



Program Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
Date: December 15, 2025 | Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

BHSOAC
1812 9th Street
Sacramento, California 95811

Advisory Committee Members:

Commission Staff:

Commissioner Gary Tsai, Chair*	Courtney Ackerman
Commissioner Mara Madrigal-Weiss, Vice Chair	Kallie Clark
Commissioner Pamela Baer*	Sandra Gallardo
Commissioner Rayshell Chambers*	Brenda Grealish
Commissioner Senator Dave Cortese (Designee Marjorie Swartz)*	Melissa Martin-Mollard
Commissioner Makenzie Cross*	Claire Sallee
Commissioner Brandon Fernandez*	Cody Scott

*Participated remotely.

Advisory Committee Member absent: Commissioner Michael Bernick.

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order and Roll Call – Information

Commissioner Gary Tsai, Advisory Committee Chair, called the California Behavioral Health Commission (CBH or Commission) Program Advisory Committee (PAC Committee) meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m., welcomed everyone, and reviewed the meeting agenda.

Sandra Gallardo, Chief Counsel, called the roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

Agenda Item 2: Announcements and Updates – Information

Chair Tsai gave the announcements as follows:

- The Advisory Committee will abide by Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements; additionally, as part of the Commission’s commitment to deeper public involvement and open governance, all Advisory Committee meetings include an enhanced public comment segment designed to promote genuine dialogue between the Committee and the community.

Contracts and Amendments

- In line with the new transparency efforts, the Commission will continue to provide brief updates on recent contracts and amendments approved under the Executive Director's authority. These updates are shared during all Committee announcements for informational purposes only. Please note that all contracts and amendments are negotiated between the Commission and the contractor and must be mutually agreed upon.

There are six contracts and amendments to report this month:

- An agreement in the amount of \$50,580 with the California Military Department has been approved to conduct an independent security assessment for IT security, as required by Government Code Section 11549.3.
- An agreement in the amount of \$48,677 with S&P Technology Solutions has been approved to acquire and deploy Cornerstone, a learning management software platform that will support training for both Commissioners and Commission staff.
- An agreement in the amount of \$65,000 with One Mind at Work has been approved to plan, conduct, and report on a statewide convening of leaders from across California. The goal of this convening is to shape a comprehensive program focused on supporting workforce mental health.
 - The effort builds on work initiated under a previous contract written in 2023, which concluded before the project was completed. The Commission is authorized under the Welfare and Institutions Code Section 5845(f)(14) to establish a framework and voluntary standards for mental health in the workplace. These standards aim to reduce stigma and increase awareness among public employees and employers about recovery goals of the Behavioral Health Services Act (BHSA).

Mara Madrigal-Weiss, PAC Committee Vice Chair, added that this is part of the Commission's commitment to lift up Voluntary Workplace Standards.

- An agreement in the amount of 25,000 with the California School-Based Health Alliance has been approved to fund scholarships for the 2026 Annual School Health and Behavioral Health Conference.
- An agreement in the amount of \$175,000 with University of California, San Francisco, has been approved as part of an Interagency Agreement to support Full-Service Partnership (FSP) evaluation work.
- An agreement in the amount of \$96,250 with Leading Resources, Inc., has been approved to facilitate an update to the Commission's strategic plan.

Upcoming Meetings

- The next full Commission meeting will be a two-day meeting to be held in Sacramento on January 22-23, 2026.
- The next PAC Committee meeting date will soon be announced.

For more information on any of these items, please visit the website or sign up for the email distribution list.

Agenda Item 3: General Public Comment – Information

Stacie Hiramoto (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you and good morning, Commissioners, and welcome back, Commissioner Tsai. It's nice to see everyone. This is just a question. I appreciate the attempt to open up communication. And I am just asking a question. I was at a Committee meeting recently where, during public comment, I asked a question or I felt like I was asking a question and, instead of getting any answer, I was just thanked for my comments. And I don't expect the Commissioners or the staff to have ready answers to all of our questions, but, if we ask a question and people don't know, I was hoping that either the staff or the Commission could just at least say, well, we'll answer that later or something, and not just go, okay, thank you, next, because, again, we were not happy that people from the public were not put on these Committees because we feel like dialogue was stifled. So, you gave us a public comment period, but, if all we are able to do is to ask questions and then we're just thanked, it's not a dialogue.

But, anyway, I just wanted to say that. But thank you. I think these are just kinks getting worked out and I really appreciate the staff and the Commissioners' efforts to do that. Thank you.

