

**Sacramento County Mental Health Board**  
**Community Wellness Response Team (CWRT) Advisory Committee**  
**ANNOUNCEMENT – IN PERSON MEETING**  
**HYBRID PARTICIPATION OPTION**  
**Tuesday, June 11, 2024**  
**6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**

Members Present: Corrine Sako, Katie Houston, Kaino Hopper, Severine Hollingsworth, Elijah Orr, Sarina Rodriguez, Mykel Gayent (staff: Korlany Roche)

Absent: Adam Wills

**Agenda Item**

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

- Introductions:
    - Committee Members
    - CWRT Partners
  - Review [MHB Conduct Agreement](#)
  - Announcements by CWRT Advisory Committee Members
- 
- Chair Sako commenced the meeting at 6:00pm. Introductions were made and Chair Sako read the MHB Conduct Agreement.
  - Member Hopper shared that her tone and comments were not respectful at the last meeting. She appreciated reading the Conduct Agreement and will continue to improve her service and be self-aware of how she is presenting.
  - Chair Sako shared there was an application for committee membership for a vacant MHB member seat received at last month's meeting. It was decided that the committee's co-chairs would schedule an interview with the candidate prior to coming back before this committee. This item is not on tonight's agenda due to the time taken to schedule and coordinate the interview. An interview date has been identified for all parties involved for later this month and will report back on this matter at next month's meeting.
  - Chair Sako announced there is one vacant community member seat on this committee and we recently received an application for this member seat. Co-chairs will schedule an interview with this individual as well.
  - Chair Sako reported she attended a meeting where a representative from the State's Department of Health and Human Services spoke about the work that is being done with 988 at the state level from different workgroups. She learned there is a 988 crisis policy advisory workgroup that meets every 2 months at the state level and these workgroups are discussing and deliberating items that have consistently come up in this body's meeting, including marketing and bidirectionality between 988 and emergency responders. It is my understanding that specific state guidance for the 988/911/peace apps interoperability is currently being deliberated and will be voted on in August at the CA Office of Emergency Services workgroup meeting. The concerns that are being identified at the state level are similar to the concerns being identified at the local level here, such as the need to build up capacity without overwhelming what we have right now and framing that programs are still in the infancy stage. They have seen an increase in call volume from 17% to 19% since January and that a statewide communication strategy implementation plan should be decided on at the state level this month. I am sharing this because counties are waiting for guidance from the State regarding these issues, which could explain the pace we have been seeing with our county. I have asked the representative of the CA Department of Health and Human Services to present at our committee and they've agreed to do so, but not until the Fall when these things have been worked out at the state level – so they can come with actual guidance for us. We should expect them to around October.
    - Terri (with WellSpace) added that the workgroups are open to the public. There are several workgroups and they can be found on their website. There is a lot of work going forward as they are developing a 5 year plan for implementation.
    - Chair Sako added there is work being done at the federal level. FCC is being asked to fix the issue around geo-routing. If someone calls 988 from an 818 area code but they're here in Sacramento, they will get the call center in Southern CA. At the federal level, the FCC will be looking at a proposal to fix this issue.
  - Member Gayent asked about the work being done at the state level, and where we can get links to the website? Chair Sako will email the links.

