

CPAW MEETING
Date of Meeting: Thursday January 17th, 2013
3:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Location: 2425 Bisso Lane, Suite 100, Concord, CA 94520



Members attending: Brenda Crawford, Tom Gilbert, John Gragnani, Lori Hefner, John Hollender, Dave Kahler , Kimberly Krisch, Susanna Marshland, Kathi McLaughlin, Susan Medlin, Mariana Moore, Ryan Nestman, Teresa Pasquini, Anis Pereyra, Sam Yoshioka

Staff attending: Cynthia Belon, Jeromy Collado, Helen Kearns, Gerold Loenicker, Leslie Ochang, Heather Sweeten-Healy, Tommy Tighe, Jennifer Tuipulotu, Jami Delgado, Stacey Tupper, Steve Grolnic-McClurg, Jana Drazich, Ziba Rahimzadeh, Sandy Marsh

Public Participants: Beth Williams (Shelter Inc.) , Maria Ramirez (MHCC), Bill Schlant (Local 1), Cally Martin (First 5), Lorena Huerta (Familias Unidas)

Excused from Meeting: Lisa Bruce, Molly Hamaker, Anna Lubarov

TOPIC	ISSUE/CONCLUSION	ACTION/RECOMMENDATION	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
<p>➤ Opening, Agenda Review, Announcements: Staff Transitions BHI Update MHSAs Coordinator Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions made • Steve Grolnic-McClurg was introduced and welcomed as the new CC Mental Health Director • Mary Roy has moved on from her position as MHSAs Program manager to First Hope • Cynthia Belon shared steering committee met. Consumer and family members shared their stories to help build understanding of what they experience when attempting to get services through our system of care. This will be used to guide the next steps of engaging community in a discussion to move forward with integration efforts. Decisions around context for next steps haven't been decided. We will continue to build on the momentum of engaging consumers and family members 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven Grolnic-McClurg visited the First Hope program, supervised by Mary Roy. An amazing team was built. Doors are open and they have started seeing clients. • Steven Grolnic-McClurg provide an update on the vacant MHSA Program Coordinator position <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Permanent position was posted and the selection process will take a few months. ○ Stacey Tupper added the posting posted on 12/31/2012 for a three week period and closes on Friday. The posting was statewide and went out on Craigslist, CIMH and CMHDA ○ Attempting to get a temporary MHSA coordinator in the meantime. • Stacey Tupper explained the process for hiring internally. County HR has strict standards. HR provides a list to establish employment. That list is given to the hiring manager to select for interviews. Consumers and family members can be involved depending on the hiring manager. The interview panel consists of people with extreme knowledge of the job. The interview is recorded, taped with specific questions and a specific scoring system • Age related committees will be starting up in February <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aging and Older Adult committee has been ongoing ○ TAY coordinator is Michaela Mougenskoff. Meetings will be on 2nd Thursday of the month starting February 14 from 9-11:30AM, location TBD ○ Adult Coordinator is Betsy Orme. Meetings 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>will be on the second Wednesday of the month starting February 13, 2013 9-11:30AM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Helen Kearns announced Children’s is in the process of developing a committee and passed around sheet for those interested. Hope is to is have a comprehensive group with the Children’s Task Force, stakeholders and consumers. ● Teresa Pasquini and Kathi McLaughlin shared that is feels disrespectful to be told when the committees are going to meet without checking the availability of other non-county people who would like to participate. Since the age related committees are CPAW committees, the county should be mindful of other people’s time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cynthia supports that the committee should establish who will be in the committee and when they will meet themselves. ● Parking lot item: Brenda Crawford requested time be made to speak about some of the work Aging and Older Adult committee is working on ● Kathi and Brenda helped design an innovation idea that was approved and asked what is the timeline around the RFP coming out <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve G-M responded that it will be expedited and will be posted as soon as possible. ● Steve GM announced the process of drafting the RFP will begin for the Crisis Residential Program. A request was made to get feedback on what is most important at the next Capital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide name and email on Children’s committee sign up sheet if interested ➤ Steven Grolnic-McClurg will work with committee coordinators to designate meeting times that work for the majority of interested members ➤ Lori requested to see the draft of the Aging and Older Adult RFP before it is released 	
--	---	---	--

