

Sacramento County Mental Health Board Executive Committee Meeting

MINUTES – TELECONFERENCE MEETING

Tuesday, March 15, 2022

12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

Members Present: Corinne McIntosh-Sako, Laura Bemis, Ann Arneill and William Cho (staff: Glenda Basina)

Members Absent: Loran Sheley

Agenda Item
<p>I. Welcome and Introductions, Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Interim-Chair Sako convened the meeting at 12:01pm and introductions were made.
<p>II. Discussion/action item – Review and Approve April 2022 Mental Health Board General Meeting Agenda, Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Interim-Chair Sako went over the draft agenda. Member Arneill concerned about the 10-minute removal process and thinks it may be a controversial item. Member Bemis voiced to allow 20 minutes. Member Arneill also concerned about the time slotted to SacMap and thinks they need at least half an hour. Suggests to delete them from this agenda, put them in the May agenda to give 20 minutes to the bylaw discussion. Member Bemis motioned to approve the agenda with the changes stated. Member Arneill seconded. Motion passed with a no vote from Member Cho.
<p>III. Discussion item – Feedback request from County Department of Personnel Services regarding recruitment for a new Deputy County Executive – Social Services, Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Received request from Candace Mabra, Principal HR Analyst with Sacramento Personnel Services in regard to recruitment for Dep County Exec (Bruce Wagstaff's position) for feedback in consideration of the recruitment process. Chair to send to all MHB members for their feedback and 2 executive committee members to meet with Candace with member feedback. Member Bemis willing to sit with Member Sako on conversation with Candace, just need to know the role of the position. Member Sako to send email with link of the responsibilities to MHB members this afternoon. Deadline for feedback by next Thursday and meet with Candace after. Panel interview to be done at the end of May.
<p>IV. Discussion/action item – Review proposed amendment to increase time limit for public comment to 3 minutes, Executive Committee Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Member Sako stated limit is currently in sync with BOS's current public comment time. County Counsel said it can be done at discretion of Chair but Chair Sheley wanted to run it past the members. Member Arneill agrees to additional minutes, doesn't think it'll increase length of meeting and okay if it goes past the meeting time. Member Cho thinks it may be a disservice to the public, lessening the number of public to speak. Member Bemis inquired if it can just be left to the discretion of the Chair. Public comment never closes without hearing everyone. Member Sako to bring to the MHB members. Member Arneill moved to recommend to the board the increase to 3 minutes. Seconded by Member Bemis. Motion passes with a no vote from Member Cho.
<p>V. Discussion/action item – Review proposed amendment to MHB bylaws to include removal process, Executive Committee Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Member Sako stated County Counsel, Robert Parrish, researched and confirmed that other board/commissions in the state have a removal process and drafted up language

Sacramento County Mental Health Board Executive Committee Meeting

Agenda Item

for a removal process for the board. Member Sako received the draft language at noon yesterday which is the reason why it was not sent as a packet with the agenda. Member Sako shared the document on screen and read through the draft language. The MHB cannot remove/suspend a member, it only gives the board ability to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors (BOS). By having this provision it strengthens what has already been in the Comfort Agreement what actions would take place if there were repeated violations.

- Member Bemis thinks to bring to MHB board for consideration, discussion and vote.
- Member Arneill asked who would initiate/decide the recommendation about a member committing the acts. Member Sako stated according to the draft, it would be the co-chairs. Member Arneill also asked when is the hearing for the member to put in their defense? It should be at the MHB in order for the 2/3 vote to happen. Member Sako to get clarification on this from Counsel. Member Arneill also questioned the “not be limited to” portion of the cause for suspension/removal and suggests to check this with Counsel. Member Sako read through notes provided by County Counsel that there were parts that can be revised at the discretion of the board.
- Member Cho would like to know the communication of Member Sako to County Counsel, the dynamics; what was spoke of, what was discussed, how it was discussed and what was asked of him to do. Member Cho commented that the language came from Member Sako’s direction and would like all communications related to this. Member Sako responded that Member Cho was at the MHB retreat where there was talk of the removal process as well as at the last Executive Meeting where this was discussed and direction was to go to County Counsel to see if the board, had in purview to take on, and he thought it was a good idea. County Counsel researched other boards/commission and found they also had this process in their bylaws and offered to draft up language as shared on screen. Member Cho agreed but would still like to see all the communications. Member Sako would discuss with County staff, not sure if it’s a PRA and doesn’t know why her word/explanation is not good enough. Member Cho responded that her word/explanation is biased and there’s an agenda behind it and as a board member he should have purview absent a PRA but if this is what’s required, he can submit one. Member Sako responded she would be happy to fulfill his request but would check with County staff on procedures for it. She hears what he think the intention is and already told what hers is and the impact is that she feels his impugning the integrity of how she’s been interim and vice chair when she’s said numerous times of her intent. Member Cho stated he feels the same of Member Sako being disruptive, consistent pattern of behavior of being disruptive, argumentative, disrespectful, dismissive, patronizing, arrogant and can be subject to this. Member Sako agreed she could be, it’s for everyone. Member Cho said it’s not because according to it, the only people who can bring charges are the Chair and Co-Chair. Member Sako responded there’s already a process in the by-laws for executive officers to be removed. Member Cho asked if that was a threat. Member Sako stated it’s a statement and called a point of order. Member Arneill commented that she’s observed none of the behavior on Member Sako’s part but asked to put a pin in the topic to determine the way in which in her written emails on this subject can be shared and put an end to the discussion which is counter-productive on this matter. There’s a lot to evaluate in terms whether the following acts are the best way to describe the circumstances under which somebody could be removed. Member Cho requested Glenda to record the verbal request for PRA, to start the time clock although, he’s purvue to the information absent it and expects a response as well. Member Sako is happy to find out with County staff as well as Dr. Quist about process if it would just go

Sacramento County Mental Health Board

Executive Committee Meeting

Agenda Item

to Member Cho or the entire board members. Member Arneill stated to give the communication to the whole executive committee on the request for drafting this provision for amending the bylaws. Member Cho agreed.