## II. Public Comments related to the Community Wellness Response Team (CWRT)

- Public Comment #1: In 2022 I was shot by Sacramento Police Department with a mental health crisis. I was diagnosed with Lupis Nephritis and as part of my treatment I was corticoid steroids at a high dose. Three times I've talked to my doctors that I was having problems remembering time, problems remembering what was going on and what my actions were, and I felt out of control. Unfortunately, it wasn't caught in time and I called Sac PD to assist us. Dispatch wasn't very helpful since I was hallucinating the entire time, they called back and my wife called again. I was under the impression that we weren't going to get hurt so I locked us in the room and I thought that was the way to keep my family safe. I don't remember much, I don't have any recollection of what happened and I really wish that they had called another resource that night to diffuse the situation. In my opinion, it was escalated and escalated and the follow up afterward ruined my reputation and I ultimately lost my job. We've been struggling for 2 years and it's not over yet. I'm here as an advocate to support law enforcement and support our community to try to figure out a way so that this doesn't happen again. I'm 1 in 4 with this condition that is alive, I'm not sure where the other 3 are but it is a scary place to be in especially when the condition is not treated. I find it hard when I see people who are saying this – I wish if I had known that was the response I would have never called.
- Public Comment #2: That night was a scary night and he thought his dad was out to kill him and that happened the day before. We called our pastor and we thought he would get back to himself. I challenged him and said if you truly think your dad is going to kill you, you need to call 911. They called officers over and our daughter was 4 months old at the time and I was pumping and it was really hard. I had lack of sleep and didn't have time to take care of my baby and I was on the phone with them the whole night, and I begged them not to do anything thinking that my husband just needed a little bit of time to get back to himself. That morning he lost it and he walked around the room saying that it was not a safe place and they were going to come and kill us. They, the SWAT team broke into the house and immediately broke into the master bedroom and immediately started shooting. I didn't think he got shot until much later. It was hard for me and they took me and my kids right away and I didn't know what happened until 2 weeks later when he was in the hospital. He was still not himself and didn't know what happened.
- Members thanked public commenters for sharing their story.
- Public Comment #3: I'm here as a community member but I sit on the MHB. I want to compliment the CWRT – I heard from a family last week that they called the CWRT out and unbeknownst to the mother, one of the other sons also called 911. The Sheriff's Department and CWRT both arrived on the scene. They worked together effectively to calm the situation and resolve it without anyone going to jail or hospital. I also heard from another family that they had a positive experience with CWRT when they were called out. I am part of a workgroup on SB43 implementation which is the changes in the law regarding grave disability and wanted to share that there will be a meeting for end users seeking their input into the implementation of SB43 in the Sacramento region, that will be convened by the hospital association that is running this workgroup but will be led by Al Rowlett and myself. If you or anyone you know is interested in being included in that conversation to make sure that your community or your point of view is represented in that conversation, please reach out to me and I'd be happy to give you more information. Finally, the NAMI walk was cancelled but rescheduled to this Saturday from 8am-noon at the Scottish Rite building on A street and invite you all to come and join us. There will be 45 vendors with lots of fun to be had.

## III. Discussion/Action Item: Review CWRT Advisory Committee Bylaws with Reconsideration of Membership Exclusion Criteria

- Chair Sako shared that the AC Bylaws went to the full MHB which was approved, then went to the BOS in April and it was sent back for revision. I have a clip from that meeting to provide context so everyone knows what was discussed and what the supervisors are thinking in their sending it back to us. Video clip from BOS meeting on April 9, 2024: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1T1E\\_JzRu9HsXpJdYIGq03ZLAWmH7yCqA/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1T1E_JzRu9HsXpJdYIGq03ZLAWmH7yCqA/view). For added context, the item was listed on their consent calendar. Consent calendar items are usually items that will be considered in one fell swoop so they may say we approve the consent calendar which may be 20 or 25 items could be approved in that time. If a supervisor has an issue or wants discussion on one of the items on the consent calendar, they will pull the item off and so that's what happened, why it says consent matters. It was item number 23 on the consent calendar but I believe it was Supervisor Kennedy who pulled the item off for discussion.
- Chair Sako included in the agenda packet the current CWRT Advisory Committee Bylaws and reviewed the text on page 4 that indicates membership exclusion criteria.
- Chair Sako discussed the text doesn't eliminate wholeheartedly participation from law enforcement, but that community feedback was recommending that the participation be between law enforcement and BHS that were standing up the program and implementing the program. It is my understanding that there had been monthly communication since September and would like to note that we have 3 members of Sacramento Sheriff's Office sitting at the table. I think it is clear we are not wholeheartedly

eliminating law enforcement from this conversation. There are also law enforcement members participating at the state level in the policy workgroups and even at the federal level. I'm not sure why that narrative continues to remain. The work we did in November when we reconsidered this, at a previous meeting we were challenged by Supervisor Desmond to look at the text and not be exclusionary, we took out the Membership Exclusionary Criteria header out altogether, still has text about what the community stakeholder workgroup information was received and instead of saying we're excluding folks that have ever served in law enforcement, we're recommending that persons who have a background, that they haven't served in the last 7-10 years. It should also be noted that we do have members currently serving on this committee that either have or have had family or intimate relationships with those who have service. Even though that was information gathered in the workgroup sessions, it is not the recommendation that this committee has stuck to.

