

**MENTAL HEALTH COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 22nd, 2022 - FINAL**

Agenda Item / Discussion	Action /Follow-Up
<p>I. Call to Order / Introductions Chair, Cmsr. B. Serwin, called the meeting to order @ 3:39 pm</p> <p><u>Members Present:</u> Chair, Cmsr. B. Serwin, District II Vice-Chair, Cmsr. Laura Griffin, District V Cmsr. Leslie May, District V Cmsr. Alana Russaw, District IV</p> <p><u>Members Absent:</u> Cmsr. Douglas Dunn, District III</p> <p><u>Other Attendees:</u> Angela Beck Jennifer Bruggeman Jen Quallick Dawn Morrow</p>	<p>Meeting was held via Zoom platform</p>
<p>II. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None</p>	
<p>III. COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (L. May) I thought we were going to put the bylaw (with President Biden’s Executive Order regarding equity and social justice) on this agenda. I sent it in the beginning of this month but did not see it on here. (RESPONSE: B. Serwin) What I think we need to do (with your proposal) since it is something requesting a change to current recruiting process, that is outside of our ability, it is no longer in our bylaws to even participate in that. I think we need to craft it as a motion that we advise the Board of Supervisor (BoS) modify their recruiting process to ensure those recommendations. Cmsr. Griffin and I can work with you to craft that motion. It is not something we are changing an internal bylaw, we would be advising them to change their bylaws. We were totally written out of the process with the last change to our bylaws that Cmsr. Andersen and Cmsr. Mitchoff initiated that moved it from the commission having a role. • (L. May) the only other comment I wanted to make was that I need to hop on the city council meeting tonight because BACS (Bay Area Community Services) is trying to get Antioch to give them money toward their hotel (Project House Key) in Concord. I am wondering why they are coming to Antioch to ask for money for a hotel that is Concord for the unhoused population? I just wanted to make mention of that to you all and I think this needs to be addressed. I don’t appreciate it. A council member called me at home this morning to tell me she received calls from two residents who said they were hungry and they don’t have any food, that the residents aren’t being fed. It seems like a pattern from Niereka House to now, the House Key program. Something is not right with BACS and their management of these programs. The County needs to be aware of this. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (L. Griffin) I just want to suggest, at the Quality of Care Meeting, we had a great presentation from County Behavioral Health (BHS) and the Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE) on the Wellness in Schools Program (WISP). Unfortunately, it was at the end of the meeting and almost everyone had left, it was a long meeting. I would like to suggest we invite them back at one of the Commission meetings and be on one of the first agenda items so we all can hear. I think it's important work they are doing. 	
<p>IV. COMMITTEE CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMENTS: Happy Birthday Commissioner Leslie May!</p>	
<p>V. APPROVE minutes from January 25, 2022, meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L. May motioned to approve the minutes as written. Seconded by L. Griffin <p>Vote: 4-0-0 Ayes: B. Serwin (Chair), B. Serwin (Vice-Chair), L. May, A. Russaw Abstain: none</p>	<p>http://cchealth.org/mentalhealth/mhc/agendas-minutes.php</p>
<p>VI. UPDATE on Mental Health Commission (MHC) Committee Chair Meeting</p> <p>We have had a Committee Chair meeting earlier this year and decided it was helpful and held another and we will probably have a couple more, monthly and then change to quarterly. The reason I felt it was important was we have the commission as a ship overall and the three committees: Justice Systems, MHSA-Finance and Quality of Care. They are all moving along in their boats but want to make sure we stay aligned and that we are all within scope; that we know what our scope is and stay within scope and then when we make commitments (annual or along the way) that we know we have a committee assigned to that commitment.</p> <p>We have started that process. We have assigned our goals for the year. Each committee has a goal that it is moving forward and identified we all want to find and scrutinize our mission statements to ensure they are up-to-date and within scope of what we think we are doing today. Then we have some procedural things where we are doing things differently or not sure how to, so we are using this as a platform to talk about those things. In order to have more consistency and guidance, across the committees so we are all working together.</p> <p>(Angela Beck) This is going to be monthly for how long until quarterly? (Cmsr. Serwin) Monthly until we feel we are ready to do this quarterly.</p>	
<p>VII. UPDATE on Site Visit Program</p> <p>Just a quick update on the next three sites listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmony Home is a small Board and Care (B&C) and they are not going to participate. We need to streamline and simplify the letter and paperwork for the smaller B&C (6 beds and smaller) Hope House, we have made contact and are trying to schedule with them now and sent on a couple of dates assuming they have patients. That is one issue, do they have people in the program right now. So, it is a little fluid. 	

