Welcome and Agenda Review

Angelica Almeida, Ph.D. provided an overview of the meeting as an opportunity to look at the draft of the Housing Conservatorship preliminary evaluation report, discuss concerns and questions, and solicit feedback from working group members.

Updates on Data and Timeline

Dr. Almeida addressed outstanding data issues, some of which are described in the preliminary report. This includes data on 5150 holds from the California Department of Justice (DoJ) that SFDPH is pursuing through their contacts. Further conversation with DoJ would help determine the reliability and completeness of the data. Data from the Office of Patients’ Rights could also inform the working group on LPS-designated facilities. SFDPH is in communication with individual hospitals on how these data are tracked with the hopes that client-level data can be obtained, and outreach to local hospitals via the Hospital Council of Northern and Central California is ongoing.

Dr. Almeida reached out to Supervisor Mandelman’s office to inquire about a submission extension on the preliminary report, as suggested by members of the working group at the previous meeting. While the extension was not allowed, the Supervisor’s office indicated they were open to the submission of an addendum which could update the preliminary report with additional information if it were available.

Working Group Discussion on the Preliminary Report

Rami Arafah, Ph.D., from Harder+Company Community Research, opened with an overview with the differences between the previous draft of the preliminary report and the current draft that was presented to the working group at the meeting:

- The background section and the framing of the report was updated with feedback from working group members
- The findings section was updated with new data, notably with a more accurate estimate for the number of 5150s after the availability of new data to match SFPD data with SFDPH Coordinated Care Management System (CCMS) data
- The ‘looking ahead’ section included reflections on where the evaluation was moving towards, including a section on issues that have not been addressed at the time of publication of the preliminary report.

Dr. Arafah then opened the conversation to the working group, where the following discussion points were raised:
• The lack of voluntary services and pathways for people in need and whether the report could reflect that the working group discussed this concern. Relatedly, concerns raised about individuals currently on the city’s housing waitlist, and the limited resources already at the city’s disposal.
• Preliminary data do not show if individuals with multiple 5150s were offered housing and whether those individuals were given the choice for those services. Working group members said that those shortcomings should be acknowledged, and added that there are people who are on the coordinated entry list but not prioritized based on data from the last meeting.
• Discussion that the report should mention more explicitly the large number of 5150s in San Francisco are still unaccounted for, since the working group only has CCMS and SFPD data on hand.

The working group discussed the issue of peace officer involvement in 5150 holds, reiterating concerns about the limitations of these data:

• Continued interest in seeing how often they were conducted in concert with a clinician
• Concern on the lack of a shared understanding of the definitions of the SFPD call types, and a request for more mention in the preliminary report of the limitations of these categories
• Desire for more sources of information to help illustrate peace officer involvement
• Discussion to keep the figure of SFPD call types in the preliminary report, but include more language that qualifies the data points, including an explainer that language such as “aggressive behavior” and “mentally disturbed” are not endorsed by the working group.
• Working group agreed to remove the paragraph in the draft preliminary report that described the “aggressive behavior” that often leads to peace officer involvement, to avoid misinterpretation

The working group also asked about efforts to inform the public about Housing Conservatorship. The SFDPH website includes all the information from prior working group meetings, and that SFDPH has received some requests to deliver presentations on the program. The Department of Disability and Aging Services is working with the City Attorney’s Office on a presentation, primarily targeted to providers and that there are no plans at the moment to develop presentations for the general public.

Dr. Almeida added that the Housing Conservatorship pilot had launched but no individuals have been served yet. The City Attorney’s Office has drafted the necessary court forms and is waiting for approval from the presiding judge. Dr. Almeida noted that SFDPH is developing reports that can generate information on individuals who have multiple 5150s, and clarified that 5150 referrals were not automatic and dependent on the person referring the individual.

The working group was informed that the preliminary evaluation report will be submitted to the Mayor’s office and the Board of Supervisors, and that the Board of Supervisors can then request a hearing on the report. A representative from Supervisor Mandelman’s office indicated that a hearing would likely take place in late February.

Public Comments

There were no public comments made at this meeting.

Closing and Next Steps

Dr. Irene Sung informed the working group that she would be retiring and therefore stepping down from her seat in the working group.

The next meeting of the Housing Conservatorship Working Group will be on Monday, April 13th, 1:00-2:30 pm at 25 Van Ness, Room 610.