- Member Arneill inquired on location in bylaws for removal of officers. Co-Chairs' behavior should be subject to this removal policy just like any board member. Also, is it more than just them, their perception, on who's the problem? What if a board member or two who thinks some fellow board member is a problem but the officers aren't perceiving/acting on it, can a board member make a recommendation to an officer that someone be removed that the officer's need to act on it? Those are questions that are raised here. Member Sako agrees their important questions.
- Member Cho stated the criterias are subjective, for a member's unpopular/minority opinion to be thought of as disruptive. It's not a sufficient reason to remove somebody and to weaponize something like this has been apparent from the start. It's compromising the integrity and professionalism of this body. It can't be weaponized and used as a witch-hunt as intended to do. Member Sako agrees some of the language is subjective about what's constituted as disruptive/disorderly. Thinks the fact it requires 2/3 majority vote. Member Cho responded to Member Sako stating that when she speaks, she comes across as a very nice person; articulate, intelligent, compassionate, typical soccer mom and nice neighbor but people doesn't see her actions; the real intent behind her actions and what's behind all of this and that's the real problem. They just see the nice, they don't see the crazy. Members Arneill and Bemis commented that Member Cho's remark was uncalled for. Member Sako agreed and added it was unprofessional. She's taken enough jabs from him. Member Cho responded that it's mutual. Member Sako stated she doesn't know how to move the meeting forward and proceeded to ask if there was a motion to approve bringing the item in front of the general MHB for review and discussion.
- Member Bemis suggests to make edits to the language before bringing it to the board.
- Member Sako asked Glenda if meeting is being recorded to which Glenda confirmed.
- Member Arneill agrees to have it in the by-laws and there are issues to be grappled with about board members wanting to call out somebody that Co-Chairs aren't identified, that the Co-Chairs are covered by this even though they have a separate removal process in the bylaws. Agrees with Member Cho that even though criteria are spelled out, there's an element of subjectivity to them. Also agrees with Member Sako about the 2/3 of the members' vote of the action committed, eliminates some degree of the subjectivity. Lots of complexity. Thinks to make additions before passing to the board. Member Bemis agrees to spell it out a little better and make adjustments to it. Doesn't think it's fair for the Chair/Co-chair to make the decision. Thinks it needs to be back to Counsel to fit it in with everything else.
- Member Sako sees points made that could make it more objective, direct and equal across the board so it doesn't seem the Chair/Co-Chair have the power. And, in the interest of time, this isn't something to be rushed and can be suspended for now to be continued to work on. This was an open item that came up at the January retreat and talked about. If there's a consensus that we don't do this, there could be a vote as well but as was discussed at last Executive meeting this was something that the majority of folks were interested in hearing what County Counsel had to say and is now being brought to the members. Member Arneill asked that the 2 points she made be brought back to Counsel about making sure the criteria apply to removal of Chair/Vice-Chair and about a member wanting to recommend removal of someone, not just Chair/Vice-Chair. Can an ordinary member make a recommendation to the Chair/Vice-Chair? There's nothing about it, if just going back to provisions of Conduct agreement that

Sacramento County Mental Health Board

Executive Committee Meeting

Agenda Item

Chair/Vice-Chair initiate it. We have this presumption that there's this cliquish cabal that makes all of the determinations about behavior would put an end to the whole level of accusation if it can be independent from the Chair/Vice-Chair. Member Bemis, also suggests to take out "conduct unbecoming".

- Member Sako stated this item will not be voted on and will not be put on the April MHB General meeting. Will circle back with Counsel about getting cleared to disclose the correspondence to members of this Executive committee in regards to issue to removal as well as criteria of removal of Chair/Vice-Chair, making it more clear. Also a process of a member bringing a complaint to the Executive committee.
- Member Cho commented that he was in the understanding the meetings were not recorded and asked if this has changed. Glenda responded that she records the meetings specifically for preparing the minutes and nothing is released to the public. Member Cho asked if the meetings of the larger board are records. Glenda responded that she believes they are for minutes only. Member Sako said she gets the notifications for recording for the ASOC but doesn't for the MHB. Glenda responded that she records CSOC and believes Jason records the MHB in helping him with the minutes. Member Arneill stated that once recorded, it's available to the public. Glenda responded that recordings are deleted once minutes are prepared.
- Member Arneill suggests to have meetings recorded for proof and not hearsay of one's actions and should include this topic to a meeting agenda. Should run it by County Counsel to see if recording of meetings for sufficient documentation for grounds of member removal. Knows recordings are permitted in the Brown Act and ask County Counsel for this citation.

VI. Public Comment

- Public Comment 1. Agrees for a formalized process for removal of members on the board. Sees concerns with just having Chair/Co-Chair initiate the process. A lot of the criteria are subjective. Thinks it's a waste of time with an hour-long discussion and nothing decided. Thinks to focus much more on filling the seats on the board before worrying about people off the board and worry about the mental health in Sacramento a lot more.
- Public Comment 2. Process to have any member to bring to Executive Committee to discuss whether to bring to entire board. Also, could there be something already at the BOS for removal? There would be nothing stopping members or the public contacting the BOS pertaining to issues on the MHB. Also, on talk of language not welcomed, there are other language that some people would not like used, like cabal, which is used as an anti-symetic slur.

IV. Adjournment, Chair

- Interim-Chair Sako concluded the meeting at 1:06pm. Next meeting is on April 19.