- The packet labeled DRAFT is what Chair Sako is presenting for consideration, with highlighted text. The Membership Exclusion Criteria heading is still removed, information that was deemed important to include that was derived from the community stakeholder workgroup sessions, and information about individuals who can be considered for membership. If this draft is approved, that means any individual with a history of serving in law enforcement could be considered for membership. Noted that not just specific to law enforcement, but EMT/EMS/Paramedic/Fire to be in an active consultation type relationship for effective interoperability and bidirectionality of the CWRT program. Also noted that EMT/EMS/Paramedic/Fire/law enforcement attend and participate in the monthly CWRT AC meetings as liaison representatives to their respective departments. In taking the direction of trying to refine the Bylaws and being less exclusionary and making it clear that we have been having law enforcement involved in the conversation, we continue to do so and that we would be willing to consider folks with law enforcement service background, just not active service.
- Member Hollingsworth asked if we should remove the paragraph about not having served in 7-10 years since that was the complaint from the supervisors. Chair Sako clarified that the text is there to provide context for what was provided in the stakeholder workgroup sessions, but it is not the recommendation to remove this text.
- Member Rodriguez pointed to text that could be rearranged to clarify the recommendation. In that way, it clarifies what current, active law enforcement members can do for our Board and it also clarifies that they are welcome to, once they are no longer serving, apply to the Board.
- Member Houston agrees and wants to hear the voice of law enforcement not being involved. Going from having a large gap with them not being involved, to the option to leave law enforcement service today and join tomorrow is a big jump. Houston asked if we want to discuss a timeframe because it was the vagueness of the timeframe that is a concern. We pulled the timeframe directly from the public and said 7-10 years, but could we also consider a conflict of interest where they're actively working. Their community is law enforcement and even after retirement, we want to make sure the community outside of law enforcement has a voice. I don't know if an arbitrary amount of time will meet that need but I think it would be a lot to go from 7-10 years to nothing.
- Member Rodriguez shared another potential option is having clarification on the number of Board members there are. Right now the Bylaws states that CWRT AC will have 9 seats; of the 9 seats, 3 will be filled by current MHB members and 6 filled by community members. It is not clear in our Bylaws whether or not law enforcement could fill a seat. There could be clarification on adding a seat, making it 10 seats, that could be filled by a former or non-active law enforcement member or EMS. Or clarify that it is 5 community members with some other position added.
  - Chair Sako discussed whether individuals are still considered a member of the community if they retire from law enforcement. These seats are for consideration and applicants will be screened and interviewed by the co-chairs. If their lived experience is deemed to make them a viable candidate for membership, it can be brought forward. If their lived experience isn't as strong as another candidate, or there are concerns of conflict of interest, it can be discussed during that time.
- Chair Sako shared she has been trying to change this narrative, which is incorrect, and that law enforcement is and has been part of this conversation and have been a part of what we're doing here. How do we move forward so that we're not, for the fourth or fifth time, spending more time instead of reviewing outcomes, working on Bylaw amendments.
- Member Orr concurred with Chair Sako's statement of spending time on this topic. Member Orr questioned why the AC is so adamant about not letting law enforcement be involved when it would be important to bring in their voice since they deal with these issues first hand. I am confused personally why we wouldn't want the voice of law enforcement at our table. It will be up to the co-chairs to interview and screen the candidates to ensure they would be a good fit. We can get more in depth when we are not excluding individuals.
  - Chair Sako provided context that the AC does not want to exclude law enforcement. The overwhelming majority of feedback from the stakeholder workgroup sessions was guiding this program, and it was the community saying they felt it was not appropriate for law enforcement to be on the AC. The reasons that were given were that they felt the AC would be a place for individuals who didn't have platforms to be heard or have power over voting could be a place where they could have that, with the thinking was that law enforcement already has platforms and places where their voices could be heard. The AC is not trying to exclude law enforcement

altogether and they are also working with County. Chair Sako discussed how the AC can honor and stay faithful or have fidelity to the community and stakeholder workgroup while also meeting the needs of the community now. Is it still matching what the program is doing now as we're re-evaluating it.

