

Statement for BOS Meeting 1/15/13

Good morning. I am Annis Pereyra, a MHC consumer rep. from District II, acting as an official rep of the MHC in the interview process for CCC Mental Health Director. I am speaking today to publicly voice my concerns as a taxpayer, consumer, and family member who was challenged by my moral and ethical responsibility to the consumers and families I represent, still struggling with my participation in the selection process. I have had previous experience with the interview process for the Mental Health Dept. This interview process was vastly different to my prior experience.

My observations are as follows:

- There was no confidentiality agreement before the interview process began, and no discussion of ground rules. After the first day of interviews, I heard comment from the community about each candidate, and after the 2nd day I heard how individual panel members had voted, and voiced concern about this.
- I believe that there were individual panel members who should have recused themselves from voting on certain applicants due to conflict of interest. I was approached by one such contractor before all candidates had been interviewed; specifically attempting to influence my choice of a candidate that contractor has a strong relationship with.
- The Behavioral Health Director repeatedly stated that all on the interview panel were there by her invitation.
- The Behavioral Health Director made a comment directly following the interview of one candidate, stating that she had tuned the candidate out during the interview because she could not stand to listen to her. This particular candidate was the most highly qualified of all candidates interviewed. This comment influenced the vote I cast and this action on my part has caused me the deepest regret.

- The BHD allowed extra questions to be asked of a candidate on the second day of interviews instead of following the list of prepared questions. I voiced concern because I believed the usual process was to ask only the prepared questions. If all interviewers were allowed to ask any questions we wanted, I would have asked questions of other candidates, including questions to candidates on the first day.
- I tried to express doubts during the process. I repeatedly brought up my concerns during the interviews about the lack of line-staff representation and in general, lack of meaningful stakeholder inclusion in the integration process. In addition, I voiced concern about how poor communication has been between the new Behavioral Health Division, and how that lack of communication has fostered distrust and suspicion. I more specifically voiced the opinion that this was an opportunity to create a fresh start and a move to calm fears and foster cooperation among all stakeholders.
- The Mental Health Commission members on the interview panel had no opportunity to hold a conversation to form an opinion so that the entire body of the MHC could stand before the community and endorse this selection process. The selection process was an item on the MHC agenda but was not opened to discussion during the meeting following the interviews.
- I telephoned the BHD after the selection was completed, voicing my discomfort with the process. She stated that she was also not ready to move the process forward due to concerns. A second meeting was called, but at that time the BHD left me to fend for myself to express my conflict. At that meeting, all others voiced the opinion that the decision should proceed.

Therefore, as an advocate for consumers and families, I absolutely cannot endorse the selection process and firmly support the union position.

Kathi McLaughlin
706 Soto St.
Martinez, Ca 94553
(925) 372-6886
kathimclaughlin@comcast.net

TESTIMONY TO CONTRA COSTA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RE: PROCESS TO APPOINT MENTAL HEALTH DIRECTOR

Good morning members of the Board and public. My name is Kathi McLaughlin and I am a decades-long child advocate, family member, and consumer. I have been doing this as a volunteer for more years than most of you have been in office. I am also an elected official, having been re-elected to my 4th term as a local school board member and serving at a state-level as a delegate to the California School Boards Association. I mention my local and state elected positions because I believe it gives me additional insight and understanding about the expectations for integrity and transparency in the hiring of anyone who will be interpreting public regulations and serving as our public representative. Because I have very serious concerns about Contra Costa's process, I am here to ask you to postpone this appointment of Steven Grolic McClurg as Mental Health Director.

As the Chair of the Santa Clara County Mental Health Board I participated in the selection and appointment process for their Mental Health Director. I am intimately familiar with the process and its legal and ethical requirements to include consumers and family members. Although I know Steven personally and respect him as a provider representative on the MHSA stakeholder committee, I question his qualifications for this important position. His most recent employment is as the Clinical Director of Rubicon, a community based program serving homeless and/or mentally ill adults. At Rubicon he supervised less than 25 people and was not directly responsible for the agency's budget of just \$15.5 million (with only \$7.3 million of that from government sources). He did not report to the Board of Directors of the agency. It is a big step, some might say an insurmountable one, to move from that position to directing a public agency supervising more than 400 employees, providing services to thousands of children and adults in need of mental health services, with a multi-million dollar budget and significant legal reporting requirements.

