

MINUTES

CALIFORNIA MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AUTHORITY (CalMHSA)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING – REGULAR MEETING

Sacramento, California

October 13, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT

Wayne Clark, PhD, CalMHSA President, Monterey County

Maureen F. Baumann, LCSW, CalMHSA Vice President, Placer County

Karen Baylor, PhD, MFT, CalMHSA Secretary, San Luis Obispo County

Scott Gruendl, MPA, CalMHSA Treasurer, Glenn County

Michael Kennedy, MFT, Bay Area Region Representative, Sonoma County

Brad Luz, PhD, Central Region Representative, Sutter/Yuba County

William Arroyo, MD, Los Angeles Region Representative, Los Angeles County (alternate)

Mark Refowitz, MSW, Southern Region Representative, Orange County

William Cornelius, PhD, Superior Region Representative, Colusa County

Anne Robin, MFT, Butte County

Daniel Nielson, El Dorado County

Barbara LaHaie, Humboldt County (alternate)

Andrea Kuhlen, Imperial County (alternate)

Brad Cloud, Kern County (alternate)

Kristy Kelly, MFT, Lake County

Ken Crandall, ASW, Lassen County

Bruce Gurganus, MFT, Marin County

Tom Pinizzotto, Mendocino County (alternate)

Karen Stockton, PhD, MSW, Modoc County

Bill Brenneman, Riverside County (alternate)

Mary Ann Bennett, Sacramento County

Allan Rawland, MSW, ACSW, San Bernardino County

Alfredo Aguirre, LCSW, San Diego County

Stephen Kaplan, San Mateo County

Nancy Pena, PhD, Santa Clara County

Madelyn Schlaepfer, PhD, Stanislaus County

Noel J. O'Neill, MFT, Trinity County

Joan Beesley, Yolo County (alternate)

NON-VOTING ALTERNATES

Michelle Callejas, Sacramento County

CaSonya Thomas, MPA, CHC, San Bernardino County

Bonnie Hoffman, Solano County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Suzanne Tavano, Contra Costa County

Donna Taylor, RN, Fresno County

Janice Melton, LCSW, Madera County

John Lawless, Mariposa County

Jaye Vanderhurst, LCSW, Napa County

Alan Yamamoto, LCSW, San Benito County

Jo Robinson, San Francisco City and County

Leslie Tremaine, EdD, Santa Cruz County

Michael Noda, Siskiyou County

Halsey Simmons, MFT, Solano County

Jesse Duff, Tri-City Mental Health Center

Tracie Riggs, MPA, EA, Tuolumne County

Meloney Roy, LCSW, Ventura County

STAFF PRESENT

John Chaquica, CPA, MBA, ARM, CalMHSA Executive Director

Kim Santin, CPA, CalMHSA Finance and Administration Director

Ann Collentine, MPPA, CalMHSA Program Director

Stephanie Welch, MSW, CalMHSA Program Manager

Laura Li, CalMHSA Program Analyst

Maya Maas, George Hills Corporate Assistant

Amy Shearer, CalMHSA Executive Assistant

Doug Alliston, Legal Counsel, Murphy Campbell Guthrie & Alliston

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Stacie Hiramoto, Racial and Ethnic Mental Health Disparities Coalition (REMHDCO)

Delphine Brody, California Network of Mental Health Clients

Anara Guard, EDC, Inc

Theresa Lee, EDC, Inc

Ansara Lewis, Los Angeles County

Michele Curran

Amber Burkan, California Youth Empowerment Network (CAYEN)

Patricia Ryan, California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA)

Kristin Barlow, California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA)

Joseph Robinson, California Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies (CASRA)

John T. Liddle, Morgan Stanley Smith Barney

Deborah Dunn, Morgan Stanley Smith Barney

Perry Two-Feathers Tripp, California Network of Mental Health Clients

Mike Roth, Paschal-Roth Public Affairs

Lynn Thull, California Alliance

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Mental Health Services Authority (CalMHSA) was called to order by President Wayne Clark, Ph.D., at 2:45 p.m. on October 13, 2011, at the Courtyard Marriott Hotel in Sacramento, California.

2. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Laura Li, Program Analyst, called roll of the board and confirmed a quorum. President Clark confirmed that no one was listening in on the teleconference line. Doug Alliston, Legal Counsel, Murphy Campbell Guthrie & Alliston, gave instructions on voting and roll call.

3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Mr. Alliston reviewed the instructions for public comment, including the process of public comment cards. He also noted items not on the agenda would be reserved for public comment at the end of the agenda.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AS POSTED

President Clark called for approval of the agenda as posted and asked for comment from Board members or staff. Hearing none, President Clark entertained a motion to approve the agenda as posted.

Action: A motion was made to approve the agenda as posted.

Motion carried by unanimous consent.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

President Clark acknowledged the consent calendar and asked for comment from Board members or staff. Hearing none, President Clark entertained a motion to approve the consent calendar.

Action: A motion was made to approve the consent calendar.

Motion: William Arroyo, Los Angeles County
Second: Alfredo Aguirre, San Diego County

Motion carried unanimously.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

6. MEMBERSHIP

A. CalMHSA New County Membership Application(s)

Allan Rawland, San Bernardino County, reported the County of San Benito and the Tri-City Mental Health Center had completed the application and requirements for membership in CalMHSA and recommended approval of their membership.

Action: A motion was made to approve San Benito County and Tri-City Mental Health Center's memberships to CalMHSA.

Motion: Mark Refowitz, Orange County
Second: Kristy Kelly, Lake County

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

B. County Outreach Report

Mr. Rawland provided information on the outreach process and activities used to engage the new members, and mentioned future outreach activities. He noted the Counties he has spoken to have expressed interest.

7. FINANCIAL MATTERS

A. Report from the Finance Ad Hoc Committee

Kim Santin, Finance Director, gave an update on the status of CalMHSA financial matters since the August 2011 Board Meeting. She noted that the Finance Ad Hoc Committee has had three meetings since the Board last met.

The Board had directed the Committee to interview investment management consultants, and the Committee directed staff to send out a Request for Qualifications. They received three responses, and the Committee decided to go forward with Morgan Stanley Smith Barney on August 30, 2011. They will be working on the contract, and will bring it back to the Board in December for approval.

Action: *None, information only*

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

The next step after selecting the investment management consultants was to develop an investment policy to establish guidelines for investing funds. CalMHSA staff met with Morgan Stanley Smith Barney who developed the policy, and then brought it back to Finance Ad Hoc Committee. The Finance Ad Hoc Committee recommended the policy for approval.

Action: *Approval of Resolution Number 11-06 Investment Policy.*

Motion: *Karen Stockton, Modoc County*

Second: *William Arroyo, Los Angeles County*

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

Ms. Santin gave an overview of CalMHSA's cash balances and financial history since inception in May 2009 (formal establishment in July 2009). CalMHSA has received all the funding except for \$394,000 from 3 counties who have assigned funds. To date, cash deposits have been \$143,300,000. She gave an overview of expenditures. CalMHSA staff is developing a revenue and expenditure report by program for the Board to review.

Action: *None; Information only*

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

B. Approval of Finance Committee Charter

Ms. Santin noted that at the August 2011 Board Meeting the Board approved the Committee Charter to create a standing finance committee. The Finance Ad Hoc Committee has developed a charter for the Finance Committee. The Committee will have 6 voting members, with 5 members representing each region, 3 of which will be Board members, and 2 of which may be County Chief Financial Officers. The Committee will include the President as *ex officio* member, and each member will serve a two year term. The Finance Ad Hoc Committee recommended Board approval of the Finance Committee Charter.

Action: *Approval of Finance Committee Charter.*

Motion: *William Cornelius, Colusa County*

Second: *Karen Stockton, Modoc County*

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

Ms. Santin next introduced the recommendation for the Board to receive and accept the unaudited financial statements for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 2011. She noted that the statements have been submitted to the financial auditor, and are undergoing an independent audit, to be presented at the December Board meeting.