Chair Tsai stated appreciation for the feedback. He agreed that the reason for the relaxed Roberts Rules of Order rules is to allow back-and-forth conversations.

Executive Director Grealish stated she is happy to follow up. She thanked Stacie Hiramoto for their suggestions as Commission processes continue to be improved.

Gabriel Balducci (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Hello, everyone, and, Commissioners, thank you. I'm the CEO of Urban Vision Alliance, a nonprofit based in San Francisco. We recently organized a delegation of over 60 Bay Area leaders from many of the mayor's offices in the Bay Area to tour several large-scale homelessness facilities in Texas – Austin and San Antonio – partially led by the Bay Area Council, as well. And we then had a meeting on the (indiscernible) in San Francisco to discuss takeaways.

There's a real opportunity to create a technology platform where citizens could see all of the different housing-related projects and, specifically, an entire portfolio of behavioral health facilities that would create a feeling of transparency and visibility and significantly increase private sector participation and support and community acceptance. We're working on something related to that that we think will increase the pipeline of housing for behavioral health, and we look forward to sharing it with all of you as we progress with that initiative. Thank you.

Fernando Pinon (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: My question was just in regards to the voluntary workplace standards for mental health and how we can participate more in that discussion.

Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss stated much of the information is in the Commission's report, which is posted on the website. The report highlights voluntary workplace standards. She referred Fernando Pinon back to Commission staff who can help with any additional questions.

Agenda Item 4: Meeting Minutes – Action

Chair Tsai stated the September 18, 2025, PAC Committee Meeting Minutes will be reviewed for approval.

There were no questions from Committee Members and no public comment.

Action: Chair Tsai asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cross, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee approves the September 18, 2025, Meeting Minutes as presented.*

Motion passed 7 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted "Yes": Commissioners Baer, Chambers, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss, and Chair Tsai.

Agenda Item 5: Innovation Partnership Fund (IPF) Request for Proposals (RFP) Outline – Action

Chair Tsai stated the Committee will hear a presentation on the IPF RFP outline for the upcoming IPF Grant Program and consider making a recommendation to move it forward to the full Commission, which will meet in January 2026. He asked staff to present this agenda item.

Kallie Clark, Ph.D., Chief of Research, Evaluation, and Program Operations, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the efforts to date, RFP outline components informed by the IPF Framework, and feedback received to date. She stated elements to consider include if there should be a grant carve-out or minimum and maximum grant amounts, how to assess sustainability in the application process, what success looks like and what metrics should be used to measure this, and how to ensure that grantees have the capacity to accurately and successfully collect, track, and apply data to ensure continuous improvement.

Committee Discussion

Commissioner Baer suggested including a collaborative peer learning element to connect the grantees so they can rely on each other as a resource. Many entities are

siloes. It is important to bring them together to discuss best practices and share touchpoints on what is successful.

Commissioner Chambers agreed that siloes are one of the biggest system issues. She asked if the RFP will bring out answers to the bullet points in the elements to consider slide, such as what success looks like and the metrics to use.

Dr. Clark stated the elements to consider are about how Committee Members envision what would make these grants successful under the IPF, such as improvements in client outcomes, service delivery outreach and how to measure that, and what a story about IPF should look like.

Commissioner Chambers asked what success looks like with the new BHSA and trying to make innovations that align. She asked how to have the best relevancy and impact in the behavioral health system, when everything is changing and shifting.

Chair Tsai stated success can be defined different ways. Staff is asking about what Committee Members think success looks like under the IPF. He stated, although there should be fundamental components that tie everything together, success may look different depending on the focus of each program.

Commissioner Fernandez agreed that the goals should remain flexible. Also, requiring grantees to provide specific types of data will minimize the range of applicants. The type of data to be tracked and collected will be distinct to the type of plan put forward.

Commissioner Chambers stated it says that it will focus on community-based organizations but there will be reductions in community-based mental health programming in the next round. She stated the need for culturally and linguistically appropriate programs that focus on a mix of technology. It is important to protect smaller cultural-specific communities.

Commissioner Chambers referred to the second feedback item listed on Slide 8, the nuts and bolts slide about eligibility and scoring: "The CBH must ensure no conflict of interest with Commissioners." The response on the slide is that this item is addressed with existing conflict of interest laws and waivers. She asked the legal team to provide more guidance to Commissioners and the public on how to appropriately participate and engage in conversations. Many Commissioners are also part of small community-based organizations or work on other boards that might create a conflict of interest.

