



# Yolo County Department of Health Services

---

## Local Mental Health Board Meeting Minutes

**Monday, February 23, 2015, 7:00 PM – 9:00 PM**  
Arthur F. Turner Community Library Meeting Room  
1212 Merkley Avenue, West Sacramento - CA 95691

- Members Present:** Brad Anderson; Bret Bandley; Richard Bellows; Davis Campbell; June Forbes; Martha Guerrero; James Glica-Hernandez; Nicki King; Robert Schelen, Chair; Janlee Wong; Tawny Yambrovich
- Members Excused:** Robert Canning, Vice-Chair; Supervisor Jim Provenza; Michael Hebda; Tom Waltz;
- Staff Present:** Joan Beesley, MHSa Program Manager  
Karen Larsen, Mental Health Director / Alcohol and Drug Administrator  
Makayle Neuvert, Administrative Assistant  
Jennifer Perez, Assistant Deputy to Supervisor Villegas  
Sandra Rodriguez, Assistant Deputy to Supervisor Provenza
- Community Members:** None
- Others/Guests:** Julie Burns, Yolo County Juvenile Detention Facility  
Nathan Palmer, Yolo County Probation Department

- 
- 1. Call to Order and Introductions** – The February 23, 2015 meeting of the Local Mental Health Board (LMHB) was called to order at 7:03 PM. Introductions were made including Board guest speakers and the community members in attendance.
  - 2. Public Comment** – None
  - 3. Approval of Agenda – Motion:** James Glica-Hernandez, **Second:** June Forbes, **Discussion:** Richard Bellows suggested that a timekeeper be added to the regular meetings. None, **Vote:** Unanimous
  - 4. Approval of Minutes from January 26, 2015** – Motion: Richard Bellows, Second: Davis Campbell, Discussion: None, Vote: One Abstention
  - 5. Announcements and Correspondence** –
    - June Forbes invited all to attend the NAMI sponsored Pat Williams Dinner on 02/25/15. A flyer was shared.
    - Bob encouraged participation in the Adopt-a-Household program benefiting Bridge to Housing participants. Contact Tracey Dickinson at the CAO's office for more information.
    - Karen Larsen shared a consumer member LMHB application which was given to Jennifer Perez who offered to hand off to the BOS office.
    - Karen also noted that other Counties have expressed interest in Laura's Law implementation and information sharing is anticipate din the near future.

6. **Board of Supervisors Report** – Sandra Rodriguez, Assistant Deputy to Supervisor Provenza attended in Supervisor Provenza’s absence and shared his apologies for not being able to attend due to a scheduling conflict.
7. **Yolo County Probation Department Juvenile Placement Program** – Julie Burns of Yolo County Juvenile Detention Facility and Nathan Palmer of Yolo County Probation Department shared handouts and a presentation on the proposed Juvenile Placement Program changes. Currently the Probation Department is working with the CAO’s Offices and there will be additional reporting / decisions in early April 2015 when they report back to the BOS.

Comments and Questions from the LMHB members:

- Programmatically this may be a good opportunity for MHS A PEI funding and services.
- Regarding Senator Bell’s hearings for the use of psycho-active drugs, how many of these young people are on medication monitoring and compliant? Per Julie approximately 20-25% are appropriately on medication.
- One comment noting a desire to see a dialogue on strengthening the Foster Care System including funding. Julie noted that justice involved youth are highly marginalized and challenging all around. The probation part is a small piece and they are working with additional departments including DESS and AMDH. Karen noted the challenges with out-of-home out-of-county placement. Utilizing a local Yolo County facility that is currently underutilized space coupled with the potential to continue parental family interaction is worth considering.
- Foster kids are a sub-population and very vulnerable to mental health issues making them lean toward the criminal justice system therefore support for the proposal was noted.
- Questions regarding foster family placement were answered. Julie clarified that in the past four years only 1 or 2 youth have gone into foster care versus the rest which go into group home settings. This practice can have detrimental impacts for a variety of reasons including the remote local of the group homes. Progressive increase in the severity of crimes is a common outcome. Individual or smaller group attention and care, a higher staff to youth ratio, and the development of relationships would all help. She encouraged review of the resources provided.
- Clarifications included: the facility would not be locked and potential run-aways would benefit from being on the probation campus so response time could be much faster with higher level of intelligence. The youth would attend school in the community under appropriate supervision and schools would be trained.
- The proposal follows a structured three year pilot program with demonstrable outcomes required – the San Mateo model. Funding and quality staff are imperative.
- The living accommodation were noted by one member as reasonable and the necessity for self-determination and will with the youth is important.
- Concerned about the limited information provide on the services to youth was noted. Both Julie and Nate confirmed that this information was available and gave an overview of the general services.
- Should the LMHB agree with the proposal, a formal expression of support is helpful or a letter acknowledging that there is a need, emphasizing that difficulty of the marginalized population and the inherent difficulty would appreciated. Bob Schelen proposed that we refer this topic to the LMHB Program Committee for further review and in March get a recommendation from the committee on the action to take.
- Additional questions can be directed to [julie.burns@yolocounty.org](mailto:julie.burns@yolocounty.org) or [nate.palmer@yolocounty.org](mailto:nate.palmer@yolocounty.org).