Action: *Receive and file the unaudited financial statements for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2011.*

Motion: *Mark Refowitz, Orange County*

Second: Noel O'Neill, Trinity County

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

Ms. Santin noted that following the Board's approval of the Finance Committee Charter, staff will need to recruit participants from each region. She will work with Mr. Rawland to recruit members for a committee slate, which will be brought back to the Board for approval in December.

8. PROGRAM MATTERS

A. PEI Statewide Projects – Contracts Update

Ann Collentine, Program Director, presented an update about program implementation to date. She noted that staff is negotiating 24 contracts with program partners, of which currently 18 are approved and executed, and these partners are starting to do work across the state. She thanked the Directors for providing their county liaisons to CalMHSA staff, and requested that anyone who had not provided theirs yet please send them to Laura Li, Stephanie Welch, or herself.

Ms. Collentine gave a brief overview of the Program Partners Orientation in August, which was attended by more than 45 program partners and facilitated synergy between the partners and initiatives. She noted that partners were given an introduction to working with CalMHSA, and that Senator Darrell Steinberg and three individuals with lived experience of mental illness spoke at the event.

Action: None, information only.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

Scott Gruendl, Glenn County, asked what the process moving forward is for the "Promoting Mental Health in the Workplace" program which no one had bid on. Ms. Collentine responded that that is the type of activity that would go to the Advisory Committee before being brought to the Executive Committee and the Board. Mr. Chaquica noted that there are new members that have joined CalMHSA since the plan was originally approved, and staff will begin working on a revised plan for the additional funding that will go through the Advisory Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Board, before being brought to

the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) for approval in January 2012.

B. Stigma and Discrimination Consortium Project, SDR Program 1, Component 1

Ms. Collentine noted that the Board has a fiduciary responsibility to successfully implement the approved workplan and programs. She gave a brief overview of the history of Stigma and Discrimination Reduction Program 1, Component 1, for which the Board had approved the California Network of Mental Health Clients in June 2011 as the selected contractor. Staff met with the Network in August and September to negotiate the contract. On September 6th CalMHSA staff presented the Client Network with a letter requesting that they respond to a number of concerns regarding their contract negotiations by October 3rd. Ms. Collentine briefly listed the goals of SDR Program 1, Component 1. On October 4th at 1:00 AM CalMHSA received a response from the Client Network which provided most of the requested information, and acknowledged that the organization was in need of leadership and personnel to become stable and meet their mission and vision. They included a short-term plan to achieve this in the next three months. CalMHSA staff prepared an alternative plan in the interim because the Consortium is critical to the success of the other SDR programs, and needs to be up and running as soon as possible. On behalf of CalMHSA staff, Ms. Collentine recommended that the Board cease contract negotiations with the Client Network, and that CalMHSA temporarily take responsibility for the Program due to the urgency of getting the program up and running. Staff also recommends CalMHSA enter into contract negotiations with a client leader to complete the activities identified in the work plan. CalMHSA could utilize a project manager on an as-needed basis to serve as a management consultant. Staff recommends that CalMHSA provide support to this program until September 30, 2012. In addition, staff recommends that CalMHSA release a Request for Interest (RFI) for a client leader as soon as possible. She explained the reasons for not returning to the RFP process.

William Arroyo, Los Angeles County, asked how the ten-day response time was decided on, because he did not feel it was very feasible. Ms. Collentine responded that they wanted to give people at least a week and a few extra days because they want to move quickly.

Mark Refowitz, Orange County, asked why there was a rush, and said he was concerned that ten days was not adequate to get the right person. Ms. Collentine noted that the RFI is soliciting a client leader who is willing to enter into contract negotiations to implement the Consortium. Ms. Collentine said it is important to move as quickly as possible, to have the Consortium meet in

January. The Consortium leadership is critical to the other SDR program components.

Michael Kennedy, Sonoma County, asked for clarification of the Client Network's involvement. Ms. Collentine clarified that in a year they might go back to an RFP, but for now they are looking for a client leader for one year. Right now, staff is concerned about moving forward with the Client Network. They may be ready in a year, but right now they are not.

