

Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group Approved Meeting Minutes

July 27, 2021 | 9:30 – 1:00 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 9:32 am (estimated)

Committee Members Present: Dr. Scott Arai, Psy. D., Kara Chien, J.D., Dr. Vitka Eisen, M.S.W., Ed.D, Steve Fields, M.P.A., Dr. Ana Gonzalez, D.O., Dr. Hali Hammer, M.D., Dr. Monique LeSarre, Psy. D., Andrea Salinas, L.M.F.T., Amy Wong, Phillip Jones.

Committee Members Absent: Shon Buford, Jameel Patterson, Sara Shortt, M.S.W.

2. Welcome and Review of Agenda

Dr. Monique LeSarre, IWG Chair, opened the meeting, welcoming IWG members and the public to the meeting. She reviewed the meeting goals and agenda and invited IWG members to read Group Agreements. Chair LeSarre reviewed the MHSF components, along with a reminder of the staff that will present on those components. Member Hammer suggested that the notes be provided to presenters to ensure that the notes are accurate. Member Fields agreed with this suggestion. Chair LeSarre agreed and acknowledged that other members were nodding in agreement on camera.

3. Discussion Item #1: Approve Meeting Minutes

Member Hammer inquired if the IWG meeting minutes are provided to the presenters to ensure that their content of the presentation is being accurately captured. Facilitator James stated that the Central City Planning team reviews the notes and that they are not provided to presenters. Heather Littleton informed the IWG that if there are any inaccuracies in the notes to let them know.

4. Public Comment for Discussion Item #1

No public comment.

5. Action on Discussion Item #1

Member Fields moved to approve the June 2021 meeting minutes; Member Eisen seconded the motion. Meeting minutes were approved by the IWG.

6. Discussion Item #2: Principles to Apply When Developing MHSF Recommendations

Chair LeSarre informed the IWG that Discussion Item #2 will be postponed and addressed in August. Facilitator Jennifer James explained that the start time provided to the IWG in their Outlook invite did not match the time for the start time posted on the public agenda and, as a result, the item had been removed.

7. Discussion Item #3: MHSF Foundation

Chair LeSarre introduced the new Director of Administration and Operations Kelly Kirkpatrick, Director of Administration and Operations, Mental Health SF at San Francisco Department of Public Health.

Director Kirkpatrick gave the IWG a high-level overview of Proposition C, Our City, Our Home, funds. She informed the IWG that any deeper programmatic questions will be forwarded and answered later. She also informed the IWG that Dr. Pating will go into detail regarding New Beds & Facilities. She reminded the IWG of what Proposition C is and reviewed the ongoing, annualized spending. She also showed the comparison for three different fiscal years and the allocations for the different MHSF components and other investments to serve persons experiencing homelessness.

Discussion:

Member Salinas inquired about the Office of Coordinated Care (OCC's) budget allocation for Case Management expansion and about the projected increase of slots. She also inquired if Proposition F funds would be used for the MHSF expansion. Director Kirkpatrick deferred the Intensive Care Management (ICM) question to Marlo Simmons. Director Kirkpatrick reminded the IWG of the purposed of Proposition F and that these funds would be allocated to MHSF if the courts had ruled against the 50% threshold for Prop C.

Deputy Director Marlo Simmons informed the IWG that the August meeting will review OCC in more detail. She continued by saying that MHSF legislation outlines 3 different levels of case management and that SFDPH is expanding across all the levels.

Member Fields inquired if budget presented for the Mental Health Services Center (MHSC) is going to be presented to the IWG before it is finalized. Director Kirkpatrick indicated that SFDPH wanted to allocated funds and is looking forward to IWG input. Member Fields asked if there has been a location selected for the MHSC. Director Kirkpatrick explained that SFDPH wants input in the design. Member Fields inquired if there will be other supporting revenue, besides Prop C revenue.

Member Eisen inquired if staff wages and salaries are being taken into consideration when putting together the budget for beds and slots. Director Kirkpatrick stated that the budget is based on the average contracted rates for the type of beds. Member Eisen expressed concern that there is a staffing issue due to current rates and suggested that they are, perhaps, ineffective rates.

Member Wong asked for clarification on how funds will be allocated to the various programs and areas of focus, particularly the long-term beds. Director Kirkpatrick reminded the IWG that Dr. Pating will give more details in his presentation. She continued by stating most beds will be opening this fiscal year.

