

SAN FRANCISCO

# Housing Conservatorship Working Group

---

MEETING 6 • August 17, 2020 • 1:00-2:30PM • Zoom Platform





# AGENDA

- Welcome & Agenda Review
- Implementation Update
- Evaluation Update and Data Review
- Public Comment
- Closing & Next Steps



# Workgroup Duties

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
  - Preliminary report to BOS and Mayor by January 21, 2020
  - Annual reports to BOS, Mayor, & State beginning January 1, 2021



# Implementation Update



# Implementation

- Continued collaboration across partners
- Active engagement and outreach for individuals
- Forms finalized with court
- Notice for individuals with 5+ 5150 WIC Holds
- No petitions have been filed



# Evaluation Update



# Overview

---

- Reporting requirements and available data
- Updated reporting and next steps
- Limitations and considerations

# Evaluation Requirements from Admin Code

Requirement	Data Point(s)
1. Number and status of persons who have been recommended for a Housing Conservatorship, evaluated for eligibility for a Housing Conservatorship, and/or conserved	-As described in requirement
2. The effectiveness of these conservatorships in addressing the short and long term needs of those persons, including a description of the services they received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Description of treatment and services</li> <li>-Housing status</li> <li>-PES contact</li> <li>-Substance use treatment compliance</li> <li>-Incarceration</li> <li>-Individual experience survey</li> </ul>
3. The impact of conservatorships established on existing conservatorships and on mental health programs provided by the city	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number of LPS conservatorships</li> <li>-Impact on mental health programs provided by the city (high level trends)</li> </ul>
4. 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	-As described in requirement
5. 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	-Narrative description for each relevant 5150, or broader trends

# Evaluation Requirement #4

*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*

**Note: Data includes a significant number of duplicate individuals included in both counts. Future data pulls will be designed to minimize duplication.**

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

\*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 Requirement #4: Limitations

---

- **Likely a large number of duplicates**
  - No incident dates in CCMS data pull
  - No data from some hospitals in San Francisco
- **Plans to address duplication:**
  - New data pull after migration to Epic database is complete
  - Outreach to Hospital Council of Northern and Central California

# Population Data: Fiscal Year 2019/20

---

## **Information for individuals who had 4+ 5150's and seen at PES (113 individuals):**

- Demographics
  - 32% between ages 40-50
  - 64% Male
  - 32% African American/Black, 50% White
- Urgent/Emergent Services
  - Average of 10.4 visits to PES

# Evaluation Requirement #5

---

*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:**

- Data from SFPD on all officer-involved 5150s in FY2019-20
  - Date, reason for emergency call, resolution
- **Data from a random sample of SFPD incidence reports**
  - 147 unique reports pulled from FY2019-20
  - More information on type of incidence including incidence narrative

# SFPD Incident Report Data

---

*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*

Primary Research Question	Data Point(s)
<b>WHY</b> are officers called to incidents resulting in Section 5150 detentions?	INCIDENT: - Type of incident NARRATIVE: - Who called the peace officer? - Other themes

# SFPD Incident Report Data

*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*

Supporting Research Questions	Data Point(s)
<b>WHO</b> is detained under Section 5150 by peace officers?	DETAINED: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Age</li><li>- Race</li><li>- Sex</li></ul>
<b>WHO</b> called the peace officer?	NARRATIVE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Who called the peace officer?</li></ul>
<b>WHERE</b> are incidents resulting in officer-involved Section 5150 detentions taking place?	INCIDENT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- District</li><li>- Location of Occurrence</li></ul>
<b>WHEN</b> are incidents resulting in officer-involved Section 5150 detentions taking place?	INCIDENT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Occurrence from date / time</li></ul>



# Workgroup Consideration One

- Limitations around data collection on WIC §5150 holds from *all* local hospitals and emergency departments in San Francisco limits the Working Group's ability to determine effectiveness of the Housing Conservatorship pilot.
  - **Next steps:** SFDPH is working with the Hospital Council of Northern and Central California to establish working relationships to gather these data from individual hospitals, and will also conduct outreach to the Department of Justice and San Francisco Mental Health Clients' Rights Advocates to discuss available data and its limitations.



## Workgroup Consideration Two

- In order to fully respond to the evaluation requirement that calls for explaining why a peace officer was the most appropriate person to execute a WIC §5150 hold, further data should be extracted from existing police records, including information on whether the hold was initiated in collaboration with other professionals (e.g., clinician, case manager, etc.). It is the understanding of Working Group members that peace officers can be called by clinicians to assist with WIC §5150 holds to detain an individual for transport.
  - **Next steps:** SFDPH is working with SFPD to identify if a sample of incident reports can be reviewed in greater detail to provide qualitative information to the Working Group. These discussions are also part of larger efforts through Mental Health SF to identify needs and alternatives to peace officer involvement in behavioral health crises.



## Workgroup Consideration Three

- Working Group members have a desire to better understand the process by which individuals served by the Housing Conservatorship pilot will be offered voluntary services and housing at initial engagement. Specifically, Working Group members have expressed interest in what types of services and housing resources will be offered, availability of those services, and what that process will look like.
- **Next steps:** Working Group members will receive regular updates on the experience of individuals served by the Housing Conservatorship, and these service experiences will be a focus of ongoing evaluation activities.



## Workgroup Consideration Four

- Initial figures suggest a high rate of African Americans detained under WIC §5150 holds across San Francisco, when compared to the overall demographic characteristics of San Francisco. When this rate is examined within the larger context of a declining number of African Americans residing in San Francisco, the Working Group is concerned that a disproportionate number of African Americans could be conserved under the pilot program.
  - **Next steps:** The Working Group intends to make sure that the Housing Conservatorship pilot does not bring unintentional consequences or impacts for San Francisco's African American residents, and this topic will be a priority focus of ongoing and annual evaluation activities.



## Workgroup Consideration Five

- The Working Group held its first meeting in November 2019, and some members have expressed a desire for more time to gather data (as outlined above), meet, discuss, and evaluate findings before submitting a preliminary report.
  - **Next steps:** The Working Group added an additional meeting to review the report prior to submission. While data will not be comprehensive, the goal is to provide a preliminary report and move towards obtaining more comprehensive and complete data for future reports.



# PUBLIC COMMENT



## Closing and Next Steps

### **Upcoming Working Group Meetings:**

**Dates:** Monday October 26, 2020

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



# Information Sharing and Engagement

**Email:** [Housing.Conservatorship-Workgroup@sfdph.org](mailto:Housing.Conservatorship-Workgroup@sfdph.org)

**Website Updates:** [www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/housingconserv/default.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/housingconserv/default.asp)