Alfredo Aguirre, San Diego County, asked for clarification on the role of the Consortium. Stephanie Welch responded that the role of the Consortium is to bring up to 18 different critical perspectives, but it was important that the process was led by a client.

Mr. Gruendl asked for an estimated timeline for the whole process. Ms. Collentine responded that after the ten-day period, staff could get through contract negotiations within two weeks. She also noted that the RFI is just a request for a resume.

Dr. Arroyo stated that he was baffled by the idea that staff would make a decision based on just a resume. He noted that he needs to be able to assure the Board that there is a fiscal viability.

Mr. Alliston noted that staff's recommendation is to bring someone on board who would be supported by CalMHSA staff, which is why it is a viable alternative.

Mary Ann Bennett, Sacramento County, asked if the request is to add someone to CalMHSA staff who will be a person with lived experience, and the consortium would be a high-level focus group. Ms. Collentine responded that yes, the person would be hired as a consultant on contract.

Mr. Kennedy noted that when using a client or family member, often it is necessary to provide technical support and build capacity to move forward.

Mr. Refowitz stated that he was still concerned with the ten-day timeframe, and noted that sole-source contracting with someone like the Mental Health Association of San Francisco could be an option. Ms. Collentine said they had already considered the Stigma and Discrimination Reduction partners like MHA-SF, but they are all already at-capacity with their SDR projects. Ms. Welch commented that the Board specifically wanted a client-run organization, and there are not many available that are statewide. None of CalMHSA's other contractors are client-run organizations.

Anne Robin, Butte County, wanted to make clear that this is a bridge to the next step, which would then possibly include a consumer-led organization.

Karen Baylor, San Luis Obispo County, asked if there was another timeline that could be considered.

Stephen Kaplan, San Mateo County, asked why there was a deadline at all, and suggested that the RFI remain open until a good candidate was found.

Nancy Pena, Santa Clara County, noted that it seemed like the Consortium deliverables would require more staff than just one person. Ms. Welch responded that the other SDR partners had met several times to divide the work and define the role and responsibilities of the Consortium. She also noted that many of the tasks were not due in the first year, and could be completed by a client-led organization after the first year.

President Clark clarified that the motion does not specifically state a ten-day deadline.

Mr. Gruendl said they should add to the recommendation that there is a time limit of one year to turn it back over to a client-run organization.

John Chaquica, Executive Director, responded that that is the recommendation, and if an appropriate organization comes to the table within the year they would turn the Consortium over to them at that point. He also noted that they need a deadline to the RFI for legal reasons, and could open it up again if there were no suitable candidates—perhaps two 15 day periods.

Dr. Arroyo proposed that the Executive Director work with a small group of Board members to address their concerns, and then bring the proposal back to the Board.

President Clark noted that there was a motion on the floor. He responded to Dr. Arroyo that the Officers had been included in staff discussions about the RFI timeline.

Ms. Pena asked if there was an option to amend the motion to add two 15 day increments of time to the RFI. She was informed that that was allowable.

Dr. Stockton expressed her concern that clients and family members be part of the selection process for the Project Manager.

Dr. Baylor asked if the motion was to give the Executive Director authority to select the Project Manager.

Mr. Kaplan asked what the advantages were to the two 15-day periods, compared to an unspecified deadline.

Mr. Chaquica responded that there needs to be a deadline so that respondents know when the last day that their applications will be accepted is. The two 15-day periods allows flexibility in case a suitable candidate is not found in the first 15 days.

Mr. Kaplan asked if the RFI could not just say that applications will be accepted until a qualified person is found.

Mr. Alliston responded that he had not researched that specific issue, but said he understood the desire for some certainty so that people know when the last day is that their application will be accepted.

Noel O'Neill, Trinity County, asked what kind of consultation the Executive Director will use in the selection process.

Mr. Chaquica responded he will rely on the RFI qualifications and Ann Collentine and Stephanie Welch and their expertise in the area as well as the interview process.

Mr. O'Neill asked that someone with lived experience be included in the selection process.

