

SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION



**Mayor
London N. Breed**

1380 Howard Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 255-3474 fax: 255-3760
mhb@mhbsf.org
www.mhbsf.org
www.sfgov.org/mental_health

Balham Javier Vigil, Co-Chair
Stephen Banuelos, Co-Chair
Genesis Vasconez, MS, PMHNP-BC, Vice-Chair
Lisa Williams, Secretary
Terezie (Terry) Bohrer, RN, MSW, CLNC
Judith Klain, MPH
Carletta Jackson-Lane, JD
Kescha S. Mason
Liza Murawski
Toni Parks
Harriette Stallworth Stevens, EdD
Lisa Wynn

UNADOPTED MINUTES

Behavioral Health Commission Implementation Committee Meeting Tuesday, May 10, 2022 4:06 PM – 4:45 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call

CHAIR: Stephen Banuelos

COMMISSIONER'S PRESENT: Co Chair Stephen Banuelos, Carlotta Jackson- Lane, Toni Parks (not present), Judith Klain (not present), Keisha S. Mason, Bahlam J. Vigil

QUORUM: established with 4 out of the 6 original commissioners present

Visiting commissioners present: none

Members of the public: Wynship Hillier

Government Code AB361 remote meeting read by Amber Gray

Roll Call Vote: Carletta Jackson- Lane Yes; Keisha S. Mason Yes; Co Chair Javier Vigil Balham-?

Passed by Co chair Stephen Banuelos

Co Chair Banuelos stated that 1.0 does not need to be done 1.1 cannot be done due the minutes not being published. 1.2 is going to be below in 2.0 so before we go to 1.3 lets have public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Wynship Hillier “ regarding Quorum just briefly: When this committee was created. It was created with only 6 seats. There has been no change introduced by for advice by the executive committee since then, which was January 2019. Actually Quorum is 4 people.

1.3 Co Chair Stephen Banuelos asked how this item was added to the agenda.

Executive Director Grier explained that this was apart of the Peter Murphy wanting to return and do a presentation. Do to not further contact we will move on to the next item.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

2.1 follow up on the grievance presentation from BHS. Co Chair Stephen Banuelos solicited comments from others: None and stated that the presentation was spot on from the prospective of BHS. Having worked there he knows what they have to do. I can understand why they may have 50-60 grievances to deal with. That being the case as far as the law is concerned. Grievances are based on if services were denied and hearings regarding that. His impression was that people were not expecting to hear this.

Executive Director Grier explained that he took the time out after a meal and workout that he attempted to file out a grievance form himself and found it to be to be complicated and convoluted and gets people involved in Medi –Cal verses Medical. He can imagine being in an assisted living care facility. It would be an extreme Burdon. He stated that he believes what he was hearing That It needs to be more stream lined, more efficient, and it needs to have more person to person.

Co Chair Vigil commented: just to echo it terms of the resolution we’ve passed to allow us to work on this. There are some bureaucrat questions and ways they have to follow through with. He is wondering if there ‘s a way we could get rid of some of the red tape to try to stream lined the process and make it more accessible to people so they could go through the grievance process.

Carlotta Jackson- Lane stated she was not present for the actual grievance process, however, in terms of the actual grievance process the City and County of San Francisco and those programs funded by the Department of Public Health. It has been essential to the site visits to have the interactions with the clients. The language is that their cannot be any retaliation, however there’s a fear factor regarding there housing being at risk. Maybe we would consider continuing to have this on the implementation committee. It is dear to C. Toni Parks.

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos stated I would keep that in mind. You could spend a lot of time filling all this time filling all this paperwork out and it has nothing to do with being denied services and the behavioral health department can say we are providing services what you are

complaining about is not under our purview. We are going to have more this unrelated to problems that are important to the consumers with Behavioral health conditions. We are getting more reports about conditions of the shelter in place hotels. These are important to the people we serve as it relates to already pre existing behavioral health conditions. It may cause for a whole new intervention. We use to have an ombudsmen to address these matters, however he's not sure if there 's actually one in place at the present time. We may need to continue this discussion until we can come up with a more positive solution or way to address these concerns. We can take these concerns to the BHS.

2.2 Strategic Plan: Is there anything on this item anyone would like to comment on? No Comments

2.3 Review of the Care Court proposal: Discussion

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos stated previous comments for the commissioners are do we want to do anything formal around this item? Should we send our comments to the state as the commission or work individually?

