided. The next will be Adult and Older Adult Services, along with Children and Adolescent Services. The third will be all the other major services: MHSA (Mental Health Services Act), A<sup>3</sup> (Anyone, Anytime, Anywhere), and Housing Services. So, with Site Visits and Introduction to Commission, that's five modules. We need to decide, do we want to just keep building out modules and have them available upon request in print form and then post all on the website to be available to anyone anytime? Or do we just stop at six and repeat them every six months.</p> <p>Let's think about it and discuss this next time.</p>	
<p><b>X. DISCUSS the April 18th Behavioral Health Care Infrastructure Projects (BHCIP) Stakeholder Meeting</b></p> <p>This was put on the agenda to get feedback from commissioners who attended that meeting. As I recall, Cmsr. Dunn, Cmsr. Griffin, myself and Cmsr. May were there. This is an opportunity to just provide feedback. Anything you would like to send back to the stakeholder executive board, for Cmsr. Griffin, as she is on that.</p> <p><b>Questions and Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Cmsr. Dunn) We want to be sure to maximize every building refurbishment or new building opportunity that comes down the pike with these BHCIP Grants. Between Rounds 4 to 6, there is about a \$1.5bil statewide. We want to ensure we get our fair share. We need a Needs Assessment from the county like we had back in 2016 so we know where the gaps are today. Right now, we know a bit, but we don't completely know and we, the commission, need to completely know so that we can advocate for the right kind of buildings with these upcoming rounds. Round 4 are children and adolescent. Round 5 and 6 have not been determined as yet, but know they will be determined by August and December.</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Cmsr. Serwin) I know I did ask the facilitator in the stakeholder meeting, Roberta Chambers, about the scope of the needs assessment. I realize there has been inventories of our facilities and clients and where they are as a way of getting a handle on what we have in our system. I am sure there are experts looking at future needs. My question to here whether we are considering demand as the county grows, we have information that, through COVID, the number of people needing mental health services has increased. How are we looking at demand, so as we build this increased infrastructure that we have enough capacity. As I recall, there was a wide ranging conversation that went on about the different kinds of services we need. Cmsr. Griffin, for example, mentioned a residential children’s <b>maximum (or long-term?)</b> care facility.</li> <li>• (Cmsr. Griffin) I want to reaffirm what Cmsr. Dunn mentioned that is now time to start thinking about Rounds 4, 5, and 6. They are not quite sure but have a pretty good idea the communities will be able to apply for facilities where they have gaps in continuums. So, like Cmsr. Dunn said, now is the time to start thinking about that and preparing what we need here in Contra Costa County (CCC). As far as the quantitative data, I took down in my notes, like what I heard, that they are building a service map and looking to identify where services are needed in our county. Who are being served and how they are being served. That they are going to provide a report about what came out of the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>; all the opinions of the stakeholders that were there. What services they felt were needed. That will be coming out as well. It was a really good meeting and opportunity for people to chime in on what is needed. That really encompasses the meeting. So, I am looking forward to hearing more about what came out of the meeting and the data they will be collecting.</li> <li>• (Cmsr. Serwin) Going back to the needs assessment I really want to stress is that the Quality of Care is that one of the motions last year was a needs assessment. I asked Ms. Chambers about the scope of the one she is conducting on behalf of BHS. Her response was that it was a really big questions. I don’t think she meant a big question in terms of what people wanted to do, it’s more a question of the scope. I think this is the opportunity for the concerns of the Quality of Care committee to be factored into that needs assessment. We are doing a needs assessment squarely on the topic of having adequate services and adequate placements. I’d like for us to meet with Roberta Chambers, Dr. Tavano and sit down and really focus in on scope. What the scope is and now is the time to do so before the analysis gets too far down the line to actually be able to <b>                    </b> .</li> </ul>	
<p><b>XI. DETERMINE May 2022 Mental Health Commission Meeting Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MHC Orientation Module III: Introduction to Behavioral Health Services Part II – Adult and Older Adult Programs and Services and Children and Adolescent Programs and Services</b></li> <li>• <b>Mandatory site visits</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>VOTE on MHC Code of Conduct</b></li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>UPDATE on April 18th Behavioral Health Care Infrastructure Projects (BHCIP) stakeholder meeting</b></li> <li>• <b>Public Hearing of MHSa Three Year Plan 2021-2023 Update</b></li> </ul> <p>Our meeting will be a very short meeting, an hour or less of time. We will adjourn and there will be a second meeting, which will be a public hearing of the MHSa Three-year plan update 2021-2023. So, the items we cover before then in the Commission meeting, need to fit within one hour or less. The more time we leave for the public hearing the better.</p> <p>Agenda items agreed/approved.</p>	
<p><b>XII. Adjourned meeting at 4:59 pm</b></p>	