Chief Counsel Gallardo welcomed Commissioners to reach out to her with questions. She stated the Political Reform Act has strict recusal requirements. Although it is on a case-by-case basis, the general rule is, if a Commissioner's organization is considering applying for any grant that is sponsored by the Commission, that Commissioner does not participate in any of the formation discussions of the grant because it could be seen as a conflict of interest.

Public Comment and Open Dialogue

John Alita (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners. I'm John Alita. I'm the Executive Director of the San Joaquin Pride Center. I'm also a grantee under the CRDP project. So, some comments and questions today. First of all, our group does support, of course, the focus of applications being on

increasing equity and reducing disparities. We would like to stress, though, that we hope there'll be more demonstration than simply saying someone has a commitment to diversity and sort of just stating some diversity demographics in their geography for their application to be considered. We think there should be some more clarity around what exactly they are pursuing other than some kind of vague references.

We also want to caution on the -- we understand programs need to be seen as sustainable, but, to weigh that principle too strongly, it might be more challenging for CBOs. It also seems to implicate that the approach or the program would need to become Medi-Cal eligible and, from our perspective, if it were eligible, it would already kind of have been sustainable and not necessarily needing funds.

In terms of duplicating existing efforts, our CRDP cohort wants to make sure that that doesn't mean us. Our funding does sunset in June of 2026, so we wouldn't necessarily want to be considered one of the existing efforts as that would really hamper most of us from being able to be considered for some of this funding.

Also, we do support CBOs being the lead. We believe it's more difficult; at least, particularly, we know that in our county for our governmental agencies to always be the leads in this way. They do not necessarily have the cultural understanding or the kind of more nimble infrastructure that our CBOs do in order to provide services.

We also strongly support the feedback comment that awards should prioritize equity and lived experience. In terms of the specific language calling out BIPOC and LGBTQ communities, while it is true that those are subsumed under the other sections, because they are such important communities and in need of such services, we believe that they should be called out specifically as part of the language in in the RFP.

And then, under the last box on Slide 9 about using the funding to sustain and expand CRDP, we do not suggest that other projects should not be eligible. We just want to make sure that all projects that need funding get it. I think you all know at this point the history of this project and how successful it's been, and we really do feel that what we're contributing can continue under the new way that the IPF is being implemented. So, thank you. That's all I have to say.

Fernando Pinon (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thanks. I just wanted to touch on the point about data control and maybe a useful model you could look to is NASA's Citizen Scientist Program. They also have a program called TRISH and through that they use all of the different commercial aerospace providers, but it's all data managed under NASA so that it can go across groups and everyone can have the same quality control mechanism. Thank you.

Kiran Sahota (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Good morning. Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Kiran Sahota. I am a former county employee. I ran MHSAs in a large county and was also part of the original innovations framework a decade ago. So, I'm really excited about innovations. Innovations, since I've retired, has still been a big part of my life. Excuse me as I look down at all my notes, as I've been writing notes this whole time. But a couple things I'd like you to hopefully keep in mind as you look at

this framework is I hope you don't X out the idea of expanded innovations. Just because innovations work in one area, we may want to still innovate in other areas to make sure that it can be successful across the board. And so, I hope that you will consider expanded innovation efforts.

I keep hearing the words story and success, story and success. And I just want to make sure that we're not looking at scripted innovations because then that's not innovations. When you are scripting it, it becomes programming. And so, I'm really hoping that the parameters towards innovations do not detract from true innovations, and that success sometimes is failure. And that sometimes we do have to try new and innovative ideas, but they may not work or they may not work with a particular population.

So, I think we need to be mindful of what success looks like. And it could be, hey, success is we realized that it works better with this population versus that population. And that failure isn't necessarily a waste of funding. And that's what everyone tends to look at is that, if it's not successful and able to be replicated, then it was a waste of funding. And that's not always the case. So, I hope we also look at that success could be failure, but it's learning that is innovation.

And then, the other one aspect that I really wanted to talk about was to kind of tie on to what Commissioner Baer was saying, is that of learning communities. I agree wholeheartedly. And an innovation program I'm currently working on, we meet every six months with eight counties and we talk through challenges. We talk through success. We talk through what worked for one county that may not work for another county. So, I'm highly recommending some sort of learning community.