**8. MHSA Housing Update** – Joan Beesley, MHSA Program Manager shared an update on the following items:

- Application for the MHSA plan housing funding by the developer has not been filed yet but the housing project continues to move forward slowly. Mercy Housing is the developer and is working with Yolo Housing Authority on MHSA units that will be built in conjunction with the grater development at the Old Hospital location.
- Multi-department / service collaborations are in process in conjunction with the MHSA efforts though the locations will not be part of the MHSA facilities / housing plan.
- THE CalHFA filing is anticipated it the near future and a standard posting will allow time for review.
- Reminder: A quarterly MHSA stakeholder meeting will be held Thompson Room in Bauer Building on February 26<sup>th</sup> with a variety of MHSA updates to be shared.

**9. Department Report** – Karen Larsen

- a. Triage for Services / Orientation: No discussion.
- b. Mental Health Director's Report

- Homelessness – Bridge to Housing

MHD Report: *This is our last week of the Bridge to Housing project. We have issued vouchers to house 31 people, 13 are still waiting on documentation, 10 cancelled due to background checks and 11 discharged from the program. Two residents have moved into their own place and several others are visiting units with their case managers and determining funding for items such as deposits. Probation has agreed to pay for transitional housing for 6 of those with criminal backgrounds and our department will be funding residential substance abuse treatment for those who are amenable to this. The County, City, and Housing Authority are meeting regularly to discuss the exit strategy for the program with a specific focus on those individuals whom we don't believe will be successful by the end of next week.*

Discussion: None

- Children's System of Care

MHD Report: *Our department has made the decision to contract out the majority of our children's services. This is not a decision that we made in haste without feedback from families, community partners and staff. We will do our best over the next several weeks to identify cases that can be easily transferred, determine which service provider will be the best fit for the family, and hold onto those cases that can be terminated within a reasonable amount of time. There will be no layoffs as the result of this change. Two clinicians will be transitioned into our Transition Age Youth (TAY) care team and the Supervising Clinician will be moved into our QI division. We believe this decision will provide for better access and improved outcomes for the children and families we serve.*

Discussion: Karen further clarified that Dr. Rosi Health Service's child psychiatrist will remain on staff for medication management as well as the specialized MDIC clinician. Full Service Partnership services are potentially going out for RFP to better serve those at risk. In response to a question, Karen commented that the penetration rate of mental health support in foster care in not as good as it could be.

- Community Intervention Program (SB82)

MHD Report: *The Davis Community Intervention Program clinician has been hired. She is bilingual which may help the other jurisdictions as well. Turning Point Community Programs is in the final process of hiring the clinician for the rural areas as well. They have also hired the Peer Support Workers for the project. We are looking forward to beginning to analyze some of the data that is*

coming in. We have heard anecdotally from the police departments that they are seeing a decrease in hospitalizations.

Discussion: The Woodland CIP clinician is also bilingual.

- SAMHSA Primary and Behavioral Health Care Integration Grant

MHD Report: *The department is partnering with CommuniCare Health Centers on a Primary and Behavioral Health Care Integration (PBHCI) grant through the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. The grant is \$400,000 per year for four years. The goal of the grant is to provide primary care services in the mental health setting to address chronic health conditions and improve health outcomes for the people we serve.*

Discussion: None.

