

CALIFORNIA HEALTH FACILITIES FINANCING AUTHORITY (“CHFFA”)

Agenda Item 11 – Information Item

Investment in Mental Health Wellness Act of 2013

February 26, 2015

Background

After two funding rounds of the Investment in Mental Health Wellness Grant Program (“IMHWGP”), CHFFA has approximately \$61 million in grant program funds remaining and available for subsequent funding rounds, primarily for Crisis Residential Treatment programs. At the January 29, 2015 board meeting, there was a roundtable discussion to determine the next steps for the IMHWGP. The panel included the following:

- Will Rhett-Mariscal, PhD., Associate Director, California Institute for Behavioral Health Solutions
- Robert Oakes, Executive Director, County Behavioral Health Directors Association of California (“CBHDA”)
- Diane Van Maren, Independent Policy Consultant

The panel discussed the various options the CHFFA board could explore that may assist in determining how to address the remaining funds in the IMHWGP.

The various options included:

- To allow a longer application period (e.g., six months instead of the current approximate 2.5 months) for counties to have sufficient enough time to design good projects and submit good applications.
- To schedule the application periods for all future funding rounds.
- To consider legislative changes to move funding from the Crisis Residential Treatment program allocation to the other programs whose funding has been nearly depleted.
- To extend the readiness and feasibility determination period.

Further, Mr. Oakes announced that he would distribute a survey to all counties to determine the counties’ needs. The CHFFA board decided to review the results of the survey to ascertain what next steps should be implemented.

County Survey

After the CHFFA board meeting, Mr. Oakes informed CHFFA staff that the survey questionnaire was sent to the 52 counties in California. A summary of the results are presented in this report to help guide the CHFFA board on how to address the remaining grant program funds.

Staff invited key stakeholders to appear at the February 26th board meeting to discuss the results of the survey and to assist the CHFFA board with the next steps. The key stakeholders include:

- Robert Oakes, Executive Director, County Behavioral Health Directors Association of California
- Diane Van Maren, Independent Policy Consultant
- Betty Dahlquist, Executive Director, California Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies

Summary of Survey Responses

- ***Question 1: The current window to submit an application for a Crisis Residential Treatment Program (“CRT”) is three (3) months. Some counties say that isn’t enough time to meet the “readiness” requirement of the application. What is the least amount of time needed by your county to meet the “readiness” requirement?***
 - *7 of 30 counties (23.33%) responded less than 6 months*
 - *12 of 30 counties (40%) responded at least 6 months*
 - *4 of 30 counties (13.33%) responded more than 6 months*
 - *7 of 30 counties (23.33%) did not respond/already have a CRT or one in process/not interested*

Note, the range of time identified by the responding counties ranged between 4 months and 12 months – with an overall average of 6 months.

- ***Question 2: Most of the funds for Mobile Crisis Support and Crisis Stabilization Treatment (“CST”) have been awarded, and CST was “oversubscribed” in several regions. If your county is unable to succeed in an application for CRT and did not receive any awards for CST, how much SB 82 funding would your county seek for CST if a portion of remaining CRT funding was moved to CST?***
 - *16 of 30 counties (53.33%) indicated they would not apply for additional CST funding for various reasons*
 - *3 of 30 counties (10%) would like less than \$1 million for additional CST funding*
 - *11 of 30 counties (36.67%) would like more than \$1 million for additional CST funding*

In summary, only 13 counties provided responses stating what amount of money they might apply for if additional crisis stabilization dollars became available (by re-allocating them from the crisis residential pot) with a range in costs as low as \$300,000 and as high as \$7.5 million with an aggregate total amount of requested additional crisis stabilization dollars between \$20.3 million and \$48.3 million.

- **Question 3: Is your county aware that nonprofit participation is allowed for CRT under SB 82?**
 - 28 of 30 counties (93.33%) responded yes
 - 2 of 30 counties (6.67%) responded no

In summary, most counties are aware that nonprofit organizations are allowed under SB 82.

- **Question 4: If the funds remaining are not distributed by region, at some point the regional allocation formula will be removed, and counties will compete for SB 82 funds statewide. What barriers exist to your county applying for CRT funding under SB 82 that could be addressed through regulatory or legislative changes?**

22 counties provided responses identifying, (1) the barriers they presently experience that inhibit submission of an application for crisis residential grant funding or (2) recommendations they have for altering the program to make an application for crisis residential funding more feasible and here is a sampling of the issues identified:

- The county has already been awarded funding and is focused on implementing that program
- The county needs technical assistance for developing a project
- There is insufficient money available for smaller counties
- Rural counties have more of a challenge (because of census) fashioning a sustainable program
- NIMBY issues
- There is insufficient need for the services in the particular county
- Non-profit providers should be permitted to own the real property housing the crisis residential programs
- Reimbursement rates need to be increased (legislative issue)
- A mechanism to pay for youth crisis services should be created (legislative issue)
- The Authority should be permitted to award monies to develop transitional housing (legislative issue)
- The Authority should be permitted to award monies for non-licensed crisis residential programs (legislative issue)