As an elected official myself, I question the lack of transparency involved in this selection process, especially its lack of consumer and family representation. The support information the Board was provided is inaccurate and makes it appear that there was more diverse representation than was actually the case:

- There was no representation from CPAW (the MHSA stakeholder oversight committee). Although Sam Yoshioka (a member of both the Mental Health Commission and CPAW) is listed as representing CPAW, he actually

represented the Commission and there was **never** a vote by CPAW to make him our representative. In fact, we were never asked to send a representative or consulted in this process.

- The representatives from both Local 1 and Local 21 were NOT selected by their peers. Their names were in fact submitted by their supervisors.
- There was no representation from family members of children
- Consumer and family member representation was limited at best
- The representation from the contractors' appears to include people with significant conflict of interest concerns, not to mention that contractors were allowed to pick their representatives while both unions were denied that privilege.

Ten days ago I asked for, and less than 16 hours ago received, information about the selection process and related documents. I have not yet had time to review the 111 pages of information provided. I have shared this information with our union representatives, interested advocates, and the press, and respectfully request that you postpone your decision until we have all had time to review this information. The fact that it took so long to respond to my public information request, and the volume of information provided, coupled with the initial attempt to delegate this job to the Health Services Director without a public review seems to me to require at the least a postponement of this appointment pending further public review and comment.

Teresa Pasquini
2536 Heide Court
El Sobrante, CA 94803
January 15, 2013

Good morning Chair Glover and Supervisors. My name is Teresa Pasquini, I am a lifetime resident of West Contra Costa County with 35 years of lived experience as a family member with the public mental health system. I have a brother who is an older adult currently being served in the West County MH clinic. I have an adult son whose 12th permanent LPS Conservatorship renewal hearing will occur today at 11a.m. I have skin in this game literally. My comments today are only as a sister and mother.

As a Contra Costa Mental Health Commissioner for the past 6 ½ years, I have had the privilege of working with consumers, families and staff across the continuum both county and cbos. As the Commission liaison to the Mental Health Coalition and the Consolidated Planning and Advisory Workgroup for MHSA, I have worked with all stakeholders through out the MHSA implementation. We have worked hard to develop strong bonds of trust and partnership, even when we disagree. The

BH Integration process, concerns about MHSA Finances and the questionable hiring process of the mental health director have damaged that trust and partnership.

As the niece of Henry Clarke, the beloved former leader of PEU Local One, my ties to labor are strong. The selection interview panel may have included a Local 1 and Local 21 member but it was not a member selected by the union. That is unacceptable. The Commission selected its own representatives; the Alliance selected its own representatives but line staff and managers were not given the respect to self select their reps. Most disturbing is the fact that there were no direct users of this public mental health system invited to the process. We cannot claim we have an inclusive community driven stakeholder system and then selectively exclude those who are trying to work and live in that system every day.

In my email to the Board on December 19th I stated strong support for the positions of both Local One and the managers of Local 21. I specifically questioned the fact that WI Code 5607 had not been honored. This is something that I raised at the November meeting of the Mental Health Commission after I protested the failure to allow a public discussion of the

appointment. I asked why it was not going before the BOS and received no response. We were prevented from an opportunity to have a report back from our representatives on this selection process.

In further communication with Supervisor Mitchoff I gave additional details of my concerns about the interview process but also stated that there were additional concerns about the integration of the BH Division and the low morale of the mental health line staff and managers that I have repeatedly discussed at the Commission, the BH Steering Committee and privately with several county leaders.

I have served this community in endless ways to assist in transforming and integrating our system from any door-to-door. I have bared my soul and pain as a mother of an adult son with serious and persistent mental illness who has been forgotten by many and I have fought for others who have no mom. My comments are not directed against Mr. McClurg but they are directed against cronyism and abuse of public process. I stand in solidarity with the 400 plus members of the mental health division of CCC in requesting that this appointment not be ratified.