Action: *Authorize the Executive Director to contract as necessary to commence a timely implementation of SDR Program 1, Component 1.*

Motion: *Stephen Kaplan, San Mateo County*
Second: *Anne Robin, Butte County*

The motion passed unanimously.

Action: *Amend the motion to add two 15-day increments of time for responses to the RFI.*

Motion: *Nancy Pena, Santa Clara County*

Second: *Alfredo Aguirre, San Diego County*

The motion passed unanimously.

Public comments were heard from the following individuals:
Perry Two-Feathers Tripp, California Network of Mental Health Clients
Stacy Hiramoto, REMHDCO

C. Advisory Committee Slate

Maureen Bauman, Placer County, gave an overview of the stakeholder selection process for the Advisory Committee, and introduced the new members.

Action: *Approval of the Advisory Committee slate.*

Motion: *Scott Gruendl, Glenn County*

Second: *Nancy Pena, Santa Clara County*

The motion passed unanimously.

Public comments were heard from the following individuals:
None

D. PEI Statewide Projects Evaluation – Contractor Selection

Stephanie Welch, Program Manager, reviewed the role and purpose of the Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) Statewide Evaluation, and gave an update of the steps taken to date. She noted that the \$8 to \$10 million range was identified because there was a need for technical support and training for contractors, and some of the funds would be retained for this purpose. She gave an overview of the RFSQ respondents, and explained the review process for the statements of qualifications. She introduced the recommendation to approve RAND Corporation as the evaluation contractor for Statewide PEI programs, based on the outcome of the review process. She described their qualifications and experience in similar evaluation processes, and noted that they scored much higher in the review process than the other candidates.

Action: *1) Direct staff to negotiate with RAND Corporation based on its SOQ for the implementation of the CalMHSA Statewide Evaluation for an appropriate amount needed between \$8 million and \$10 million (the funding range identified in the RFSQ).*

2) Delegate to CalMHSA President and Executive Director the authority to execute contract negotiated by staff.

Motion:

Second:

Public comments were heard from the following individuals:
None

President Clark noted that he, Dr. Arroyo, and Dr. Stockton were members of the review panel, and added his support for the recommendation to approve RAND Corporation.

Dr. Arroyo commented that the other candidates were very impressive, but RAND Corporation was identified as the strongest.

Dr. Stockton added that the review panel gave very consistent ratings, and the group decision was unanimous.

Mr. Gurganus asked how the \$8 to \$10 million range was established. He was informed it was decided on in the original plan that was approved by the Board.

Ms. Welch clarified that they will spend \$10 million on evaluation, but up to \$2 million of that may be used for training and technical assistance for program partners.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Communications Consultant

Ms. Collentine introduced the recommendation to hire a communications consultant to implement CalMHSA's communication goals. Staff recommended that the consultant be hired using CalMHSA's sole source guidelines, which allows sole source procurement when a consultant's capabilities are unique. She introduced Mike Roth of Paschal-Roth Public Affairs, and gave an overview of his qualifications. Counsel reviewed staff's recommendation and concluded that the justification complies with section B of the procurement policy.

Mike Roth thanked the Board and expressed his readiness to work with CalMHSA to share the great story of the Mental Health Services Act.

Action: *Approval of sole source engagement of communications consultant.*

Motion: *Nancy Pena, Santa Clara County*

Second: *Karen Baylor, San Luis Obispo*

The motion passed unanimously.

Public comment was heard from the following individual(s):
None

B. Board of Directors Meeting Calendar

President Clark introduced the two options for the 2012 Board Calendar.

Mr. Chaquica gave the background for the two options, indicating that option 2 would commence in February.

Dr. Baylor noted that the locations would depend on where the California Mental Health Directors Association holds their meetings, and they have not announced that information yet.

Action: *Approve option 2 as revised.*

Motion: *Karen Baylor, San Luis Obispo*

Second: *Bruce Gurganus, Marin County*

The motion passed unanimously.

10. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Chaquica noted that Brown Act discussions will begin in December. He introduced staff's update (included in the Board meeting packet) on strategic planning goals and objective. He informed the Board that they would receive staff evaluations on October 14th, which they could complete and submit to CalMHSA. He gave a short update on the CMHDA business plan.