Chair LeSarre expressed concern over the domains not addressing conversations around Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) violence and other social issues. She clarified her concern by giving an example about the experience within her program. Dr. Hillary Kunins stated that DPH works to incorporate anti-racist practice across services – from training within the department to contracted providers. Dr. Kunins acknowledged that the presentation was not explicit on how these issues would be and are currently being addressed. Chair LeSarre stated that providers would like to be able to provide services to individuals with significant challenges.

8. Discussion Item #4 Drug Sobering Center Refinement of Recommendations and Voting

Facilitator James reviewed the Recommendation RoadMap and reminded the IWG where they are the recommendation development process. She also shared what is appropriate and what to be aware of in relation to conflict of interest around the DSC. She also stated that Deputy Attorney, John Givner, will be at the August meeting to provide more clarification.

Member Eisen asked for clarification of the word "recuse." Facilitator James stated that if an IWG member must recuse themselves, they have to leave the meeting as a Panelist, but may return as an attendee. Member Eisen states that she recuses from the Drug Sobering Center conversation.

Member Hammer requested clarification about the general types of items that can be discussed. Heather Littleton stated that if the discussion is general then it is okay. She referred Member Hammer to John Givner.

Chair LeSarre provided input that the goal is to achieve transparency and that there is no perceived influence by the IWG.

Member Fields indicated that he has spoken with John Givner and expressed that it is challenging to find a balance in providing input in one's area of expertise. He continued to ask for clarification around what "that part of the discussion" refers to. Facilitator James provided an example of an agency providing input on New Beds and then applying to be a contractor for that area. Heather Littleton added clarification that providing input on general discussions and deferred to John Givner for guidance on more detailed discussions. Member Fields stated that there are also certain items that are voted for that would require a recusal.

Member Salinas expressed her concern that if those individuals that work in the field are not a part of the discussion it would defeat the purpose of having an Implementation Work Group. She continued that the IWG just provides categorical input. She suggested that John Givner be available in real time to provide guidance regarding the conversation. Heather Littleton stated that John Givner will be available during August meeting and will be available via text. She indicated that she is taking notes and will follow up with John Givner.

Facilitator James stated that the conversation would move to the DSC recommendations. Member Arai reviewed the Drug Sobering Center additional recommendations.

Section 1 Discussion:

Facilitator Ashlyn Dadkhah informed the IWG that these recommendations were provided to DPH for feedback and then Heather Littleton asked for clarification if the IWG meant that no new centers would be opened outside of the current DSC plans. Member Arai confirmed that the assumption is correct, and that the recommendation is that there not be new sobering centers until the IWG has mapped out the current service system. Member Fields supports this recommendation.

Member Wong stated that the group expressed wanting a clear mapping of all services and existing programs and so that MHSF programs are duplicates. She reiterated that the IWG does not want to stop opening programs.

Presenter Emeterio Garcia informed the IWG that these draft recommendations were shared with the DPH team and that they are in alignment with said recommendations.

Section 2 Discussion:

Member Hammer informed the IWG that some IWG members and DPH staff met for a productive process in developing MHSF legislation. She indicated that it might be helpful to provide some of

those documents to the IWG to provide some background on why items were included in the legislation.

Member Fields asked for clarification regarding Recommendation #5. Member Arai stated that it is for individuals who get picked up from the street, ensuring that family or pets should be provided support at the program while the individual is recuperating. Member Fields suggested a change to the wording of the recommendation. Member Hammer suggested additional wording to clarify recommendation and make it more inclusive.

Member Salinas suggested providing clarity around providing resources for families, if needed. Member Arai suggested that might be a different recommendation. Facilitator James clarified the recommendation. Member Salinas stated that it is good to ensure a warm handoff for services to those who are not going to the DSC.

Section 3 Discussion:

Member Jones suggested doing outreach and education for those individuals that will be using the center. Member Salinas added that DPH clinics should also be engaged.

Section 4 Discussion:

Heather Littleton requested that there be an addition made to recommendation #2 for clarity. Chair LeSarre suggested adding words to address accountability by implementing a plan for pay equity. Member Fields also suggested wording to clarify the pay parity between DPH and contracted providers. Member Chien engaged in a discussion regarding using DPH enriched staff to run the program or to train CBOs. Member Wong indicated that DPH staff would provide more continuity of care and would be more cost-effective in the long run than CBOs. Member Fields stated that there is no data that city and contract providers differ in providing services.