And I really think what's been lacking in all the years of MHSA/BHSA is that of the learning communities. How to work with counties. How do CBOs fit into counties? And how does it look when you're working at cross-county agencies? So, really learning from that because what a small county does could actually impact a large county. And what a CBO does in one county could impact CBOs in another county. And I really hope that you look at that learning community from a CBH standpoint and really running something to allow participants to really learn off of each other. And that's all I have. Thank you for your time.

Eba Laye (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you. Eba Laye, President of Whole Systems Learning, and I want to speak to the second slide in the framework: "increase equity, reduce disparities, and ensure innovation projects serve underserved populations and those most in need." And I want to juxtapose that against the second feedback that talked about prioritizing BIPOC and LGBTQ.

So, the answer to that spoke about "other populations, as determined by the CBH," which we don't know who they are. "Communities impacted by other behavioral health disparities." We don't really know what that means. "Low-income populations," which isn't something that has been specifically addressed in prior programs. So, it seems to me, we're really just dealing with underserved populations.

Now, if we're not really dealing only with underserved populations, then we are not really addressing the need to increase equities and reduce disparities. So, I think that

the “increase equities, reduce disparities” requirement should apply to underserved populations specifically, even if that is only prioritized in the scoring. I think that there’s a need to prioritize it.

The other thing is that, if populations are going to say they’re underserved, then, in order to adequately increase equity, there should be some statistical evidence of that a population is being underserved and a population should be called out. Thank you.

Chair Tsai stated he wanted to avoid a strict time limit for public comment but, due to the number of public commenters and the short meeting time, he limited public comments to one minute.

Eba Laya stated: Can I ask one question? Is this a dialogue or are we just making the public comment?

Executive Director Grealish asked members of the public to send their full written comments to Commission staff by December 31, 2025, so comments can be captured to help inform the crafting of the upcoming RFP.

Regina Mason (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak this morning. And I’m Regina Mason. I’m the Co-Founder of The Village Project. Our organization came to fruition to meet the unmet needs of the African-American community in Monterey County through Proposition 63. And now that that’s gone away, we’re doing innovative things to sustain mental health services to our population of unserved, inappropriately served, and underserved members of our community, which we see on a daily basis.

I was prepared to talk about the nuts and bolts, but in the interest of time and you put that slide up around areas that you wanted to cover, so I will give public comment on what I originally came to talk about in writing. But I want to make sure that the tier system that you’re proposing not exclude an organization to be able to apply for tier funding and to apply for a larger grant. That’s number one.

The other thing is that I don’t think that CDEPs should be labeled as existing programs. We do have a CDEP, by the way, and I think that those CDEPs should be able to get funding outside of being an existing program because our programs were being researched at the time to look at what’s working and what’s not working.

And then, when it comes to data collection, I really think that there should be some additional funding for data collection outside of the amount being awarded. Thank you. I’ll put all my other stuff in writing. Thanks.

Josephina Alvarado Mena (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you so much. I’m just going to skip my introduction so I can get right to my comments. The first one is related to the question of sustainability and the review process. And I think that there’s another question for the Commission and that question is what is the Commission’s role in helping to sustain the programs that are funded through the IPF? If these are

programs that prove to be really effective, then I would think the Commission would want to see them sustained and are scaled. So that's a question back.

And then, in terms of what does success look like, I have three specific suggestions. One is that an equity evaluation framework be developed to measure this. Secondly, specific metrics related to reducing disparities need to be included and measured as part of the evaluation of this element. And then, finally, all grantees should be required to disaggregate the data by race, ethnicity, and LGBTQ+ status so that reductions in disparities can actually be tracked, and that is a requirement of the BHSA in the legislation.

And then, finally, there's a question about awards prioritizing equity, lived experience, and community leadership in the scoring criteria. And, if that is going to be the case, which I wholeheartedly support, then the review process should include leaders that have experience related to equity, lived experience, and community leadership. Without the expertise in the review process in terms of the leaders, then you're not going to really be able to meaningfully assess that criteria. Thank you.

Reyna Vasquez (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Good morning, Commissioners, and thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment. My name is Reyna Vasquez and I'm with The Village Project, which is one of the organizations of the CRDP. I also already had my notes prepared regarding the first box under feedback on Slide 8 stating "proposed projects must not duplicate existing efforts." So, I am concerned about how existing efforts is being interpreted, particularly as it relates to CRDP IPPs.