He gave an overview of updates to the CalMHSA website, including the work to make the website ADA compliant. He provided an update on the CalMHSA database, CalMatrix, and noted that there will be a demonstration at the December Board meeting.

He gave an update on the status of county outreach activities. He noted that they have been working with the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission and CMHDA to ensure collaboration and non-duplication of efforts as part of the media campaign.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS

A. Public Comments – Non-Agenda Items

President Clark invited members of the public to make comments on non-agenda items. Hearing none, he proceeded to the next agenda item.

12. NEW BUSINESS

President Clark asked the Board if there was any new business. Hearing none, he proceeded to the next agenda item.

13. CLOSING COMMENTS


President Clark asked the Board if there were any closing comments. Hearing none, he proceeded to the next agenda item.


14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,


Karen Baylor, PhD, LMFT
Secretary, CalMHSA


Date

CalMHSA PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

(Please Print)

All cards should be returned to staff prior to the start of the meeting. You will be called upon at the appropriate time to speak. Public Comment may be limited to three minutes per speaker. If you wish to remain anonymous, you can omit your name and organization, write your comment on the blank lines below and the President will read your comment/question.

(ONE COMMENT CARD PER AGENDA ITEM)

AGENDA ITEM: 8B
PAGE NUMBER: 89
NAME: STARCE HIRAMOTO
ORGANIZATION: REMHDCO

(Speakers should address the Board, not each other or the audience, and are expected to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner. No debate or argument between speakers and/or members of the audience shall be permitted. Comments relative to any issues that are currently the subject of active litigation will not be heard in the meeting.)

Comment/Question: CONCERNS WITH A PROPOSAL
TO ~~CHANGE~~ CHANGE CONTRACT

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT

The Board welcomes and encourages public participation in its meetings. This time is reserved for members of the public (including Stakeholders) to address the Board concerning matters on the Agenda. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person and twenty minutes total. Those who wish to remain anonymous can submit written comments/questions which will be read during the relevant public comment period.

For Agenda items, public comment will be taken at the time those items are addressed. Each interested party is invited to complete the Public Comment Card and provide it to CalMHSA staff prior to start of meeting. When it appears there are several members of the public wishing to address the Board on a specific item, at the outset of the item the Board President may announce the maximum amount of time that will be allowed for presentation of testimony on that item.

CalMHSA PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

(Please Print)

All cards should be returned to staff prior to the start of the meeting. You will be called upon at the appropriate time to speak. Public Comment may be limited to three minutes per speaker. If you wish to remain anonymous, you can omit your name and organization, write your comment on the blank lines below and the President will read your comment/question.

(ONE COMMENT CARD PER AGENDA ITEM)

AGENDA ITEM: S. Program matters. B. Prob @ Complaint @
PAGE NUMBER: 89
NAME: Perry Two Feathers Tribe
ORGANIZATION: CA. NETWORK OF MENTAL HEALTH CLIENTS

(Speakers should address the Board, not each other or the audience, and are expected to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner. No debate or argument between speakers and/or members of the audience shall be permitted. Comments relative to any issues that are currently the subject of active litigation will not be heard in the meeting.)

Comment/Question:

ADDRESS TO BOARD ON C.N.M.H.C.
LEADERSHIP + STATUS OF ORGANIZATION
MOVING INTO THE FUTURE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT

The Board welcomes and encourages public participation in its meetings. This time is reserved for members of the public (including Stakeholders) to address the Board concerning matters on the Agenda. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person and twenty minutes total. Those who wish to remain anonymous can submit written comments/questions which will be read during the relevant public comment period.

For Agenda items, public comment will be taken at the time those items are addressed. Each Interested party is invited to complete the Public Comment Card and provide it to CalMHSA staff prior to start of meeting. When it appears there are several members of the public wishing to address the Board on a specific item, at the outset of the item the Board President may announce the maximum amount of time that will be allowed for presentation of testimony on that item.