- Crestwood (Pleasant Hill), both Pathways (16 beds, TAY age) and Bridges (64 beds, 18+): discussion regarding in-patient and outpatient vs Enhanced board and care. List needs to be updated and modified. We are in the process of recruiting for the site visit teams for both programs and Angela will send out an email for volunteers. We are focusing on Bridge and will need three interviewers.

Questions and Comments:

- (Cmsr. Russaw) Is there a way we can do a ‘meet & greet’ so all of the B&Cs, in-patient/out-patient can know who we are, what we are about? I understand Angela sends a letter, but I feel there is a better way we can possibly look more official so people will not have a chance back out of things, especially at the last minute.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) A meet and greet would be a good idea. I’m not sure when the last time, I don’t think I’m familiar with the commission ever doing a meeting and greet. Do you Jennifer? (Cmsr. Russaw) Well maybe it is just a nice time now with this COVID thing winding down, it’s a good time to reintroduce county services, including the commission. It would help to have more weight to have it with BHS, but we could just be more aware of the work we are doing. I just think no one really knows about us and we should be shouting from the rooftops the work we are doing to help the community. (Cmsr. Serwin) I think that is a really good idea and I’m sure we could put together an interesting program around that.
- (Jen Quallick) When it comes to the meetings and meet & greets, I don’t necessarily think that is a bad idea at all, it’s a great way to re-introduce commission members and those involved. Not really being aware, Jennifer, does BHS staff go to these along with the commission? Do you all go collectively and jointly? (Cmsr. Serwin) You mean site visits? (Jen Q) yes the site visits. (Cmsr. Serwin) No, the MHSA has their own site visit program. The BHS does certain kinds of reviews of its clients/CBO’s. This is something that is very particular to mental health commissions and boards to have site visit programs. Totally stand-alone programs. They are really meant to have a level of objectivity that the commission provides.

VIII. UPDATE on MHC Code of Conduct

What I have been referring to as Code of Conduct is more like Conduct Guidelines. We started out with five various models of conduct guidelines. It has been a process of wanting to extract the things that are most common and pertain most to the commission. Over the last few days, Cmsr. Griffin and I have made a lot of progress and thought I would share with you to date. <screenshare document>

Every code of conduct is really specific to each institution and what their needs are. We started with what is the purpose of our conduct guidelines for the commission and came around to providing guidelines for professional behavior that leads to open and respectful dialogue in meetings, electronic communications; and other media and that supports effective operations, consensus decisions, and impactful actions by the MHC. So, we want professional behavior. The purpose is to have open and respectful dialogue in all settings, not only meetings but also email, texting,

social media. The purpose for all of it is to ensure we have effective operations that we make decisions with complete consensus and that are actions are impactful.

The one thing we talked about doing is, looking at the Consolidated Planning Advisory Workgroup (CPAW) working agreement that Jennifer provided us and they have a meeting facilitator and read the working agreement before the meeting and by staying and participating in the meeting you are essentially agreeing to these terms. This covers more than meetings and covers a broader other areas. We would need something beyond that to cover these areas outside of meetings. This is a rough draft and have been compiled from multiple sources that we think are important to include and there is overlap and we will weed it down further.

The first category we looked at were Zoom meeting technical specifics. We don't know how long we will be doing Zoom meetings but I have a feeling they are here to stay to a large degree. The typical things you would expect:

- Mute Microphone;
- Be mindful of background noise;
- Use Chat sparingly so it isn't a distraction;
- Position camera properly and keep on;
- Maintain a stable image;
- Avoid multi-tasking;
- Prepare materials to share in advance (have files and thoughts ready to go when it is time to share).

The next category is meeting conduct:

- Turn off/mute cell phones;
- <interrupted with questions and did not finish this list>

The next category:

- Act with integrity;
- Treat all with mutual respect, trust and dignity;
- Assume they are acting in the best interest of commission business.

