



San Francisco Department of Public Health

Housing Conservatorship Workgroup: Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 16, 2019 @ 12:30-2pm
1380 Howard, Room 515

In attendance:

Chair	Angelica Almeida, Ph.D. (SFDPH)
Workgroup Members	Kelly Dearman (Seat 1), Jessica Lehman (Seat 2), Simon Pang (Seat 3), Jennifer Esteen (Seat 4), Rachel Rodriguez (Seat 5), Sara Shortt (Seat 6), Dr. Irene Sung (Seat 8), Jose Orbeta (Seat 9), Jill Nielsen (Seat 10), Dara Papo (Seat 11), Sgt. Kelly Kruger (Seat 12)
Evaluation Team	Rami Arafah (Harder+Company Community Research), Tsuyoshi Onda (Harder+Company Community Research)

Welcome and Agenda Review

Angelica Almeida, Ph.D. welcomed everyone to the meeting, provided an overview of the planned agenda, and reviewed the duties and charge of the working group.

Population Data

Dr. Almeida presented data that members of the working group were interested in exploring further from the previous meeting (Nov 18, 2019). These data included demographic information on the 117 individuals who had four or more WIC §5150 holds and were seen at Psychiatric Emergency Services (PES) during Fiscal Year 2018-2019. In addition, data on the use of urgent and emergency services, linkage to ongoing care, and the number of individuals assessed for coordinated entry (32%) among this population were shared with the working group. Working members raised several topics for discussion based on the data, including:

- The disproportionately large representation of African American individuals among this sample (30%) given the racial composition of San Francisco, which the working group expressed interest in exploring further at a subsequent meeting. Jill Nielsen noted that the African American caseload for LPS conservatorships could also be provided at a meeting in the near future.
- The number of individuals that would be AOT-eligible, likely a small number among this group.
- Reasons why everyone was not assessed for coordinated entry, given their level of need, and a discussion on the self-reported nature of the assessment.

Evaluation Update

Rami Arafah, Ph.D., from Harder+Company Community Research, gave an overview of the evaluation update prepared for this meeting, including reporting requirements and available data, limitations of the data, and next steps. Preliminary data on the number of 5150s that occurred in San Francisco during Fiscal Year 2018-2019 was outlined using two data sources: the SFDPH Coordinated Care Management System (CCMS) and SFPD’s database. Dr. Arafah presented important data limitations and possible workarounds, including:

- A significant number of duplicate individuals included in both counts.
- CCMS data covers individuals seen at Zuckerberg SF General Hospital and does not include the date of incidence for the 5150.

- Additional data will be collected from other local hospitals, in addition to individual incidence dates for the CCMS data
- Local hospitals were made aware of the data request and additional information on data availability would be made clear by the next working group meeting.

Dr. Arafah then outlined preliminary data exploring why a peace officer was the appropriate person to perform the 5150 detention, explaining the importance of piecing together multiple data sources. Working group members asked for clarification on the terminology used in the SFPD data and commented that some of the language may need revision. Feedback obtained from the Mobile Crisis Team suggested that SFPD officers typically get involved in 5150 holds when aggressive behavior is exhibited. Anecdotal evidence also suggested that there has been some decrease in officer involvement, while the launch of Mental Health SF in the near future would be a new development to respond to emergency calls.

Members of the working group raised discussion points and topics to explore the barriers to gathering more comprehensive data on 5150s involving peace officers, including:

- Access to dispatch reports which may include more descriptive information.
- The possibility of a metric for the number of 5150s performed by peace officers who were called by mental health professionals or clinical teams already on the scene at the time of incidence.
- The possibility of reaching out to other law enforcement teams, such as the Sheriff's office.
- An interest in remaining adamant about getting the data the working group needs for accurate reporting since it is required by law, and not to reconsider because of barriers of accessing data.

The working group continued the discussion on the intent of the evaluation requirement on why a peace officer was the appropriate person to perform the 5150 detention, including the following summarized points:

- The requirement may reflect efforts to minimize the use of law enforcement in mental health crises.
- A potential process where 911 calls could refer directly to the mobile crisis team, for instance, to demonstrate alternative pathways to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's office
- Data on whether getting cited and booked has an impact on housing eligibility
- A consideration of the structural issue that all 911 calls go through police, which would at least partially explain why a peace officer was involved, and a discussion that it might be more of a question of the appropriate use of peace officers and how the Mobile Crisis Team is deployed.

Dr. Almeida explained that a working draft of the preliminary evaluation report was e-mailed and that an overview of the preliminary quantitative data analysis would be included in the full draft to be sent to the working group on January 10th, 2020 for their review prior to the final report submission to the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors on January 21st, 2020. Working group discussed additions they wanted to see in the report including a section on voluntary services and language on the role of the office of the Public Conservator. The working group discussed whether it made sense to discuss the whole revised report in person before submitting with two options presented: another meeting between January 10th and final report submission, or pushing the report submission date back, if granted permission.

Public Comments

There were no public comments made at this meeting.

Closing and Next Steps

Dr. Almeida closed the meeting by informing the working group of the additional meeting to be scheduled for the working group to discuss the preliminary evaluation report. The next meeting of the Housing Conservatorship Working group will be on Monday, January 13th, 11:00 am-12:30 pm at 1380 Howard, Room 515.