



March 25, 2022

Mark Ghaly, MD, MPH

Secretary, California Health and Human Services Agency

1215 O Street

Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Preliminary Feedback on CARE Court Proposal**

Dear Secretary Ghaly:

On behalf of the undersigned statewide provider advocacy associations, we would like to thank the Administration for reaching out to community-based organizations (CBOs) representing the backbone of the public behavioral health delivery system about the proposed CARE Court framework. We commend Governor Newsom and the Administration for thinking creatively about gaps in the continuum of care for individuals living with behavioral health challenges. We believe the attention to linking some of the most at-risk individuals with severe mental illness who are ready for treatment to important social supports including counseling, medication and housing, are critical interventions in promoting whole person care.

Due to the lack of detail in the proposal to date, our organizations do not have an official position on the CARE Court proposal, and we look forward to additional discussion via the stakeholder workgroups and other communication mechanisms before registering a position. In this vein, we offer the following questions and considerations that we believe should guide the

development of this new program. Our organizations and the members we represent stand ready to engage and lend our expertise as you develop the details of the CARE Court framework.

As we solicited input from our various members, it became clear that there are two overarching concerns that need to be addressed in order to move the framework forward. In particular, coercive treatment and the need to have a very thoughtful implementation process.

Individuals coerced into treatment experience these services as trauma, not “care.” Though we understand that the Administration’s goal is not to look to conservatorship, 5150’s and other types of mandated treatment as a first option, the fact that these may ultimately be a part of some individuals’ treatment plans during CARE Court is concerning. Research shows that coerced treatment is also ineffective treatment and there are numerous studies demonstrating this with respect to services for individuals experiencing mental health and substance use conditions. Accordingly, coerced treatment should be a last resort, and only used in those instances where there is an immediate threat to life or risk of serious harm. This is a value shared in common by all four state associations and our member organizations.

It is important to note that when it comes to the proposed target population for CARE Court, those individuals experiencing co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders might be the majority group as they are more likely to come to the attention of those who might make referrals into the CARE Court process. Additionally, we remain concerned about clients who never have had contact with the legal system but through this initiative would be experiencing it through this new program. This is why it is of utmost importance to ensure that the CARE Court referral and treatment process is comprehensive and attends to the various impacts of the social determinants of health on this population.

During our conversations with CalHHS staff, we understand that the Administration’s commitment to focusing on the least restrictive treatment environments and allowing as much individual choice in the CARE Court process is valued. However, many of our members continue to react to the messaging around CARE Court which seems to feed into stigma-based beliefs around violence and incompetence on the part of those that CARE Court would look to

serve. This messaging can and will have an impact on those who might participate in CARE Court, and as you have rightly stated, “care” and “court” are two words that don’t make much sense when combined.

With respect to timeline, we believe the January 2023 start date for CARE Court is overly ambitious for an effort with this level of complexity. We are concerned that the ambitious timeline may leave many important details and questions unresolved, and ultimately fail the individuals the proposal aims to help. For example, if critical resources such as workforce for treatment settings and housing do not exist, an individual is bound to fail. As such, we request consideration of a more realistic implementation date.

Below, we outline additional feedback from our members:

How does the Administration envision substance use disorder conditions to be included in CARE Court? Is methamphetamine-induced psychosis, a transient condition, included under the eligibility criteria? Regardless, individuals with co-occurring conditions will be included under CARE Court and the services described do not match what is needed for an individual with a substance use disorder condition. Access to MAT, recovery residences, harm reduction services, contingency management, and individualized treatment are critical for individuals with substance use disorders. Additionally, what will prevent CARE Court from being used to further criminalize or coerce substance use disorders? How will additional treatment capacity be funded for substance use disorder care? Drug Medi-Cal alone cannot meet the full needs. Since a high percentage of the population in question are co-occurring there is a significant capacity shortage today to meet the need of this population.

There will need to be a new workforce of evaluators for CARE Court that is trained specifically on the eligible diagnoses and impairment criteria. From conversations regarding alienist evaluations for felony incompetent to stand trial (IST) evaluations, there is not sufficient training or an adequate amount of evaluators leading to delays before evaluation and inappropriate evaluations leading to individuals who are competent being placed on the IST waitlist. How will the state prevent something similar from happening with CARE Court? One potential solution could include adapting the Massachusetts model for IST evaluations which includes workshops

for evaluators, individual mentoring, review of reports, written examination and an ongoing quality improvement process overseen by the state mental health agency. Additionally, it is imperative that the CARE Court process include protections for underserved, underrepresented and under-resourced communities that have been historically targeted by law enforcement for crimes at a higher rate than other communities.