It is meant to be an over-arching guideline for behavior. Then the next is about other perspectives:

- Value other perspectives, it is okay to disagree politely and respectfully as different perspectives are welcomed and encouraged.
- We added a note about active listening but need to further define;
- Focus on the subject matter and issues;
- No sidebars;
- One speaker at a time; don't interrupt and raise your hand to be acknowledged;
- Everyone participates, no one dominates;
- Keep your comments within the time limit and be brief and to the point (we are committed to starting and finishing on time);
- Come prepared to discuss the published agenda items and handouts.
- When talking about those with mental illness use first person language.
- Uphold the reputation and good standing of the mental health commission.

You can tell these are coming from different places and you can tell the way they are written, the style, overlap and tense. We need to make sure they are comprehensive and tighten them up and put into same language.

I am curious what is missing? Is there anything too heavy handed or too condescending? Overlapping? I really like the second bullet regarding how we treat each other. Most seem to be more about how we interact with each other in the meeting context.

For digital communications like email text messaging and social media, this first bullet is the same as above and how we need to treat each other, whether texting or in a meeting. We added some more specific to email, texting, etc.:

- Refraining from sharing confidential information;
- Consider the tone and don't shout;
- Don't mix business and pleasure, in terms of your content;
- Think before you share;
- Don't overshare;
- Don't be reactive is very similar to consider tone and do not shout;
- Do not vent online.
- Do not commit the MHC to any action unless authorized to do so by the commission or chair. That extends to making any statement on behalf of the commission or reporting to represent the commission in any public medium unless specifically authorized to do so (need to work out the language).

We took the working agreement language from CPAW that we revised for the MHC. At the beginning of the agenda/meeting, the language opens with "The input of all participants in the MHC meetings is highly valued. To ensure all voices can be expressed in a productive and respectful environment, the commission has adopted the following self-governance agreement for all participants at all MHC meetings." At the very end, there may (should) be ramifications. This is what we landed on "The chair or vice-chair, at their discretion, may mute or remove from the meeting anyone not abiding by the conduct guidelines. Obviously, no one wants to be in the position to do that but I feel if we don't have any repercussions, most will abide by a working agreement with or without ramifications, others need them. Thoughts?

Or instead of an 'in meeting' consequence it should be handled outside of the meeting afterwards. The chair could have a communication with that commissioner or member of the public, that we have conduct guidelines.

(Cmsr. Griffin) We are going to have to approach it in two ways because an in person, it will be different from Zoom. We can't remove them necessarily from an in person meeting.

<discussion of timers and option>

Questions and Comments:

- (Jen Quallick) I think this is a fabulous idea to have. My one question is to implement this, how are you to ensure everyone has received, acknowledged and read it? Will someone be signing this? How will this get put into motion?
- (Cmsr. Russaw) The last meeting, I feel it was almost like a conflict of interest. Will that be addressed in this conduct as well? I just feel like one of the Commissioners was able to almost promote his business and I didn't appreciate the way that was done. (RESPONSE: Cmsr. Griffin) We do need to put that in there. It is very important.

- (Cmsr. Serwin) There is one commissioner that has his own non-profit and how do we define that vs. a for-profit business. What constitutes a conflict of interest.
- (Cmsr. Russaw) I wouldn't even feel bad about you looking at it from that vantage point, as if you are speaking to a child. Everyone has different professional conduct and we want to make sure we are going across the board; often times when I attend the main Commission meeting, I notice it is more lacks in the individual committee meetings. I like that we have the same document to stand on.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) When you think of texting/emailing, what other things do you think of, in terms of etiquette or common sense?
- (Cmsr. Russaw) Slang, things taken out of context because you are not in front of the person.
- (Cmsr. Griffin) How about 'speak professionally'?
- (Cmsr. Russaw) I think it's others perception. It could run the spectrum, how something is meant to come across but how it is interpreted.
- (Cmsr. Serwin) Consider the person who is writing has the best intentions.
- (Jen Quallick) I'm tending to think more along the lines of Cmsr. Griffin, with the professional component. I text my friends one way, but anything you all are texting whether it is part of a meeting or not, could be requested as part of a PRA (Public Records Act), if, in fact someone ever were upset and they needed information, if someone submitted an inquiry. So, if you don't want it misinterpreted or misunderstood, how would you put that into a document? So, I would write as you are intending to have it be perceived in a professional manner. Again, when it comes to communications among the commissioners. Be mindful of your audience.
- (Cmsr. Russaw) The other bullet I was concerned about, refrain from sharing confidential information, no blind copying someone that is not intended. Not being transparent. Many times, it can be malicious and goes back to the PRA.