- Triennial Review

MHD Report: *The second week of February brought our Triennial review from the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). This review occurs every three years. It is a full system review that looks at policies and procedures, access to care, quality improvement activities, and chart reviews. While the reviewers were impressed with our strides over the past year, the department received a great deal of feedback about ways to improve our system. This was the first time that the review was conducted by DHCS and it was evident to those from our department who have participated previously, that the reviewers' interpretation of Title 9 is a much more narrow view than the department has experienced in the past.*

Discussion: A corrective action plan will be prepared and shared.

- LMHB Program Committee, Finance Committee

MHD Report: *The Program Committee met with me for the first time and we discussed several key areas. I am looking forward to more of these meetings. I had a separate conversation with Mr. Bellows regarding the Finance Committee and ways we can support one another in making informed decisions in terms of budgeting.*

Discussion: Going forward the committee will work on tying back to LMHB Strategic Plan goals.

- Law Enforcement / Mental Health MOU

MHD Report: *For several years the emergency rooms, law enforcement, and our department have been operating under an MOU for 5150s that is outdated. Over the course of the last several months, this group has met several times and finalized a new MOU that reflects current practices and meets the needs of all involved. The MOU is now under final review by all and will be moving forward with signatures.*

Discussion: None.

- Primary Care / Behavioral Health MOUs

MHD Report: *In addition to the MOU mentioned above, our department is also working on MOUs with Elica Health Centers, Northern Valley Indian Health, and Woodland Memorial Hospital. The MOUs outline roles and responsibilities, transfer of care criteria, and consultation and conflict resolution processes.*

Discussion: None.

- Healthy Yolo

MHD Report: *Healthy Yolo is a collaborative, participatory effort that aims to engage and mobilize the community so they may have a voice in addressing public health issues. Healthy Yolo seeks to describe health characteristics of our community, analyze causal factors of health, and devise and implement*

*programs to maintain or improve the health and well-being of all. After completion of the community health assessment, stakeholders have identified three areas of focus as follows: Mental Health, Chronic Disease Prevention, and Health Issues Associated with Aging. We will have a brief overview and opportunity for LMHB feedback at next month's LMHB.*

Discussion: None

- Jail Peer Reviews

MHD Report: *As previously shared, the department issued a corrective action report to CFMG. The corrective action plan is being implemented and we will be having a status update meeting with CFMG and county staff on March 2, 2015. Another peer review is currently underway with Psychiatrist/Mental Health focus. Our contract with CFMG ends June 2016 and the RFP process will begin well ahead of that date.*

Discussion: None.

- Yolo County Spirit Awards

MHD Report: *Employees were given the opportunity to highlight the "above-and-beyond efforts" of their co-workers who, through their daily activities, promote Yolo County's core values (Service – Performance – Integrity – Responsibility – Innovation – Teamwork), by nominating them for a SPIRIT Award. Sixty-one nominations, recognizing over 90 employees were thoughtfully considered by past SPIRIT Award recipients and the below have been selected to receive this year's SPIRIT Awards. The winners will be recognized by the Board of Supervisors on February 24 at 9:00 a.m. in the Board Chambers, followed by a brief reception. Please join us in congratulating these outstanding employees.*

Discussion: Appreciation and applause were shared for Karen and others in the recognition of the spirit awards.

- c. Health & Human Services Integration Update: The HHS Integration plan was submitted to the BOS in January and there is an Executive Summary suggested for review. Interviews for the Director position are underway.

## 10. Chair Report – Bob Schelen

- a. Committee Reports:

- Program Committee (PC): Committee Chair Martha shared a memo / information outlining the current areas of focus.
  - Action Item: Robert will lead the Program Committee in preparation of a recommendation to the Board on suicide prevention in the jail.
  - Action Item: The California Mental Health Planning Council has sent correspondence on patient's rights councils and the topic was referred to the PC to review and determine how to reply and next steps.
- Budget and Finance Committee (BFC): The ADMH budget is to be prepared by the end of March. The committee will conference call / email Karen to share feedback. In the future the committee noted a desire to do a better job identifying strategic plan goals.
- Communication and Education Committee (CEC): James shared on behalf of the committee that they continue to plan for March's public forum. The committee is looking at using the County Fair Mall as a future public forum location because it is highly accessible.
  - Action Item: The CEC was asked to publicize as much as possible in order to increase consumer attendance.