	<p>Facilities and IT Meeting of the Mental Health Commission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teresa shared that there will be a MH Commission Capital Facilities meeting, however the agenda has not been created. She will open the meeting for more input. She added there was 3 years of stakeholder process. CPAW stakeholders and MH Commission joined together in a community forum and the community input was made clear. There are recommendations in place . 		
➤ Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Brenda Crawford shared that on February 14, 2013, MHCC partnered with Crip-Hop nation, a national organization to provide opportunity for those with disabilities to engage in a variety of performing arts from rap to playing guitar, etc. It is a national movement with artists with disabilities. MHCC flyers will be distributed. It is an open invitation and open mic for CCC artists with disabilities to celebrate their artistry. ● Sandy Marsh shared January is national slavery and trafficking prevention month. January 22, 2013 at 9:15 the board will have a proclamation about ending trafficking. Media unveiling of a display at the Hilltop Mall, family justice center at 11:30AM to talk about anti-trafficking. 		
➤ MHSA Finances, Part 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cynthia Belon reported than in effort to address the concerns made regarding MHSA and the financial situation BH has decided to go forward with 2 audits of MHSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Audit 1 to be conducted by the independent auditor for the county. The audit will be a “money in-money out” audit going back to 		

	<p>2005 and forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mike Guice will be consulting on the second audit. He has expertise in the field of finances in relationship to MHSA regulations and how the money is spent. The second audit will take more time. In preparation for the second audit BHS admin is asking for 3-5 selected CPAW members to work with BHS Admin to identify deliverables for the second audit that will hopefully address all the concerns. ● Teresa responded that the MH Commission has made a motion to request an independent audit. She feels it is up to the Commission to determine what the audit will be. There is a Commission process and it feels like this is overstepping the Commission’s process ● Steve added that ad hoc committee being formed will identify a set of deliverables that will answer the questions the community has brought. If anything has been done incorrectly, we want to clear it up and move forward with best practices. The purpose of the “money in-money out” audit is to respond to the question raised by the community ● Kathi shared that until the questions posed to Jana are answered, it is difficult to decide who will be in the ad hoc audit committee and what kind of audit it should be. In her opinion, the Administration’s attempt to respond to CPAW is commendable but offensive. The plan for implementing an audit is being announced to 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>CPAW rather than having been developed collaboratively with them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cynthia responded that the decision to have the audit was an attempt to show responsiveness based on the discussion from the last CPAW meeting. The audit has not been predefined. Until the discussion with CPAW takes place in the ad hoc committee, we have no idea what will be looked at • Brenda commented that CPAW is a group that is big on shared decision making. It would have been better to come to the meeting and have a discussion about what kind of audit we need, what the process should be, and whether or not to go in front of the Commission first. • John Gragnani added that in his opinion, to reduce the shock and surprise factor, the idea of an audit could have been communicated in an email or through the planning committee. Secondly, in addition to the audit, he reminded CPAW that it is several months into the '12-'13 fiscal year and the plan CPAW agreed upon and approved has not moved forward. The main goal, to remain true to stakeholder driven processes and democracy, is to have the plan fully funded and for it to go forward. <p>Refer to handout CPAW Finance Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jana shared that after hearing the feedback from CPAW, before the final reports were submitted to the State, Jana was able to make the change to move the \$3 million from the prudent reserve to 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>the capital facilities and technology fund, as was discussed in the plan. The reason the money was not moved is that it was not felt that the money was going to be needed and that there was enough money within the capital facilities fund to build the buildings. If the money is not used, it goes into unspent funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jana explained that \$10 million was pulled out for the operation of the Crisis Res and ARC. The money is going to be put back into CSS as unspent funds, as was in the plan. • Teresa asked, “How can a fiscal officer walk in and just say, ‘Okay you don’t want it that way, we will just put it back? 2 months ago this was explained at the MH Commission Capital Facilities meeting and then it came to CPAW and changed. Now it changes back. It would be great as a stakeholder body to have the people who make the decisions in the room. If Pat Godley is going to be the decision maker, he needs to come and tell us what he has decided. Hearing whose fault it is unacceptable.” • Kathi expressed her opinion that there is a trust issue. The written response stating that the money is going to go back and be fixed does not show this will not happen again. I hear what you say but no longer trust it. • Jana explained that the money isn’t going to be spent down until the charges are known. In the plan, the ARC, Crisis Res and any other 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>operating costs were not in the plan. We needed to show a way to make it operational and we have enough money that we can have a fully funded operation. The money was categorized as a reserve. The dollars were held aside until we knew where we were. It was never meant to take 10 million and spend it on operations. It was to get where we were going, get the money then, and to put the money back into the system to spend when needed. All the RFPs have not been written. We don't know what the services will cost. The project started 3-4 years ago and stopped and started. We had to do something to hold on to the dollars, so we knew we had them when we went operational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve shared that we are not going to rebuild trust in a meeting. There was a lot of feedback last meeting. That \$10 million reserve never went through a CPAW process. We are going to go back to the plan, go through the process we have always gone through when we obligate dollars. We are going to try and present as much information as we can. It is not all good news. This is done in a spirit of trying to clear the air. • Kathi expressed, I heard the words finance says it is a go. We were told that didn't have to be considered as coming out of MHSA money. The services wouldn't just be for MHSA clients or CSS clients. We had money in the capital facilities funding stream. We chose to put some of it into IT and chose to put it more significantly into IT and we put it into the various phases of the ARC. It wasn't the PHF that was put away 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>long before this conversation solidified into these 2 piece</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teresa recommend for a few CPAW members to get together and review the Capital Facilities plan approved by the State, which is the only plan the County can act on. At the last planning meeting Teresa requested that either Dr. Walker or Pat Godley come to the Commission. CPAW members are welcome to join as well. • Teresa said she is going to strongly push the advisory body to the Board of Supervisors (the Mental Health Commission) to make a recommendation to have control of whatever recommendations go forward regarding the audit. The stakeholder body can be invited. We can collaborate and come up with a plan but CPAW isn't going to be the sole determiner of the process of the audit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cynthia suggested to perhaps go beyond creating a CPAW committee and extend to members of the Commission or Local 1 and 21. • Steve explained there are no issues with funding everything this year but there may be issues with sustaining everything approved in the plan. To make this clear everyone will look at a clear 3 year projection of where expenditures would be and what would be left based on agreed upon assumptions of funding and how to deal with unfilled positions. So we can project out and sustain everything. There is lots of new money that we need to get out the door because folks should be getting services. We will begin 	<p>➤ Look at priority 2 and 3 at next meeting along with the 3 year projected budget and make decisions based on that.