Given that there is an existing behavioral health staffing shortage, what will prevent CARE Court from draining staff from community-based programs into a costly and time-consuming court process where individuals are already receiving services? We hear from provider agencies that the critical barrier that prevents them from offering additional services is the lack of ability to hire and retain qualified workforce. One specific example is when San Francisco City and County declared a local state of emergency in December regarding the situation in the Tenderloin allowing them to waive the government hiring process and fill nearly all of the hundreds of vacant and funded positions within the behavioral health branch of the Department of Public Health. However, doing this gutted the vital workforce from local CBOs. While we appreciate that the Administration has proposed a Care Economy Workforce request in the Fiscal Year 2022-23 State Budget, workforce development will take time and the immediate need is far greater than what is proposed to meet the needs of Californians with mental health and substance use conditions.

While we understand that CARE Court is not intended to be a silver bullet solution to homelessness, likely a significant portion of the individuals in CARE Court will be experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity. How does CARE Court intend to operate when we are experiencing a general lack of housing services for individuals with behavioral health conditions? We have members that are currently doing a superb job of engaging predominantly individuals experiencing homelessness with both mental health and substance use conditions, but are having a difficult time linking individuals to housing and services particularly for individuals with co-occurring conditions because these options simply do not exist. Clients are able to take a shower, access harm reduction services, and get short-term services, but there remains a need for more housing options for individuals with behavioral health conditions.

It is also important to note that research from Dr. Margot Kushel of UC San Francisco indicates that half of all individuals experiencing homelessness today are over the age of 50 with half of this population having their first experience of homelessness after they turned 50 years old. There is a significant percentage of this population who have geriatric conditions beyond their biological age including urinary incontinence, hearing impairment and mobility impairment. As such, access to services, including housing needs to be designed to address these needs. Does the CARE Plan designed within the CARE Court model include adequate access to primary care and physical health care services?

Our members raised several questions about the mechanics of CARE Court and how it will actually work on the ground. The pathway of Referral, Clinical Evaluation, Care Plan, Support, and Success is highly aspirational and does not reflect all of the possible situations that could occur including refusal of treatment. As well as the successful examples outlined in the materials we have seen, is it possible to see a diagram or decision tree that reflects a person refusing or failing out of CARE Court, at each point in the pathway, in order to better understand their treatment options?

Lastly, our members are also concerned about the role that different system representatives play in the CARE Court model. What will happen if a homeless outreach worker or a police officer refers an individual to be evaluated and placed into CARE Court, but the individual refuses? Will the person be arrested or detained by law enforcement? Further, how does the person actually get to the court? Are they transported? Where will the person be detained until they are evaluated? We believe that jails are not the appropriate place for individuals with behavioral health conditions and psychiatric hospitals are already at capacity. What protections will exist for situations where an inappropriate referral is made?

Our organizations combined represent the backbone of California's public behavioral health system. These CBOs will be the providers on the ground serving individuals ordered into CARE Court. We have provided commentary and questions reflecting fundamental details that need to be resolved prior to CARE Court passing the Legislature, being signed by the Governor, and implemented.

We are committed to continuing discussions with our respective members and with the CalHHS team and will engage in the stakeholder and legislative process. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to outreach to any of our organizations.

Sincerely,



Le Ondra Clark Harvey, Ph.D.,  
Chief Executive Officer,  
California Council of Community Behavioral  
Health Agencies



Tyler Rinde, Executive Director, California  
Association of Alcohol and Drug Addiction  
Program Executives



Chad Costello, CPRP, Executive Director,  
California Association of Social  
Rehabilitation Agencies



Christine Stoner-Mertz, LCSW, Chief  
Executive Officer, California Alliance of  
Child and Family Services

CC:

Marko Mijic, Undersecretary, CalHHS

Stephanie Welch, Deputy Secretary of Behavioral Health, CalHHS

Corrin Buchannan, Deputy Secretary for Policy and Strategic Planning, CalHHS

Michelle Baass, Director, Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)

Jacey Cooper, Chief Deputy Director and State Medicaid Director, DHCS

Dr. Kelly Pfeifer, Deputy Director, Behavioral Health, DHCS

Agnes Lee, Policy Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Rendon

Marjorie Swartz, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Atkins

Judy Babcock, Senior Consultant, Assembly Health Committee

Scott Bain, Principal Consultant, Assembly Health Committee

Andrea Margolis, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee

Reyes Diaz, Principal Consultant, Senate Health Committee

Scott Ogus, Consultant, Senate Budget Committee

Eusevio Padilla, Chief of Staff, Office of Assemblymember Joaquin Arambula

Liz Snow, Chief of Staff, Office of Assemblymember Jim Wood

David Stammerjohan, Chief of Staff, Office of Senator Susan Eggman

Darin Walsh, Chief of Staff, Office of Senator Richard Pan

Aria Ghafari, Chief of Staff, Office of Senator Tom Umberg

Guy Strahl, Chief of Staff, Office of Assemblymember Richard Bloom