SAN FRANCISCO

Housing Conservatorship Working Group

MEETING 7 • October 26, 2020 • 1:00-3:00PM • Zoom Platform
AGENDA

- Welcome & Agenda Review
- Implementation Update
- Data Review
- Housing
- Public Comment
- Closing & Next Steps
Established by BOS Ordinance 108-19

**Purpose**

- Conduct evaluation on effectiveness of Housing Conservatorship implementation, and submit reports to the BOS, Mayor, and State Legislature, as required
  - Annual report to BOS and Mayor by January 21, 2021
  - Annual reports to BOS, Mayor, & State beginning January 1, 2021
Implementation Update
Implementation

- Continued collaboration across partners
- Active engagement and outreach for individuals
- Ongoing notice for individuals with 5+ 5150 WIC Holds
- No petitions have been processed by the court
Data Review
PES Data FY 19/20

Information for all individuals seen at PES during FY 19/20

Demographics

- 27.3% between the ages of 30 and 40
- 67.5% Male, 31.2% female, .4% Transman, .6% Transfemale
- 36.5% White, 25.9% African American/Black, 15.0% Latinx, 10.1% Asian, 5.2% Other, 12.8% Unknown

Urgent/Emergent Services

- 77.9% utilized urgent/emergent medical services
- Average of 2.8 visits to PES
PES Data FY 19/20

- **Linkage to Care**
  - 4.1% had contact with primary care during FY
  - 12.8% have an assigned intensive case manager
  - 4.1% are currently LPS conserved

- **Jail Contacts**
  - 25.6% had a jail contact during FY

- **Housing Status**
  - 62.4% are known to have experienced homelessness in the last year (17.7% for 13+ years)
  - 31.6% have been assessed for Coordinated Entry
PES Data FY 19/20

- Linkage to Care
  - 4.1% had contact with primary care during FY
  - 12.8% have an assigned intensive case manager
  - 4.1% are currently LPS conserved

- Jail Contacts
  - 25.6% had a jail contact during FY

- Housing Status
  - 62.4% are known to have experienced homelessness in the last year (17.7% for 13+ years)
  - 31.6% have been assessed for Coordinated Entry
Fiscal Year Comparison - Individuals with 4+ 5150

- **Number of Individuals**
  - FY 18/19: 117
  - FY 19/20: 113

- **Average PES Contacts**
  - FY 18/19: 12
  - FY 19/20: 10

- **% Male**
  - FY 18/19: 66
  - FY 19/20: 64

- **% of population between 40-50**
  - FY 18/19: 32
  - FY 19/20: 29
Fiscal Year Comparison - Individuals with 4+ 5150

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
<th>FY 19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Update
Evaluation Requirement #4 from Health Code

The number of detentions for evaluation and treatment under Section 5150 that occurred in SF during the evaluation period, broken down by the type of authorized person who performed the detention

Data presented at August working group meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Unique Individuals</th>
<th>Total 5150 Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFDPH: Coordinated Care Management System (CCMS)*</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>2,197**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>3,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Hospitals***</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CCMS data represents only those treated at PES
**11 individuals with eight or more 5150s; 450 individuals with more than one 5150
*** includes data from California Pacific Medical Center, Saint Francis Memorial Hospital, St. Mary's Medical Center, and UCSF
Evaluation Updates

- No one conserved yet, so no reporting on any individual level data per the state and health code requirements

- Even if someone is placed on housing conservatorship before December, the data won’t be reflected in the January 2021 report since we’re reporting on the FY2019-20

- Updates for this meeting are for Evaluation Requirement #5 from Health Code
Evaluation Requirement #5 from Health Code

Where a detention under Section 5150 was performed by a peace officer, an explanation as to why the peace officer was the appropriate person to perform the detention

Data sources:

- SFPD data on all officer-involved 5150s in FY 2019-20
- Random sample of SFPD incident reports
Evaluation Requirement #5 from Health Code

Where a detention under Section 5150 was performed by a peace officer, an explanation as to why the peace officer was the appropriate person to perform the detention

Data sources:

• SFPD data on all officer-involved 5150s in FY 2019-20
• Random sample of SFPD incident reports
SFPD Incident Report Data

Parameters of the random sample of SFPD incident reports:

• Reports pulled from FY 2019-20 (7/1/2019—6/30/2020)
• 30 dates selected at random (non-holidays)
• All available incident reports from those dates that resulted in a 5150
• Total of 147 unique reports pulled
### SFPD Incident Report Data

**What can the incident report data tell us?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Data Point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHY are officers called to incidents resulting in Section 5150 detentions?</td>
<td>INCIDENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Type of incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARRATIVE TEXT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Who placed the emergency call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other themes (e.g., threat, weapon, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO is detained under Section 5150 by officers?</td>
<td>DETAINED:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Age, Race, Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE are incidents resulting in officer-involved Section 5150 detentions taking</td>
<td>INCIDENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place?</td>
<td>- District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Location of Occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEN are incidents resulting in officer-involved Section 5150 detentions taking</td>
<td>INCIDENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place?</td>
<td>- Occurrence from date / time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What this analysis *cannot* tell us**
The exact reason *why* officers were called to respond to each of these cases in real time, as they happened, and what other alternatives may have existed.