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>moving as rapidly as possible, first with housing. People need beds. That was the most clear priority set. We will prioritize getting priority 1 programs in the plan out the door as rapidly as possible. That will take everybody's effort. It has been the case in the past year that we have approved things and not done them. I am not suggesting it would be done this time. One of the new issues we need to discuss ongoing operational costs that are quite significant for Crisis Res and for Arc and we want to make sure if we want to have those programs in existence there is sufficient funding to pay for those programs 2-3 years out. The only way to do that is do a budget that is projected over several years. As a stakeholder body we will make decisions. We will do everything we can to get the dollars for priority 1 programs out the door so people are benefitting. There has been clear comments about the desperate need for transportation We are going to look at what was approved in the plan and how can we attempt to use what was in the plan and be able to do that next month. We have to start our new stakeholder planning process for the next fiscal year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annis asked for clarification about what is being said about housing. If the vote that came before CPAW was brought to us because there were more millionaires who generated more income and there was more tax, I have no assurance nor do you that perpetually millionaires in the state of CA are going to earn more money. How can 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>you say that perpetually there is going to be 30 percent of the windfall money moving forward for housing when there very well might not be. We can have another economic slump and be back at even a lower level of funding coming in than what is happening currently. Even the example that you are giving us just leads us down another path of more confusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve agreed if the housing committee comes back and says we want to spend those funds on one time things and we don't want to obligate those dollars on a going forward basis. My experience with housing is when you obligate dollars you obligate going forward because you are putting someone in a bed. Any program, every dollar in this plan needs to get approved every year. This is not a promise. This body can decide at any future year it doesn't want to fund any component. Nothing can be promised for the future of MHSA funding because the body can decide to change the plan. ● Annis said we started out as CPAW with a huge number and over time the numbers had dropped. If CPAW members don't continue to come to the housing committee, how can we bring a recommendation to the larger body? ● Susan Medlin feels we need to not just throw money at things but make sure it's ongoing. Transportation has been coming up again and again. There were CSW positions for driving so they could provide peer support. She feels they need to look at ongoing continuing and 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>permanent solutions to things instead of saying they can't deal with it and pushing it to the side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Steve responded every innovation component that is successful is supposed to be funded on an ongoing basis. Those are costs that are going to need to come from MHSA funds in order to pay for those programs, so we have to budget for those costs, and we need to make sure that we're allotting enough money in future years to be able to do that. It would take forever to clarify that and he asked that they not do that today because they're not doing their future planning but he agrees with what she's saying.● Brenda recommended for transportation: There was an innovative project to develop a peer and family shuttle service that would be a profit-making entity.● John urged the group to wrap up the current fiscal year quickly and start the new fiscal year quickly, given that they've had three months of changing numbers and changing explanations. His suggestion is if somehow it's not fully feasible to fund a 12/13 program, maybe if priority 3 doesn't get funded in this year, it becomes priority 1 for fiscal year 13/14. He believes the integrity of CPAW is in question. Until they find a positive resolution for this year's fiscal problem, it's always going to remain so.		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sam asked for clarity about whether IT costs should be separate from operational costs. He also asked about cost of building and said it should be in the expenditure report. He also pointed out that on 12/14/10 there was expenditure that went through the Board of Supervisors for NetSmart for \$4,000,000. Why was this not in the expenditure report? ○ Steven responded it was never expended. We haven't purchased any HR yet. Some of the \$4,000,000 may have been expended for computers. ○ Sam feels then the cost of the computers should be included in the expenditure report. ○ Sam brought up another item for 02/13/11-Board order to extend the contract with ACS Consulting. Curious as to why it is not in the expenditure report. ○ Jana commented we did not spend that money. ○ Sam said he has a problem with the fact that there are expenditures that aren't reported. ○ Jana said it is in the year-end reports. ○ Sam said those were only covering operational costs. • Sam wants the people conducting the audit to come in and explain what they're going to do. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steven said what they do will be determined by the deliverables the CPAW committee determines. He said it 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>makes sense that people who conduct the audit to come to CPAW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lori wanted to get a commitment from those willing to work on the audit committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lori suggested a check-in with the Commission as well. • Tom wanted clarification on the amount of money that is budgeted for housing in the next three years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steven clarified \$800,000 a year. It's reasonable to him that the Housing Committee would come back and say this is going to be an ongoing cost. ○ Steven also asked about the page that stated there was another \$150,000 for TAY Housing. ○ Steven said he would clarify the number with Steve and Annis. • Kathi wants to know what the plan is on how the \$800,000 is being spent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steven clarified that the \$800,000.00 is not just for adults. He restated that the Housing Committee's charge is to come up with a plan for housing people, not just adults. • Kathi would have liked to have gone down each of the pieces of the plan and understand why it had not been spent. She doesn't feel she got answers. 	<p>➤ Kathi, Sam, and Lori volunteered to serve on the Ad Hoc Audit Committee. Others may sign up by emailing Jeannie DeTomasi.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lori is not comfortable with the way the money is being proposed to be allocated. She thinks a document that spells out the proposal for the committee is appropriate. She wants to see the totality in writing.○ Tom suggested the Housing Committee would bring the proposal to the March meeting. • Lori wants to know the standards for housing since people have been unhappy with their living conditions.○ Annis reminded everyone those comments came from someone who was living in an unlicensed room and board. Mental health administration does not place people in unlicensed board and care facilities, therefore they have no power or authority over them.○ Brenda said case managers refer clients to unlicensed room and board often since there's no place else to go. • Lori would like CPAW to make the time for a longer retreat since everything is so interrelated, so they could make sure all the disconnected pieces could get talked about. • Steven feels strongly that part of his responsibility is looking at how the system needs to move forward and making sure they can move the dollars forward in the best possible way. As of now they have an approved plan for how to move the money forward and will continue with that.		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teresa appreciates what Steven said. She thinks there are a lot of unacceptable things happening. She thought it was unacceptable for a Patient’s Rights Advocate to stand in front of the Board and talk about what is happening in the Conservator’s office. She doesn’t understand why positions haven’t gone forward since MHSA funds are not frozen. She states MHSA funds are not intended to fund integration or filling positions for other departments. She says her passion is gone and she feels no leadership and is stunned by what’s happened. She is concerned that there are a lot of people that can’t come to CPAW that they aren’t hearing from. • Annis would like to hear public comments now. 		
4:30 PM Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annis announced that at the Board of Supervisors meeting Sam was falsely mentioned as the delegated CPAW representative to the interview panel for the MH Director. Sam was the Mental Health Commissioner who was appointed by the Commission as a family member representative; there was no representation of CPAW, and she felt that comment needed to be clarified. • John added that CPAW was never asked to forward a delegate, but it was listed on the Board order as being part of the interview process. • Cynthia clarified that Sam was identified incorrectly on the board and that Dr. Walker 		