- Action Items: Related to disagreement on language use in a recent New York Times Op Ed, the CEC was asked to consider a response and suggest action at the next meeting.
- b. Legislative Report: A handout listing current legislation suggested for the Board's watch list was shared. A The 2/24 scheduled Senate hearing regarding the misuse of psychotropic medication in foster care youth will be attended by Martha and any additional information gathered will be shared at a future meeting.
  - Recommendation: CMHPC, WI code regarding the patient's rights council. Referred correspondence to the program committee to review and determine if there is an action, consider how to reply and what is needed.

**11. Future Meeting Planning and Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday March 23, 2015 6:00\* – 9:00 PM at the Bauer Building, 137 N. Cottonwood, Woodland, CA 95695, Thomson Conference Room. \*The next meeting will include a Public Forum from 6:00 – 7:00 PM, followed by an abridged regular meeting from 7:00 – 8:00 PM then concluding with Board Committee Workshops from 8:00 – 9:00 PM.

**12. Proposed Agenda Items –**

- Prop 47 planning as part of MHD Report
- Feedback on committee items

**To: Local Mental Health Board**  
**From: Martha Guerrero, Chair of Program Committee**  
**Date: 2/17/15**

On January 26, 2015, several members of the Program Committee identified several programs to be considered first, and the following were discussed at a meeting with Karen Larsen. On February 3, the Program Committee convened via conference call and shared information about the programs that were identified in a meeting with Karen Larsen. Below are highlights of that discussion.

### **Mental Health Court (MHC)**

Program Committee is interested in expanding the scope of Yolo County MHC from present limited focus on post-conviction misdemeanors to diversion from prosecution for both felonies & misdemeanors.

Discussion: There may be potential opportunities to coordinate a court that will implement Proposition 47 and there is an interest to consider interventions for the release of inmates to participate in outpatient mental health programs in a structured program such as the Mental Health Court. Several judges Jonathan Raven, Dave Rosenberg are interested in diversion and Judge Gaard will likely consolidate the Mental Health Court with Drug Court, which is a pre-trial diversion program.

Next Step: Karen Larsen will review the issue with the judges.

### **Assisted Outpatient Treatment**

Goal: Ensure increased "slots" are available.

Discussion: Turning Point and Judge Gaard run Yolo AOT sensitively, on the Nevada County model. In addition to the 5 budgeted AOT slots, Turning Point can and does use some ACT slots for AOT-referred clients.

Next Step: Determine appropriate caseload for ACT/FSP/AOT teams and marginal cost of ACT/FSP/AOT slots, so we can budget assertive care more accurately. Karen Larsen will use new data from MHSA oversight to determine appropriate caseload. That will help us know both how many more clients we can handle with current resources and what resources we would need to handle more.

### **Suicide Prevention in the County Jail**

Goal: Establish a regular committee to review policies, practices and performance.

Next Steps: Ask LMHB for resolution recommending it. Karen will take resolution to corrections.

### **Community Crisis Response Teams - Prop 82**

Goal 1: Assure best possible performance by Community Crisis Response program.

Goal 2: Investigate possibility of "house calls" to assess people their concerned contacts refer and link them to services such as Los Angeles Family Advocate Program assisted a NAMI-Yolo Helpline caller.

Discussion: Many counties use several funding sources including MHSA funding to contract with the local Mental Health Association for Family Advocates who make house calls. It might be preferable to contract for professional assessments. Yolo MHA cannot be a possibility, because they went bankrupt. Our Community Crisis Response teams are funded and are already doing some "welfare checks" as well as responding to crisis calls. We may have capacity to expand welfare checks into assessment and linkage without significant additional cost.

Next Step: Karen Larsen will contact Orange County to obtain information on their program and practices, and funding sources and meet with the Program Committee with updates next month.