- Member Hollingsworth shared that the Bylaws indicate we prioritize lived experience. Individuals could be in active duty and still have lived experience. As long as we obey by the Bylaws, we prioritize lived experience. I believe the way it's drafted is fine. We need to agree that the individual sitting on this Board doesn't impose their view and we have to reach quorum and take a vote.
- Member Rodriguez shared that her role here as a community representative is to represent her community. What do I not want to see is the majority of the Board turn into affiliates and former law enforcement. I believe this will break the community's trust that they worked very hard to get to today. I advocate for a special seat that can be designated to former law enforcement individual and protect the 6 community Board seats. I can make a motion but would like feedback on whether we should add or seat or have it be one of the 6 seats.
- Member Hopper appreciates the delineation of the occupation because no one asked what my occupation was. This type of response team is non-militaristic – it embraces non-violence, communication, relating to people who are in crisis, and addresses responses in a way that reduces fear. My understanding is that when a call comes in, every effort is made to determine whether it is a public safety issue then we call in our public safety partners. I think the seats are enough and appropriate and I appreciate the liaisons that attend, as well as members of the public who are unafraid to share their stories. I appreciate the non-compete clause. I think the way it's re-worded is clear and can leave in the historic background for context. I think it would be problematic to add a specific seat, and that the program reports out on updates as well as liaisons here to provide input.
- Member Gayent asked where the clause that Supervisor Kennedy is referring to regarding the 7-10 years. I'm satisfied that we have liaisons here and have confidence in the information and guidance that they provide.
- Chair Sako opened up comments to law enforcement liaisons. Sargeant Morr (Sac Sheriff) – wanted to get clarity on the request from the BOS meeting. From my time working in CIT, we were under the impression that the community wanted LEA to be separate. Did BOS want someone on the Board from law enforcement or take the wording out of the Bylaws? Chair Sako – what I took from that is they didn't like the timeframe due to their comments about having history of serving in law enforcement. What they wanted us to reconsider is taking someone that is not actively serving. Sargeant Morr – on a daily response basis, we would only be there for a crisis. I think the BOS wants to change the wording, and we've never felt excluded.
- Chief Donneli shared that this group is an advisory board and you have to work for the community. It sounds like the community is yelling that they do not want law enforcement on this Board. The people that would be interested in joining this Board are those that are passionate about helping people in times of crisis. I think that being in the liaison capacity accomplishes the same goal.
- Public Comment #1: You are a civilian response team, a civilian board. It seems appropriate to me not to have active law enforcement on your board but to consult them and include them in the process as you are doing now. I don't think this committee will be happy with anything short of something that allows law enforcement to be considered once they have left their active duties. As I was listening to the BOS, since the 7-10 years was triggering to them, you might want to remove that from the document if it's not going to make or break the document.
- Member Orr asked when the video was posted. The BOS meeting was from April 9, 2024.
- Member Hollingsworth asked whether we could add a member from CIT to the Board. Chair Sako stated that we'd have to bring that back as a separate item.
- Chief Donneli asked if the BOS knows there are liaisons? Chair Sako shared she has submitted public comment multiple times but is not sure if it has gone through.
- Member Rodriguez motioned to approve the draft of Bylaws with the location arrangement, with a second by Member Houston. A vote to approve the draft of Bylaws was called with 5 ayes and 2 abstentions. Motion has been approved and will go to the full MHB for review and action. We will report next month on the outcome.

#### **IV. Presentation: CWRT/988 Marketing Update**

- Lily Eng and ChiChi Onsunkwo from Edelman presented on the marketing update.
- Initial wave of advertising focused on clean, sharp and simple visuals. Language is simple to understand. Used social media posts and ads, transit shelter & convenience store posters, digital billboards, radio ads and window clings.
- Provided results of out-of-home ads: 134 locations, 28,659,388 impressions; digital: 5.6M impressions, 34.4k clicks.
- Second wave of advertising will expand target audience to include Asian communities; formats of digital billboards and online retargeting/website banners.

#### Member Comments/Questions:

- Chair Sako shared she recently rode the light rail and was surprised not to see any advertisement

there having seen it on the transit shelter. Should we expect to see that with buses and light rail? Edelman team will provide that feedback. They rely on their vendor to receive insights but they welcome feedback.