	<p>corrected it when he read the letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maria said coming to CPAW meetings is more confusing every single time. There is no clarity. She doesn't see how it's going to get that much better. She thinks it is one of the most dysfunctional groups ever seen. It is frightening to her that the consumers are counting on this body to take care of them, when there is such a severe lack of leadership. Every time someone brings something up, different answers are given. Something needs to shift. • Brenda said there was no family member on the interview panel who has a family member in the Contra Costa County Public Mental Health system. The person identified as the consumer does not get her services from our public mental health system. • Kathi wants a Planning Committee meeting. She thinks mistrust is the reason the meetings have been "unruly and chaotic." It is extremely frustrating to her to have had a member of their body get up and say that in public. It felt like breaking trust to her. She doesn't think the answer to the fiscal questions are complete. By postponing the meeting by two weeks, they significantly reduced the number of people present. She says "our own process was violated." She says a lot of trust was built in the last years and then something happened, especially when all the committees were 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>arbitrarily suspended, despite their requests otherwise, and until these issues are addressed she feels very violated and violated by the public comments at the hearing on Tuesday. They don't have leadership now because it's been denied them. She feels at a loss. She doesn't see a commitment to make any changes. She feels she is being talked to not with. There is not a dialogue. She wants to feel like she is more of a part of the conversation. She feels like she is being preached change but she isn't seeing it and is fed up.</p>		
4:40 PM Break			
4:55 PM Defining a Quorum for CPAW (Postponed to spend more time on financial discussion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voted to defer this conversation until next month 		
5:00 PM Dialogue with New Mental Health Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brenda thinks the most important thing to show good faith is to get dollars out the door. • Would like Steven go out and interact with consumers • Brenda again stressed how important it is to get the money out the door. She says the distrust is not good for anyone's mental health. She is tired of the battle, conflict, and mistrust. She feels like the whole culture of Mental Health has been dismantled with the integration, whether intentional or not. She says the culture is driven 		