IX. UPDATE on Budget Process

I have been valiantly trying to insert the commission into the budget process. We are at the point where the budget requirements are being developed by the various divisions and being pulled into draft budgets. This is the time when division chiefs and department heads are supposed to be working with their advisory board, if they have one, we are supposed to be working with them to get their input. I have been approaching it in two ways. (1) trying to understand the priorities of BHS, so that we can look at them and agree or we feel these are the most important priorities and these are of lesser concern, but to put our weight in that way. (2) with our dialogue with ourselves and the public, we have different priorities we have been focusing on. For example, Doug, and the MIST population has been a big priority that he has brought the commission along into believe that this is a very high priority issue to fund. The Quality of Care has a motion for funding for a needs assessment for the housing that heals concept for beds with treatment. The Justice System committee have a motion with a budget associated with it. The idea is that the commission

<p>itself may have priorities that are no on the priority radar screen of BHS and that is our second approach.</p> <p>I am trying really hard to get the priorities of the BHS laid out. The last MHC meeting (February) Dr. Tavano and all the division heads; there were a few that could not make it and she was supposed to represent to present the priorities. Some of them did, but Dr. Tavano did not layout the division-wide priorities. She talked about grants, CalAIM, but not speak to division priorities. Now I am in a situation where I am trying to get on paper the priorities that I am aware of and to get those in front of Dr. Tavano to say, 'here is what we know, what you've told us, what are your priorities that are not on this piece of paper'? Then to get that in front of Pat Godley, Chief Operating Officer (COO) and the Chief financial officers (CFO) as well. They know the priorities and has people coming to him with the budget requests to fund these priorities. One way or another, we have got to be able to get these priorities out in front of the commission for the March meeting (a week from now). This has been incredibly frustrating. I cannot tell you how hard I've worked over several years now to try to get the commission involved at the right time in the budgeting cycle. It is not being facilitated by everyone. I don't yet, what situation we will be in next Wednesday, whether we will have, minimally I can bring the list of priorities presented already. Perhaps, when I submit a request of comprehensive priorities, I might get that back or I may not. Either way, that is what I will have.</p> <p>The reason March is important is because the final draft goes to the BoS in April and the BoS will have comments, but if its passed, it can be passed. That is the major milestone and we want our input in before it goes to the BoS. Otherwise, we are in this late to the game situation trying to influence that has already been presented to the BoS. I just wish it was a more fluid interactive process up to this date. I feel like I'm pulling teeth, but I'm doing as much as I can to get as much information in place that will be useful for our discussion for our March meeting.</p> <p>Questions and Comments: None</p>	
<p>X. DISCUSS Potential Future MHC Meeting Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The impact of COVID on the mental health of youth, Dr. Rhiannon Shires ➤ The mental health challenges of youth related to human trafficking, Leslie May ➤ Psychiatric Advanced Directives MHSA project, Jennifer Bruggeman ➤ The mental health challenges of people with developmental disabilities ➤ Topics supporting MHC 2022 goals 	<p><i>Agenda Item skipped due to time constraints</i></p>
<p>XI. REVIEW motions to be presented at the March MHC Meeting</p> <p>Each committee has a motion and will be considered right after approval of the meeting minutes.</p>	
<p>XII. DETERMINE March 2022 Mental Health Commission Meeting Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Second module of Commissioner Orientation will PROVISIONALLY be presented BEFORE THE FEBRUARY Commission meeting at 3:30 	

<p>to 4:20 PM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft MHC Code of Conduct • CONSIDER Finance/MHSA Committee motion • CONSIDER Quality of Care Committee motion • CONSIDER Justice Systems Committee motion • DISCUSS information available regarding BHS budget priorities and initiatives and their projected budgets • DISCUSS MHC budget priorities • DISCUSS revenue sources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are projected revenues from federal and state sources? • How dependent are revenues on grant awards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What major grants have been awarded? ✓ What is the dollar amount of potential, unsecured grant awards? ✓ What is the contingency plan for covering projected grant revenues that are not awarded? • DISCUSS process for aligning MHC and BHS • DISCUSS process for advocacy of MHC priorities • DISCUSS remaining steps in the budget process <p>Agenda items agreed/approved.</p>	
<p>XIII.Adjourned meeting at 5:04 pm</p>	