## **Proposition 47 Implementation**

Goal: Link misdemeanants who have symptoms of serious mental illness to services, instead of just discharging them. Martha reviewed the State Budget's information on Prop 47. Prop 47 requires that state savings resulting from the Proposition be transferred to a new fund, the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools fund. The new funding will be used to reduce truancy and support drop-out prevention programs in K-12 schools, increase victims services grants, and support mental health and substance abuse disorder treatment services. The Director of Finance is required, on or before July 31, 2016, and on July 31 of each fiscal year thereafter, to calculate the state savings for the previous fiscal year compared to 2013-14. The budget does not reflect estimated 2016-16 savings related to Prop 47. According to the CSAC State Budget Analysis: The Governor's 2015-16 budget does not allocate new funds – with the exception of an augmentation to the courts' budget for workload impacts – associated with the implementation of sentencing changes enacted pursuant to the voter-approved initiative. The budget narrative reiterates the provision in Proposition 47 that the state must calculate state correctional savings achieved as a result of the measure's provisions by July 31, 2016 (and every July thereafter). Any identified savings for the first year of implementation would be allocated in 2016-17, as specified in the initiative. The majority of the savings would be dedicated to behavioral health programs (65%), with a portion earmarked for truancy prevention programs (25%) and the balance to increase victim services grants (10%).

Next Step: Karen Larsen will propose the Program Committee's service treatment recommendation to the Community Corrections Partnership as they consider programs for released inmates.

## **Out of County Placements**

Goal: Assure best possible quality of care at facilities we use, including board & care/room & board.

Next Step: Consider at next Program Committee Meeting. Issue was deferred for lack of time.

## Legislative Analyst's Office Information Below based on the following report:

<http://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Detail/3175>

### How Will Proposition 47 Affect Counties?

The reduction in penalties authorized in Proposition 47 will affect county jails and probation departments, as well as various other county agencies (such as public defenders and district attorneys' offices). In general, the proposition will significantly reduce criminal justice workload for counties. We estimate that, prior to the passage of Proposition 47, counties spent several hundred million dollars annually on workload that will be eliminated by the measure. However, local decisions on how to respond to this workload reduction will determine whether it results in fiscal savings or improvements to the administration of local criminal justice systems, such as reduced jail overcrowding. We discuss below the specific effects of Proposition 47 on jails, probation departments, and other county agencies.

#### Effects on County Jails

**Reduction in County Jail Workload.** Proposition 47 will reduce the workload for county jails associated with the individuals affected by the measure for several reasons. First, offenders convicted of the crimes affected by the measure will generally receive shorter jail terms than they otherwise would have. This is because the maximum amount of time an offender can be held in jail for a misdemeanor is one year. In contrast, when these offenses were classified as felonies, offenders were typically eligible for jail terms of between 16 months and 3 years. Second, individuals arrested for the crimes affected by Proposition 47 are less likely to be held in jail prior to the conclusion of their court case. This is because counties are less likely to hold individuals arrested for misdemeanors prior to their trials as compared to those arrested for felonies. Finally, some offenders serving sentences in jail for the crimes affected by Proposition 47 are eligible for shorter jail terms or release if they are successfully resentenced.

The above reductions in jail workload will be slightly offset by an increase in workload associated with offenders who would otherwise have been sentenced to state prison. As discussed above, when offenders who have not previously been convicted of one of the severe crimes listed in the measure commit one of the crimes affected by Proposition 47, they can only be subject to misdemeanor penalties. Accordingly, they can no longer be sentenced to state prison and may instead serve their sentences in county jail. Despite this possible increase in workload, we estimate that the total number of statewide county jail beds freed up by these changes could reach into the low tens of thousands annually within a few years.

**Relief to Overcrowded Jails.** Although Proposition 47 will free up county jail beds, it will not necessarily result in a reduction in the county jail population of a similar size. This is because, just prior to the passage of Proposition 47, 33 of the state's 58 counties—which account for two-thirds of the state's jail population—had overcrowded jails and therefore were releasing inmates early. Such overcrowded jails could use the freed up beds created by the measure to reduce early releases. This would result in longer sentences being served by the remaining jail population. In these cases, there would be little or no reduction in the size of the jail population in the affected counties. Alternatively, the freed up jail beds could be used to reduce overcrowding. This could improve the operation of jails in a couple of ways. First, it can require more staff and be more difficult to manage inmates in crowded conditions than if the jail is operating at or closer to its design capacity. In addition, reduced overcrowding could improve a county's ability to provide rehabilitation or health care services to inmates by freeing up the space necessary to conduct classes and provide treatment.