So, although these programs are currently operating, their funding is set to end on June 30th, 2026, raising the question of whether their current status would classify them as existing efforts. So, we would just like to ask for clarity that such programs are not automatically disqualified simply because they are operating today. And that's all I have for now. Thank you.

Dr. Clark clarified, since this has come up a few times during public comment, that no program will be automatically disqualified. "Existing efforts" refers to parallel programs that may happen over the life of the grant.

Gabriel Baldinucci (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you. On the question of what does success look like or should be considered success, I would suggest that a priority should be any innovation's ability to increase either the capacity or the effectiveness of the system in serving the population in need. And that might look like increasing resources, lowering cost, getting more support from the public sector, or public engagement. Thank you.

Stacie Hiramoto (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Hi. Stacie Hiramoto, REMHDCO. In the interest of time, I will just say that I support all the comments made by John Alita and Josephina Alvarado Mena. I will send written comments, but I do want to point out

one of the points on Slide 8. The fourth feedback box says “awards should prioritize equity, lived experience, and community leadership as scoring criteria,” but the response box so far says “under consideration.” And so, that’s why I think some people are concerned because it says under consideration, as if this would not prioritize those things and we want those prioritized.

The other point I wanted to make was how should the Commission best assess potential for sustainability? Please do not say Medi-Cal. Yes, that’s the best way to sustain a program, but, if the programs could be qualified for Medi-Cal already, they probably wouldn’t need to be an innovation. Thank you.

Dr. Clark clarified that “under consideration for inclusion” is staff’s way of saying the plan is to do that. No final decisions are being made until staff hears from everyone.

Laurel Benhamida, Ph.D., (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: I’m Laurel Benhamida, MASS-SSF and REMHDCO. How long can a project be proposed for? One, two, three, four, or five years?

Can collaboratives and coalitions apply? And how would the tiers be handled in that situation?

Three, I’d like to see some ballpark numbers on the size of the tier, size of contracts.

Four, 20 percent evaluation suggested.

And five, thank you, Commissioner Baer, for the peer learning suggestion. Do you have any other suggestions, based on your international experience with CBOs?

And six, I really think we ought to have time for discussion. Thank you.

Dr. Clark stated much of those questions are still under consideration and what staff is hoping to get feedback on today.

Carlene Davis (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Hi. Carlene Davis, California Black Women’s Health Project and California Reducing Disparities Project. And this goes back to the low-income and eligibility. I just want to really make sure that low-income eligibility does not get conflated with Medi-Cal under any circumstances, particularly because the asset limit has been reinstated into Medi-Cal. So, there is about to be a large swath of very low-income California residents who are no longer going to be eligible because they might have some assets. So, please do not conflate low income with Medi-Cal.

And I also do want to lift up that success does mean for CBOs and community-based organizations two things: that there are community-based organizations who are doing great work who may not yet be at the stage that they have audited financials. So, I would not want audited financials to be an exclusionary point. And then, also, to make sure that the funding opportunities allow time for planning, which would be multi-year. Thank you.

Von Simmons, Psy.D., (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Good morning. My name is Von Simmons. I'm with the California Black Women's Health Project. And I just wanted to briefly comment on Slide 9 – the response regarding BIPOC and LGBTQ+ being a part of this kind of umbrella term of underserved, low-income communities impacted by behavioral health disparities. I really want to just kind of call and encourage us to maybe reconsider that because having this umbrella term may feel very safe, but it also does not necessarily address specific needs of those groups because they're being lumped together with other groups. So, I just wanted to mention that and thought that was important to share. And thank you so much for your time.

Lueni Masina (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Lueni Masina and I represent the Essence of MANA Program, a program funded under the California Reducing Disparities Project and the only CDEP serving Pacific Islander communities, one of many communities that are often unserved and underserved. As our comment in support of requiring projects to increase equity, I also humbly urge the Commission to evaluate proposals based on real actionable plans, not just language. Like many who have gone before me, I strongly support prioritizing community-based organizations and adopting equity by honoring lived experience and community leadership.

And so, in closing, as the CRDP approaches its sunset, we urge the Commission to recognize the proven success in improving outcomes and reducing costs for BIPOC and LGBTQ+ communities. These programs reflect what innovation funding is meant to support and should be carried forward. Thank you for your time.

Committee Discussion, continued

Action: Chair Tsai asked for a symbolic motion that the PAC Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the Innovation Partnership Fund RFP outline. Commissioner Fernandez made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the Innovation Partnership Fund RFP outline.*

Motion passed 6 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted "Yes": Commissioners Baer, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss, and Chair Tsai.