- Alondra added there was some advertisement done pro bono. There was only a 6-8 week run for the marketing.
- Chair Sako asked if we could consider the larger grocery stores even though they require corporate approval. Edelman team stated the window clings were added value and provided at no extra cost.
- Chair Sako asked when the second round of advertisements will begin? Edelman stated the second wave is in production now. We should be seeing digital billboards and website targeting in Asian and English around June.
- Chair Sako shared that there may be potential to use funds for marketing based on the presentation from Public Health regarding CHIP. The Stop Stigma campaign also includes marketing for 988.
- Member Hollingsworth – lightrail, what about buses with very clear established ethnic groups and communities. We do have transit shelters. Bus banners – recommendation we can include in the next wave. I go to a lot of events and no information on tables – I feel like any provider working for Sacramento County should have 988 marketing. Many events at colleges and never seen anything about CWRT. Bathroom stalls for affordable marketing. If you are a provider it's a requirement to have advertisement since providers are contracted. Have list of all the fairs and events happening year round – all sponsored by Sacramento County should be advertising
- Member Gayent – NAMI where I had a table and we had plenty of information on 988. That's what we as an organization have done as we do outreach. Lily – inform everyone that we're working with another vendor that we are creating materials that can be distributed to the community, to have literature and other materials that CWRT is up.
- Member Houston – comment to the advertisements. Adding more languages, we also did ask about people with disabilities and male representation. We made the adjustment for the first wave to include men in visual graphics and will ensure to have gender diversity for the next wave. Will also try to find disability diversity in next wave.
- Member Orr – thank you for your presentation. Sacramento RT whether it's buses or LR, any conversation with Henry Lee and engaged president of RT and trying to reach out to them.
- Lily – any recommendations please pass to Alondra and we'll pass to vendors to see if this is a valuable avenue and they may have some suggestions whether it's a good idea or not
- Sako – would it be appropriate to come back in the Fall to provide update from the second wave? Lily – we have to see where the wave takes us with results. We'll be sharing information.
- Member Orr: I wonder how often or is there a proactive approach for our statewide local elected officials for them to amplify the message, urge that kind of outreach and that will go a long way. ChiChi – on the Stop Stigma side, plug 988 resources to proclaim mental health awareness month.

## **V. Discussion: CWRT Program Implementation, Including Data & Response Outcomes**

### **a. Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services CWRT**

### **b. 988/WellSpace Health**

### **c. Bay Area Community Services (BACS)**

### **d. 6/6/24 CWRT Program Update here:**

<https://dhs.saccounty.gov/BHS/SiteAssets/Pages/Community-Wellness-Response-Team/CWRT%20Timeline%20May%202024%20-%20Final.pdf>

Alondra/BHS

- Alondra shared that with our teams, we are in the process of doing community outreach and attending faith based organizations such as churches. We had a table at the Pride event and we're working on promotional items. We can come back next month and share the things that are happening.

Terri/WellSpace

- Terri shared they hired a community specialist that is focused on marketing. They have gone to a couple of events and we have been buying things and handing them out. Our intention is to be much more in the community and learning about events.
- Chair Sako added that Sac State ID cards have 988 numbers on the back. Terri shared that either the middle schools or high schools have 988 on their ID cards. WellSpace is working on attending events at middle schools to put a face to 988. There's also a national campaign for 5 months starting in June.
- Terri shared a success story from the May Program Update (link is above).
- 988 referred 75 calls to CWRT. There were 3 missed opportunities and 3 welfare checks for the month. Text and chat numbers decreased as kids are out of school during the summer. We will be starting our volunteer program again.

BACS

- Not present to provide updates. Will be present for next month's meeting.

Member Questions/Comments:

- Chair Sako reviewed previous minutes and shared we're not hearing anecdotes of people that don't know about CWRT or 988. We haven't received any public comments about this concern.
- Member Hollingsworth asked how we are doing budget-wise. Alondra shared we don't have any leftover. Chair Sako stated some funds were one-time funding. Perhaps the budget can be added to the agenda for next month's meeting.
- Member Orr suggested reaching out to faith based organizations, urban leagues, and neighborhood wellness programs. Terri will bring posters and Alondra is meeting with organizations serving the older adult population.
- Member Rodriguez shared having a connection with a church that offers free PSAs. Alondra is working with the County's public information officer to discuss where we can promote the program.
- Member Orr shared we could do radio ads on 97.5. Alondra stated we have some commercial ads.
- Member Hollingsworth added exploring talking to chapters at AA, NA and Al-Anon. Member Gayent stated he knows how to approach AA and NA.
- Members thanked liaisons for being here.

**VI. Adjournment**

**Next CWRT Advisory Committee Meeting Scheduled for Tuesday July 9, 2024 6pm-8pm**

Chair Sako adjourned the meeting at 7:59 pm.