**What the analysis *can* tell us**
Looking at cases where we *know* in retrospect an officer was dispatched, how often does that seem to have been appropriate?
SFPD Incident Report Data

Location of occurrence

- Southern: 24%
- Mission: 14%
- Tenderloin: 14%
- Central: 12%
- Northern: 8%
- Taraval: 7%
- Ingleside: 6%
- Park: 5%
- Bayview: 5%
- Richmond: 5%
### Age of detained individuals

- **<20**: 2%
- **20-29**: 23%
- **30-39**: 18%
- **40-49**: 22%
- **50-59**: 18%
- **60+**: 14%
- **Unknown**: 1%

### Sex of detained individuals

- **Male**: 57%
- **Female**: 42%
- **Non-binary**: 1%
- **n/a**: 1%

---

SFPD Incident Report Data

Housing Conservatorship Working Group
Race/ethnicity of detained individuals

- White: 48%
- Black/African American: 23%
- Hispanic/Latinx: 12%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 10%
- Unknown: 3%
- Native American: 2%
- n/a: 1%
SFPD Incident Report Data

Qualitative analysis from incident report narratives

- Data on the following slides were collected from the incident narrative text fields

- Text was mined for key themes and patterns but data includes limitations related to inter-rater reliability, quality of narratives, etc.
Who made the emergency call?

- Stranger/no relation: 50%
- Friend, acquaintance, relative: 34%
- Caseworker, social worker, facility staff: 10%
- Police officer, security officer: 5%
Immediate threat to others?

- **Yes**: 5% (e.g. explicit mention of immediate threat, others injured in incidence, etc.)
- **No**: 63% (default code, no mention of threat)
- **Potential**: 31% (e.g. verbal threats, brandishing weapon, etc.)
- **n/a**: 1%
SFPD Incident Report Data

“Weapon” involved?

- 1% Weapon involved
- 24% No weapon involved
- 75% n/a

Was anyone harmed or injured?

- In 78% of incidents, no one was harmed or injured
SFPD Incident Report Data

- Limitations and next steps
- Discussion
January 2021 Report: Overview and Timeline

- Full draft to Working Group: anticipated by December 7th

  - In advance of December 14th working group meeting

- Final report submission January 2021
Coordinated Entry
October 2020
Goal State: Model System

http://hsh.sfgov.org
Problem Solving

Prevent people from entering the Homelessness Response System and to redirect people who can resolve their homelessness without the need for shelter or ongoing support

- Eviction Prevention
- Relocation assistance (e.g., Homeward Bound)
- Family reunification
- Move-in assistance
- Flexible Grants
Housing Assessment

Assessment questionnaire determines priority status score

- Vulnerability
  - Physical and behavioral health
  - Experience of trauma and violence
  - Use of crisis services
  - Experience of Trauma
- Homelessness history: duration of homelessness compared to age
- Barriers to housing, including legal issues, Income and other resources
Housing Referral Status

- **Housing Referral Status**: people experiencing homelessness who are prioritized for housing based on their health **vulnerability, housing barriers, and chronicity of homelessness**
  - Housing status is determined by the HSH Assessment Process
  - Housing status households will be assigned a housing navigator who will match the household with available housing

- **Problem Solving is a continuous resource**
  - Problem solving status households will not be referred to HSH-funded permanent supportive housing, but are encouraged to access problem solving resources

http://dhsh.sfgov.org
Coordinated Entry Clinical Review

- Provides an administrative review process for clients who cannot adequately self-report their own chronicity of homelessness, barriers to housing, or vulnerability
- Clients must participate in the Coordinated Entry process at an Access Point prior to submission
- Available to any provider with a relationship with the client, ideally a case manager
- Contact hshclinicalreview@sfgov.org
Navigation and Referral

- Housing navigators assist priority status individuals with the application process for housing
  - Application paperwork
  - Gathering required documents, such as ID and income verification
  - Reasonable accommodation requirements
  - Determining individual preferences
  - Assistance with interview and move-in

- Stabilization services available for first year after move-in

http://dhsh.sfgov.org
## Access Points: Adults & Families

### Coordinated Entry for Adults

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415-487-3300 x7000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coordinated Entry for Families

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central City Access Point</td>
<td>415-644-0504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Access Point</td>
<td>415-972-1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Access Point</td>
<td>415-430-6320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://hsh.sfgov.org
# Current Access Points: Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinated Entry for Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Access Point for Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Street Youth Center and Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Youth Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Youth Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYRIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://hsh.sfgov.org](http://hsh.sfgov.org)
Behavioral Health Partnerships

- HSH Partners with UCSF to provide Coordinated Entry Assessment in Psychiatric Emergency Services – social workers at PES conduct assessment and clinical review as needed with people during their PES stay.

- HSH and the Department of Public Health are partnering to ensure that visitors to the Behavioral Health Access Center, Intensive Case Management clients and behavioral health treatment participants are connected to Coordinated Entry.

- Coordinated Entry Status is visible to providers in the CareLink (EPIC) System.

http://dhsh.sfgov.org
Process: Housing Conservatorship

All Housing Conservatorship stakeholders are asked to please refer all people experiencing homelessness to Coordinated Entry immediately, well before any Housing Conservatorship filings.

In the case of an 8th 51/50 the Housing Conservatorship team will coordinate with HSH and Coordinated Entry

- If the person is already Housing Referral Status their Housing Navigator will partner with the care team to match them to housing.
- If the person is not yet Housing Referral Status, we will coordinate with the care team to ensure they get an assessment and clinical review as applicable

Point of Contact: HSH Coordinated Entry Manager, Megan Owens

http://dhsh.sfgov.org
Questions or Comments?

Megan Owens
Coordinated Entry Manager

megan.owens@sfgov.org
PUBLIC COMMENT
Upcoming Working Group Meetings:

Dates: Monday December 14, 2020
Time: 1:00-2:30pm

Meetings will be held at 25 Van Ness, Room 610 or Virtual Platform depending on current health recommendations
Email: Housing.Conservatorship-Workgroup@sfdph.org

Website Updates: www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/housingconserv/default.asp