Agenda Item 6: Behavioral Health Student Services Act (BHSSA) Administration and Evaluation Funds – Action

Chair Tsai stated the Committee will hear a presentation on encumbering one-time BHSSA administrative and evaluation funds and consider making a recommendation to move it forward to the full Commission, which will meet in January 2026.

Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss recused herself from the discussion and decision-making with regard to this agenda item pursuant to Commission policy.

Chair Tsai asked staff to present this agenda item.

Melissa Martin-Mollard, Ph.D., Assistant Deputy Director of Research, Evaluation, and Program Operations, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the goal, BHSSA components, considerations for BHSSA administrative and evaluation funds, and next steps.

Committee Discussion

Senate Designee Swartz referred to the technical assistance for suicide prevention training contract and asked if there is a connection to the California Department of Public Health's (CDPH) contract with Center for Applied Research Solutions (CARS) to provide technical assistance for student suicide prevention efforts.

Assistant Deputy Director Martin-Mollard stated staff is coordinating with the CDPH. The technical assistance component is connected to legislation that will be discussed in the Legislative and External Affairs Advisory Committee (LEX Committee) meeting later today to support ongoing efforts to provide training and support for schools around suicide prevention.

Public Comment and Open Dialogue

Stacie Hiramoto (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Thank you. You know, when I read the legislative agenda, it was shocking to me that there was very little discussion and the only legislation they're proposing is this huge -- again, suicide prevention concerning these same partners. And I'm not saying that this is what's happening. I'm just telling you from a public perspective, if you're not deeply involved, this just looks like the same kind of insider thing that the Commission has been accused of in the past.

I also feel that you should contract with people that have boards of directors that are diverse and have a reputation of serving BIPOC communities. I realize you've got to get this money out the door by June. So, I realize, but this just, again, lacks transparency to me and I just wish we had more time to discuss it. Thank you.

Commissioner Chambers asked if staff is aware of what Stacie Hiramoto is saying or if this can be brought back later to follow up.

Executive Director Grealish stated appreciation that Stacie Hiramoto raised the concern and the thoughts. The Commission can continue to think about this and about how to ensure that the work of the Commission is reflective of the communities and that it is engaging providers and contractors who have expertise in the areas that Stacie Hiramoto raised.

Stacie Hiramoto stated: And this is not illegal, but there's a former staff person from the Commission that works there now. And again, that's not illegal; it just, again, smacks of, you know, if you know someone, I mean, these inside contact things. So, that's all I want to say.

Executive Director Grealish stated it is not the intent but stated appreciation for raising this concern that allows conversations about it.

Stacie Hiramoto stated: No, it's wonderful because you're right. In the past, they would not even have made this public. They would have just made the contract amendment. Thank you, Brenda. I just have to say, okay, thank you.

Lisa Tadlock (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Hi. Good morning. I am here representing myself and not my employer, just so that I'm clear, but I do work in this behavioral health field. And I'm wondering, because, when I see some of the opportunities here – and I think that they're great and I understand the timeline on getting RFPs – but is there some sort of crosswalk because we just heard that there is, you know, that CDPH is doing some suicide prevention?

And like the California Youth Behavioral Health Initiative under DHCS is doing a lot of this work as well. And I see some, what I want to say is cross-collaboration opportunities versus siloing like some of the efforts that I know that the Commission would like to meet. And so, I'm just bringing it forward if there could be some sort of, I don't know. I mean, I just think of it as a crosswalk and maybe there already is something in existence on how these can collaborate and support each other – all of these different initiatives. And I'm looking specifically in the justice involved piece, but I know that there are other priorities as well. So, I just wanted to put it out there that it'd really be helpful to kind of have some sort of crosswalk on what's happening currently to support the grantees in these same areas. That's it.

Allison Wolinsky (attended remotely via Zoom) stated: Hi, my name is Allison Wolinsky. I'm with Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services and I just wanted to echo, I think, the things that have already been said. It's a little bit confusing for those of us who have not been in these spaces, but who are following all the stakeholder processes for BHSA. And having seen the Phase 2 guidance come out from CDPH around really figuring out how to leverage all of these resources, including especially around suicide prevention and the funding that's going from counties back up to the state specifically around suicide prevention.

