Public comment from Stacie Hiramoto

From: Stacie Hiramoto <shiramoto@remhdco.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:24 PM
To: Brenda Grealish <brenda.grealish@bhsoac.ca.gov>; Mayra E. Alvarez (malvarez@childrenspartnership.org) <malvarez@childrenspartnership.org>
Cc: Kendra Zoller <Kendra.Zoller@bhsoac.ca.gov>; Melissa Martin-Mollard <Melissa.MMollard@bhsoac.ca.gov>
Subject: Letters Re: Tomorrow's CBH Meeting

Hello Brenda –

I don't know if these letters are in time for the Hand out packet for tomorrow's meeting, but hoping that they are. Thank you so much.

Stacie Hiramoto, MSW

Director

She/her/kanojō

Racial & Ethnic Mental Health Disparities Coalition

(916) 705-5018

Shiramoto@remhdco.org

California Reducing Disparities Project

October 22, 2025

Members of the Commission for Behavioral Health
1812 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

Re: Full Commission Meeting of October 22, 2025
General Public Comment

Dear Chair Alvarez and Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit concerns regarding the adoption of the Innovation Partnership Fund (IPF) Framework at the Commission's meeting of October 23, 2025. It is very concerning that only 30 minutes has been allotted to this item. We do not believe that this is enough time to present all the concerns and recommendations made by the public stakeholders in previous engagement opportunities, as well as to allow sufficient time for public stakeholder comments during the 10/23 meeting. **We recommend delaying voting on the final version of the framework until the January 2026 Full Commission meeting at the earliest.**

This letter contains concerns and suggestions regarding the process for developing the IPF Framework. We are also submitting a separate letter regarding our recommendations for content changes to the IPF Framework.

While we want to commend the Commissioners and staff for the hard work to reform and reorganize the Commission committee process, we would like to highlight some areas that we believe are not yet fully understood by all Commissioners. For example, during the September 18th Program Committee meetings, although substantial public comment was taken regarding the IPF, there was not a great deal of deliberation, and most questions and concerns of the pubic speakers went unanswered. It appeared that the Commissioners were not accustomed to the open discussion format. Commissioners appeared to follow the custom of just listening to the public comment without agreeing, disagreeing, or asking questions regarding the comments. Commissioners did not deliberate on how to incorporate or address public comment. It was unclear if Commissioners understood that it was still possible to incorporate/address public comment in the IPF Framework.

Moreover, the power point presentation was more a summary of the framework, not the actual framework document itself. The option to propose changes in the language to the actual IPF Framework was not explicitly put forth by staff during the presentation or after the public comment. this was a missed opportunity to further refine and improve the document.

At the end of the public comment, when the it was posed whether to approve the IPF framework, there were comments by Commissioners such as, "We really don't have the power to approve anything, only the full Commission can do this," and "We only have the power to move it (the Framework) forward." It is our contention that at least some of the Commissioners voted "AYE", because they did not want to hold up the process. It did not appear, however, that they were opposed to further changes in the exact language of IPF Framework-V3.

We acknowledge that overall, staff has made efforts to listen to public concerns and has made some changes to the IPF Framework. However, after so much public comment and concerns during the Committee meetings on the September 18th, it is very surprising that there were **no further changes** to the document. This was not known until late October 16th when the most recent draft was shared with the public.

We do not believe that this was a deliberate attempt to rush or "sneak" the IPF Framework – V3 through. We believe it was more a result of this being a new process and the Commissioners, as well as the public stakeholders, were not aware of how the Committee meetings were going to be conducted. I know as a public stakeholder, if I thought this was the ***final*** opportunity to amend the language of the IPF Framework, then I would have just come with a "mark-up" (changes/edits) of the actual document as it is done with legislation at the Capitol and asked the Commissioners to vote to approve our proposed amendments.

We also realize that the Commission is in a difficult situation since time is running out before an RFP should be written and released. However, taking the final vote after only allotting 30 minutes to this item on the agenda would feel as if the IPF Framework was being rushed through without full context or opportunity for making it a consensus document.

Thank you again for the opportunity to listen to our concerns.

Josefina Alvarado Mena
Chair, CRDP Cross Population Sustainability Steering Committee

cc: Brenda Grealish, Executive Director, Commission for Behavioral Health