

Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group Approved Meeting Minutes

January 26, 2021 | 9:30 AM – 12:25 PM

This meeting was held by WebEx pursuant to the Governor's Executive Orders and Mayoral Emergency Proclamations suspending and modifying requirements for in-person meetings. During the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) emergency, the Mental Health San Francisco Implementation Working Group will convene remotely until the it is legally authorized to meet in person.

Note: The agenda, meeting materials, and video recording will be posted at the Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group website:

<https://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/mentalhlth/Implementation.asp>

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 PM.

Committee Members Present: Scott Arai, Psy. D.; Shon Buford; Kara Chien, J.D.; Vitka Eisen, M.S.W., Ed.D; Steve Fields, M.P.A.; Ana Gonzalez, D.O.; Hali Hammer, M.D.; Philip Jones; Monique LeSarre, Psy. D.; Jameel Patterson; Andrea Salinas, L.M.F.T.; Sara Shortt, M.S.W.; Amy Wong.

Committee Members Absent: None.

2. Welcome and Review of Agenda

Jennifer James, IWG Facilitator from Harder+Company Community Research opened the meeting, welcoming the IWG members and the public to the meeting.

3. Discussion Item #1: Approve Meeting Minutes

No comments or amendments from IWG members on the December 2020 meeting minutes.

4. Public Comment for Discussion Item #1: Approve Meeting Minutes

No public comment on the approval of the December 2020 meeting minutes.

5. Action on Item #1

Member Fields moved to approve the December 2020 meeting minutes; Member Chien seconded the motion. All members approved the December 2020 minutes.

6. Discussion Item #2: DPH Behavioral Health Services Overview and Mental Health SF Budget Overview

Marlo Simmons, Acting Director Behavioral Health Services (BHS), provided an overview to the IWG on how MHSF fits within the context of BHS and other initiatives. She presented BHS revenue, investments, approach to systems of care, and demographic information on clients served (e.g., race/ethnicity, geographic location, primary diagnoses). Also included were system challenges to addressing the behavioral health needs of San Franciscans, and opportunities to address the

challenges with recent legislative changes and financial investments related to Medi-Cal Reform, Prop C, and MHSF. Acting Director Simmons shared the BHS three-year plan which includes strategic investments to improve care experience, enhance the workforce, focus on equity, ensure quality and safety for clients, and ensure financial stewardship.

Jenny Louie, Acting CFO at San Francisco Department of Public Health, provided an overview of the MHSF Budget. She presented information on the three principles driving investments for BHS: meet people where they are, make it easier to access care, and provide more locations for treatment and respite. She also reviewed the proposed spending plan for the BHS initiatives and how they map to MHSF components.

Many of the IWG members had questions about BHS initiatives:

- Member Buford was interested in better understanding how DPH will coordinate with CBOs and other departments.
 - Acting BHS Director Simmons noted this will be the role of the Office of Coordinated Care
- Member Fields had several questions and comments: wanted to ensure recidivism of substance abuse will also be addressed, in addition to prevention and early intervention; asked about the MHSF budget and opportunities for additional funding; and was interested in understanding the balance of new programming versus realignment of existing case management services for the target population.
 - Acting BHS Director Simmons responded that programming would include addressing long-term substance abuse, as well as prevention and early intervention; that there were funds available through Prop A that could be tapped for facilities as well as an opportunity to ask the budget committee for one-time facilities funds; and that existing case management services would align with the goals identified in MHSF
- Member Salinas asked for more information on infrastructure costs and resources for case management.
 - Acting BHS Director Simmons responded that the details have not yet been figured out.
- Member Patterson emphasized the increasing need in the southeast portion of the city and the need for partnership with CBO and a focus on holistic health.
- Member LeSarre echoed comments from other members including the importance of BHS systems talking to each other and changes in demographics of southeast portion of the city; she also shared concerns about pay equity and the need to employ more African American/Black and Native American staff in order to address disparities in outcomes; was curious about structures for IWG accountability; and emphasized a need for a focus on individual nutrition and community violence to address the needs of the MHSF priority population.
 - Acting BHS Director Simmons responded that they are trying to figure out how to change billing structures to achieve outcomes and that this would happen over the next few years; there is a lot still to figure out with the Office of Coordinated Care, but that it will play a key role in coordinating all of the systems; that they will be looking at innovative pilots to help employ more African American/Black and Native American staff and that they have received some state funding to address supporting African American/Black staff specifically; and that DPH needs a violence response plan and is on the list of things for BHS to develop
- Member Jones emphasized the unique needs of current and former foster youth and justice involved individuals; was curious to learn more about the peer program, including qualifications, compensation, and referral process; and incentivizing engagement of services after initial interventions with the Street Crisis Response Team.
- Member Eisen emphasized the importance of engaging health plans in MHSF; addressing the lack of communication between systems; and budget planning for MHSF.
 - Acting BHS Director Simmons responded that the health plans are not actively involved at the moment, but will be engaged in the future.

- Member Shortt asked for the IWG to discuss the revenue for budgeted items and other possible funding sources for the City.

7. Public Comment for Discussion Item #2

Public commenter shared that the Behavioral Health Access Center is not well known among community members and there is no signage and asked this to be addressed.

8. Discussion Item #3: Planning Framework Elements

Harder+Company Community Research continued to review the planning framework with a focus on the group agreements, decision-making processes, and principles for developing recommendations. This was a continuation of the planning framework review from the December meeting. After each section Harder+Company took an informal "straw poll" to ensure that Members approved each section of the framework. Members took turns reading the proposed group agreements. Member LeSarre asked that a group agreement that centers around equity should be added. After reviewing the decision-making process, Member LeSarre commented in the chat that she prefers consensus for minutes and substantive decisions. Member Shortt asked to review the original language of the recommendation principles included in the ordinance. The recommendation principles were tabled and the IWG will return to discussing the principles at the next meeting. All materials related to the IWG planning framework can be found on the IWG website:

<https://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/mentalhlth/Implementation.asp>

The group will do final discussion and a formal vote on the planning framework have been adequately reviewed. This will be revisited during the February meeting.

9. Public Comment for Discussion Item #3

Public commenter reported that the public cannot see the chat between IWG members and asked to make it visible per the Sunshine Act.

10. Discussion Item #4: Chair and Vice-Chair Selection

Harder+Company Community Research led the IWG through the selection of the Chair and Vice-Chair. Member LeSarre and Member Patterson were interested in these leadership roles. They each spoke for several minutes about their interest and experiences. Harder+Company conducted an informal poll to identify which member would be the Chair candidate and which would be the Vice-Chair. Member LeSarre received the majority of votes in the poll, and thus Member LeSarre was the candidate for Chair and Member Patterson the candidate for Vice-Chair.

11. Public Comment for Discussion Item #4

No Public Comment

12. Action for Discussion Item #4

The IWG unanimously voted in Member LeSarre as their Chair and Member Patterson as their Vice-Chair.

13. Public Comment on any matters within the Working Group's jurisdiction not on the agenda

No Public Comment

14. Adjourn

The third meeting will be Tuesday, February 23, 2021 at 9:30 AM.

Meeting adjourned at 12:25 PM.