Chair LeSarre indicated that recommendation #2 does not seem like it is in the right place. Member Wong stated that if the work is contracted, training must be provided.

The group did a poll to assess level of agreement with the revised recommendations. One IWG member who still sees issues and Facilitator James invited that person to address their concerns. Member Wong indicated that she has an issue with Section 4, Recommendation #2 is more about supporting the community. Chair LeSarre suggested a change to that recommendation. Member Wong stated that if the IWG voted, she would vote yes.

9. Public Comment for Discussion Item #4: Drug Sobering Center Recommendations

Caller 1 expressed that she works for the BHC and she has seen staff turnover. She indicated that there are between 104-107 beds that are missing from the report provided.

10. Vote on Discussion Item #4: Drug Sobering Center Recommendations

Member Fields moved to approve the Drug Sobering Center Recommendations; Member Salinas seconded the motion. All members voted to approve the Drug Sobering Center Recommendations

11. Discussion Item #5: New Beds and Facilities Discussion

Chair LeSarre introduced the presenters for New Beds and Facilities and reminded the IWG to focus on design, outcomes and effectiveness.

Facilitator James reviewed the recommendation roadmap and the conflict of interest for this item. She informed the IWG that Member Arai has recused himself from this conversation. Member Wong asked for clarification if she needs to recuse herself. Deputy Director Simmons provided guidance for Member Wong.

Dr. David Pating presented on the overview, design strategy, service expansion plan, and engaged the IWG in providing their support. He provided more detail regarding the Bed Optimization Report, which was completed by a consulting company.

Discussion:

Member Eisen suggested defining the terminology for the different types of bed.

Member Fields acknowledged Dr. Pating for a thorough presentation. He inquired if the treatment program has been turned into an enhanced Board and Care program. Dr. Pating stated that these are transitional residential beds. Member Fields states that the legislation calls for expansion of residential treatment and not Board and Care, and expressed hope that there will be broader expansion of the continuum. Member Fields states that this report is missing supporting individuals who are coming out of jail. Dr. Pating clarified that the model did not specify where the individuals came from, but it will serve those from jail or hospital.

Chair LeSarre indicated that there would be a Data Request sent out to IWG members.

Member Salinas expressed concern that individuals are being linked to ICM providers and, if they are out of county, there is no ability to begin providing services for individuals. She expressed concern on how the transition creates an extra barrier for the community providers. She also expressed concerns with beds being sent out of the county and causing members to be sent out of their home. Member Pating indicated that they are working closely with OCC to ensure good handoffs. He acknowledged that it is a problem and that he continues to work on this. He addressed the concern regarding individuals being sent to out of county beds and indicates that the plan is for out of county beds to be temporary. Emeterio Garcia (Eme) indicated that the current provider is in the East Bay and plans to expand into San Francisco and that the individual can come back and reunite with their families. He also stated that they have a day program that can serve individuals with ambulatory issues. Member Salinas suggested giving thought to a Board and Care with a harm reduction model.

Member Chien requested a definition of the outcome measures. Member Chien elevated the issue regarding individuals coming out of jail and that some treatment facilities may turn them away because of their records. She suggested having a "justice facility" model. She inquired if there will be a final portal for individuals who complete their treatment. Dr. Pating indicated that he will add these questions to the list to allow time for other members to ask questions.

Chair LeSarre states that the remainder of the questions will be acknowledged but not answered today, due to time.

Member Jones inquired if the beds increased due to funding or due to needs of the populations that are being served. Dr. Pating indicated that it is a combination of scenarios and meet all the needs.

Member Wong inquired why Hummingbird is not part of the Residential Facility. She also inquired why the 14 beds are being contracted out, when those beds can be used for housing. Member Wong elevated Member Salinas' concern regarding sending clients out of county.

12. Public Comment for Discussion Item #5

Sarah Larson expressed that she is perplexed why BHC Board and Care were left off the list. She indicated that permanent beds are being contracted out as temporary beds. She expressed that she hopes that someone can address her concerns before the next meeting.

Dr. Pating stated that the overall goal is to provide the best care at the most restrictive level.

13. Discussion Item #6: Public Comment on any matters within the Working Group's jurisdiction not on the agenda

No public comment.

14. Adjourn

Facilitator James reviewed the Potential IWG Meeting Topics.

The next meeting will be on August 24, 2021 from 9:00 AM- 1:00 pm

Meeting adjourned at 1:10 PM (estimated)