And I'm curious to see how folks can work to coordinate and with their new office for I think it's social and behavioral health that is being created in 2026. So, yes, again, just saying how I'm very curious to understand a little bit better about how all of this is being integrated across rather than being rolled out in more silos.

Assistant Deputy Director Martin-Mollard stated Commission staff meets monthly with the CDPH and the DHCS on implementation of the BHSA. This proposal is related to providing technical assistance for specific training for schools and is not a siloed approach. The Commission is trying to consider how it can support the ongoing work that the CDPH is doing around suicide prevention through the BHSSA dollars but specific to schools in this case.

Committee Discussion, continued

Action 1 of 4: Chair Tsai asked for a symbolic motion that the PAC Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption to procure Grant Management

software for an estimated \$200,000. Commissioner Cross made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Fernandez, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption to procure Grant Management software for an estimated \$200,000.*

Motion passed 6 yes, 0 no, and 1 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted “Yes”: Commissioners Baer, Chambers, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, and Chair Tsai.

The following PAC Committee Member abstained: Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss.

Action 2 of 4: Chair Tsai asked for a symbolic motion that the PAC Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption to amend the BHSSA TA provider (CARS) contract (Contract # 24MHSOAC061) to provide an additional \$1.5 million in BHSSA administrative funds for technical assistance for suicide prevention training. Chair Tsai made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Fernandez, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption to amend the BHSSA TA provider (CARS) contract (Contract # 24MHSOAC061) to provide an additional \$1.5 million in BHSSA administrative funds for technical assistance for suicide prevention training.*

Motion passed 5 yes, 0 no, and 2 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted “Yes”: Commissioners Baer, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, and Chair Tsai.

The following PAC Committee Members abstained: Commissioner Chambers and Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss.

Action 3 of 4: Chair Tsai asked for a symbolic motion that the PAC Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the disbursement of \$3.6 million in BHSSA administrative funds for substance use disorder services integration pilots through a competitive RFP process. Senate Designee Swartz made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Baer, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the disbursement of \$3.6 million in BHSSA administrative funds for substance use disorder services integration pilots through a competitive RFP process.*

Motion passed 5 yes, 0 no, and 2 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted “Yes”: Commissioners Baer, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, and Chair Tsai.

The following PAC Committee Members abstained: Commissioner Chambers and Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss.

Action 4 of 4: Chair Tsai asked for a symbolic motion that the PAC Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the disbursement of \$9 million in BHSSA evaluation for school behavioral health performance management systems through a competitive RFP process. Chair Tsai made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Baer, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the disbursement of \$9 million in BHSSA evaluation for school behavioral health performance management systems through a competitive RFP process.*

Motion passed 6 yes, 0 no, and 1 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted “Yes”: Commissioners Baer, Chambers, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, and Chair Tsai.

The following PAC Committee Member abstained: Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss.

Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss rejoined the meeting.

Agenda Item 7: Peer Respite Program Report-Out – Action

Chair Tsai stated the Committee will hear a presentation on how the Commission can invest Mental Health Wellness Act funds to promote and expand the peer respite model across the state and consider making a recommendation to move it forward to the full Commission, which will meet in January 2026 for a tentative RFP release date in March 2026. He asked staff to present this agenda item.

Courtney Ackerman, Research Scientist, Research, Evaluation, and Programs Division, provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the goals, Mental Health Wellness Act funds, and funding priorities of the Peer Respite Project, the peer respite funding outline, and next steps. She stated the proposal splits funding into two phases: one focused on building capacity and one on implementation, with research and evaluation integrated into each phase.

There were no questions from Committee Members and no public comment.

Action: Chair Tsai asked for a symbolic motion that the PAC Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the Mental Health Wellness Act Peer Respite Project outline. Commissioner Baer made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss, that:

- *The Program Advisory Committee recommends that the full Commission approves adoption of the Mental Health Wellness Act Peer Respite Project outline.*

Motion passed 6 yes, 0 no, and 1 abstain, per roll call vote as follows:

The following PAC Committee Members voted “Yes”: Commissioners Baer, Cross, Fernandez, and Senate Designee Swartz, Vice Chair Madrigal-Weiss, and Chair Tsai.

The following PAC Committee Member abstained: Commissioner Chambers.

Agenda Item 8: Adjournment

Chair Tsai stated the next full Commission meeting will be a two-day meeting to be held on January 22-23, 2026. He stated the next PAC Committee meeting date will soon be announced. He thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:00 p.m.

DRAFT