Carlotta Jackson- Lane stated: I believe this is very important and there are 2 major sides, some pros and some cons. What she would think is that if we took this issue to the Executive committee to see if we could take it to the full Commission. This is the type of issue were the commission could decide if we would like to have a direct statement from BHC or individuals continue to interact around the issue and bring information back to the commission. However it feels more comfortable and productive.

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos commented He would make sure that this shows up on the executive committee in less than an hour for a larger discussion in the meeting next week and we would be the ears of Dr. Kunins and public members.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

Follow up on RFP- he asked Dr. Kunins to update on her discussion on her power point presentation, which is on line. She did a 40-minute presentation. Part of her Power point is she talks about having a RFP in the process. The process for getting a program means that you have input from community members of the public. They work with that to put together formal proposal to be to be judged by a group of panelist. This is how the contract would be developed. Maybe we could be on this panelist. The commissioners have been on these panels in the past, however we need to know if BHS would agree to this. Anyone we talk to would have an advantage and we may need to be silent about this.

Carlotta Jackson- Lane stated thinks that when we had the SF committee that just came up she had suggested we look into this and believes this is a valuable source for the commission. We are supposed to look out for the public interest. In this case what a better way to do this with a new contract. We could be in on the ground floor. In terms of our state mandates as it relates to the commission. We were mandated to be a part of that interview panels. There's president

were we have done these interactions on panels, So when we do these RFP interview there is a community organization and government body and so fourth, so why not allow the BHC to have one of the barcodes and be apart of the process.

Executive Director Grier explained I concur with Commissioner Jackson-Lane that there should be presence of the BHC on every aspect of BHS movement. That is the charge of The BHC to identify, be on top of, keep the community fully versed and provide input. To counter react concerns of co chair being compromised. The commission does not handle any funds or allocate funds to any agencies and only our impartial site visits review would be the only thing considered in the evaluation process. I just want to put this out there for thought as you consider pondering

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos stated I would bring this up in the executive committee that we as a commission would like to be apart of this process. I will bring this up to Jessica Brown Director of MHSA. They're not going be to done with this in the near future.

Any further comments on this subject: No

2.5 Update on the Website:

Executive Director Grier explained that he wanted to do a presentation. He has done some evaluation and has found the website to be more user friendly. We had a media portion, however they took that part done and we can post a live link and we could pot links, events, and pictures. They were going to leave our history out but I did talk to them about migrating our history at least the last ten years.

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos is there a chance this could happen in June?

Executive Director Grier explained if I could finish the evaluation. It could get everything together It can probably go live in June. At that point, the implementation committee can be instrumental in finalizing what goes on the site.

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos I've been digging recently more into the Mental health SF work group website where he saw Dr. Kunins 4 hour power point presentation on there websites and there's a lot that could go on a website. That would be great

The platform is much larger and it could bring us into the next generation. When he can get a chance he will run a demo for the commission, so everyone can get a chance to look under the hood.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Wynship Hillier "I have done some digging around in the archives of the Health Commission on multiple occasions not the current but the prior the one existing. A whole previous wed site has been archived to through Archive.org and the public library may have something to do with this. They maintain paper copies of some of the minutes and agendas going back to the 1990's

and you should look into that. I think the current website can be archived and wouldn't need to be migrated over. It worries me when the Co- chair speaks of bringing up things at the executive meeting because everything discussed has to be on the agenda so you cannot have this discussion. This meeting was not properly posted the public it never got post do it not having the correct dates on it. I'm surprised the attitude has changed as if it is okay now also you lack Quorum."

Executive Director Grier explained "While Mr. Hillier is right, the meeting was posted to the website and was publically accessible to the public. The question of Quorum, I myself would error on the side of caution, and probably would have defaulted to a discussion only however we are already there. I just want to put that on the record.

3.0 COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORT:

Co Chair Stephen Banuelos Maybe that something we could change in the future. It seems a little redundant. Any committee members wish to report on their research and actions? None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

4.0 NEXT ACTION ITEMS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS - NONE

PUBLIC COMMENT: Wynship Hillier, I just wanted to say, please read the e-mail. These items are not supposed to be on the agenda. These items are not legal but items legal on the state law but prohibited by local law. The Sunshine task force has supported me on this. If you have a specific item or report you want on the agenda. You must put it in writing and send it to the chair or person that writes up the agenda. So that you item are put on the agenda they are not legal under the Sunshine Ordinance. These are general headings sort of order of business and they are not legal due to insufficient notice under the Sunshine Ordinance

FINAL PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

Meeting Adjourned at 4:45pm by Co Chair Stephen Banuelos

Minutes prepared by Amber Gray, BHC Clerk