	<p>by close consumer and family involvement. She is willing to organize consumers in every region of the county with unrestricted access to get to know Steven and for him to get to know them. She wants him to hear, feel, and experience them and the power that he has over the quality of improvement of their lives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPAW’s Requests of MH Director: integrity, transparency, trust, democracy respect, dialogue, inclusion, safety, honesty, accountability, and right balance between detail and the big picture, and full implementation of 12/13 plan with loyalty, regular conversations between the mental health director and those served, go to clinics and where people live and visit. ○ Transparency and trustworthiness and a clear articulation of priorities and plans. Please don’t have changing answers and numbers like has happened in the past and recently. ○ Wants to bring appreciation for the greater good, mutual support, support for the participation of consumer and family members, being able to bring others to the table. ○ Training for people to feel comfortable about speaking up, and support programs like the ones Brenda has started. ○ Consider this a new day. ○ Bridge building and rebuilding both within CPAW and between CPAW and other organizations ○ Creating a safe environment for hard conversations 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acknowledgement of different approaches to conflict ○ Expecting the best of one another rather than pointing out the worst. ● Brenda feels everyone needs to be fierce ambassadors for Steven’s learning about consumers ● Lori shared some Buddhist principles: Absolutely do no harm. Treat people with respect. Wants to bring out the best in each other. Please have tenderness, respect, compassion and honesty with one another. ● Lori feels it’s important not to have a conversation that blames people who are no longer working in the system. ● MH Director’s Requests of CPAW: Steven acknowledges that we are in a bad place and sometimes he doesn’t feel full of hope. He doesn’t like fights. He wants people to engage and allow the possibility of moving forward. He says it’s awful to be in the place this group has gotten to, but far worse that we cannot improve the services we should for the people we’re here to serve. He requests people agree to move forward. He agrees to hold up his responsibility with accountability and to be transparent and to present things in a clear way, and to support the good work that is already being done as well as positive change. He will continue to try and he 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• John feels Cynthia has to assume some leadership responsibility and when people squabble it shows there needs to be more leadership. He thinks there are integrity and democracy issues with CPAW. Until these issues get resolved, it is going to be very difficult moving forward in an honest and productive way.• Brenda feels if the integrity and democracy issues were to be dealt with in an open way and admit that they had stumbled, then it would be a huge step. Distrust is the worst she's ever seen. A lot of it revolves around money – a lot of people had their suspicions and then Jana came in with numbers that didn't make sense. They need to admit where they stumbled and then set about a plan to move forward. She feels the fact that OCE has been moved down by the door is symbolic of the shift. She doesn't feel it's consumer-driven or client-centered. She would like to get back to knowing why we're all here.○ Susan said it had been explained to her that the reason for the move of consumers' offices was the fact that there was confidential information being exchanged, but if that's so then why are clerks allowed to be seated more centrally in the office? She does like where she and other		
--	--	--	--