**Cost Reductions for Other Jails.** Jails that are not overcrowded will have reduced operating costs because they will have fewer inmates under their supervision. At a minimum, these counties will realize savings from purchasing less food, clothing, and other items used daily by inmates. Additional savings could also be realized, depending on the extent to which these counties are able to reduce higher cost components of their jail operations, such as staffing.

## Effects on County Probation Departments

**Probation Workload Likely to Decline.** County probation departments will experience reduced workload as a result of Proposition 47 for a couple of reasons. First, offenders who are sentenced for misdemeanors generally receive less intensive community supervision than offenders sentenced for felonies. For example, probation departments typically conduct routine meetings and compliance checks with felony offenders, while many individuals on community supervision for a misdemeanor are seldom required to meet with their probation officer or be subjected to compliance checks. In addition, some offenders typically spend less time under community supervision when they are sentenced for a misdemeanor instead of a felony. We estimate that this reduction in supervision terms could result in county probation departments experiencing a reduction of thousands of offenders in their caseloads annually.

**Impact on Community Supervision Services and Costs Could Vary.** The effect on counties will depend on how they respond to the above reductions in community supervision workload. **Counties could use the freed up resources to conduct more intensive supervision on the remaining population or provide offenders with additional rehabilitative services. Alternatively, counties could achieve savings from the reduced probation workload and redirect the funds to other local priorities. The extent to which counties choose to use the freed up resources to provide more intensive probation services versus achieving cost savings could vary by county and will likely depend on numerous factors, such as whether probation departments were adequately staffed prior to these changes.**

**Unclear Effect on SB 678 Grants.** Chapter 608, Statutes of 2009 (SB 678, Leno), commonly referred to as SB 678, was enacted to improve outcomes for certain individuals supervised by probation departments by giving counties a fiscal incentive to reduce the number of such offenders who violate the terms of their supervision and are incarcerated. For example, SB 678 provides counties a share of the state prison and parole savings that occur when such offenders are successful and not sent to state prison. Because Proposition 47 reduces the total population of offenders under community supervision by counties, it could reduce the population that is eligible for grant funds. As a result, it is possible the size of the grant that each county probation department receives will decline. Alternatively, it is possible that the size of each county's grant will increase as a result of Proposition 47. For example, if the remaining individuals supervised by a county probation department have higher rates of success, that county's grant could increase. As a result, it is possible that some counties could see an increase in SB 678 grants while other counties could see a decline, depending on differences in their probation population. Because of limitations on the data available, it is not possible for us to determine at this time whether SB 678 probation grants are likely to increase or decrease statewide as a result of Proposition 47.

## Effects on Other County Departments

As discussed above, the reduction in penalties from Proposition 47 will increase court workload associated with resentencing and reclassification of offenders over the next few years. As a result, county district attorneys' and public defenders' offices (who participate in these processes) and county sheriffs (who provide court security) could experience a temporary increase in workload. However, Proposition 47 will reduce on an ongoing basis the workload for these local agencies associated with both felony filings and other court hearings (such as for offenders who break the rules of their community supervision). However, these effects on county workload are unlikely to generate significant costs or savings.

## Effects on 2011 Realignment

As discussed above, the 2011 realignment shifted responsibility for thousands of less serious felony offenders from the state to counties. The state provided counties around \$1 billion to support this increased responsibility. Proposition 47 reduces the sentences for some of the realigned offenders. Specifically, realigned offenders who have committed an offense specified in the proposition will be subject to misdemeanor, rather than felony penalties. As a result, some of the workload reduction to counties discussed above is related to realigned offenders. While detailed data on the specific number of realigned offenders affected by Proposition 47 is currently unavailable at this time, the number could be substantial because both the 2011 realignment and Proposition 47 generally affect the same types of less serious felony offenders.