	<p>consumers are seated, but doesn't fully understand why the change happened.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lori wants the Planning Committee back. • Lori said she was hurt and shocked when Steven used the term "successful suicide" about his family member. ○ Steven said it is not okay for her to tell him how to speak about his own family. Another time when he is feeling better he would like to hear further about what exactly offended her and is sorry if he hurt her. ○ Lori said this will be a reoccurring issue given that response, and that we owe it to each other to watch our language. ○ John said we need to watch how we speak professionally. • Brenda, Lori, and John all emphasized the fact that we are working with people every day who come from abused and deplorable and awful places. At some point we have to recognize this isn't about us but about those we serve. We need to do whatever it takes to fix this. • Susan would like to come to this meeting and not go home feeling physically ill and /or with a migraine. She feels there is too much anxiety and conflict and she is not willing to invite consumers into this environment. • Brenda feels there need to be apologies all 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>around for bad behavior and mistakes and then forgiveness that needs to happen. There is a difference between mistakes made through lack of knowledge as opposed to ill intent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lori says when Nelson Mandela came out of prison there was a council that came out to say they didn't mean the wrongs committed. If she's hurt or offended someone, she wants to apologize. • Brenda thinks there needs to be a plan around reconciliation. Mental health is too important to be this fractured. 		
6:00 PM Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned. 		