

Component Exhibit 1

Capital Facilities and Technological Needs Face Sheet

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT (MHSA)
CAPITAL FACILITIES and TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS
COMPONENT PROPOSAL**

County: ALAMEDA

Date: April 2, 2009

County Mental Health Director:

Marye Thomas, M.D.

Printed Name

Signature

Date: April 2, 2009

Mailing Address: 2000 Embarcadero Cove, Suite 400
Oakland, CA 94606

Phone Number: (510) 567-8100

Fax: (510) 567-8161

E-mail: mthomas@acbhcs.org

Contact Person: Gary Spicer

Phone: (510) 567-8122

Fax: (510) 567- 8130

E-mail: gspicer@acbhcs.org

Component Exhibit 1 (continued)

COUNTY CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I am the official responsible for the administration of Community Mental Health Services in and for Alameda County and that the following are true and correct:

This Component Proposal is consistent with the Mental Health Services Act.

This Capital Facilities and Technological Needs Component Proposal is consistent with and supportive of the standards set forth in Title 9, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 3320.

The County certifies that if proposing technological needs project(s), the Technological Needs Assessment, including the Roadmap for moving toward an Integrated Information Systems Infrastructure, will be submitted with the first Technological Needs Project Proposal.

This Component Proposal has been developed with the participation of stakeholders, in accordance with Title 9, CCR Sections 3300, 3310, and 3315, and with the participation of the public and our contract service providers. The draft local Capital Facilities and Technological Needs Component Proposal was circulated for 30 days to stakeholders for review and comment and a public hearing was held by the local mental health board. All input has been considered, with adjustments made, as appropriate.

Mental Health Services Act funds are and will be used in compliance with Title 9, CCR Section 3410, Non-Supplant.

All documents in the attached Component Proposal for Capital Facilities and Technological Needs are true and correct.

Date: _____

Signature _____
Local Mental Health Director

Executed at: Alameda County Behavior Health Care Services – Administration
2000 Embarcadero Cove Suite 400 Oakland, CA 94606

Component Exhibit 2: Framework and Goal Support

COMPONENT PROPOSAL NARRATIVE

1. Framework and Goal Support

Briefly describe:

1. How the County plans to use Capital Facilities and/or Technological Needs Component funds to support the programs, services and goals implemented through the MHSA, and
2. How you derived the proposed distribution of funds below.

Proposed distribution of funds:

Capital Facilities	\$ <u>8,100,150</u>	or	<u>50%</u>
Technological Needs	\$ <u>8,100,150</u>	or	<u>50%</u>

INTRODUCTION

The Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63, hereinafter "MHSA") was passed by the California voters in November 2004. The MHSA provides funds to counties to expand mental health services to those who are unserved or underserved. To access these funds, Alameda County engaged multiple stakeholder groups to participate in a variety of planning processes that addressed the early phases of MHSA funding: Community Services and Supports (hereinafter "CSS"), Prevention and Early Intervention (hereinafter "PEI") and Workforce Education and Training (hereinafter "WET"). Plans for these three MHSA components were completed and submitted to the state between 2006 and 2008. The CSS and PEI plans have already received state approval and approval of the WET plan is pending.

During these early planning phases, staff and stakeholders identified capital facility and technology needs that were linked to MHSA programs. In addition, the California Department of Mental Health has shared the expectation that a fully integrated and interoperable Electronic Health Record (EHR) system will be funded by MHSA Technology funds in each county. Alameda County has made a new EHR system the highest priority of this funding stream and has used cost estimates from vendors and similar county systems to arrive at this estimate.

Alameda County will focus the use of its Capital Facilities funds on three new facilities: two wellness centers located in different regions of the county and one crisis and consultation service center in the central part of the county. Based on costs from two recently established and constructed county-owned behavioral health facilities; \$8.1 million of capital funding is expected to support the acquisition, construction and/or rehabilitation of these facilities. Depending on the location and scope of these facilities, some funds may be available for small expansions or renovations of existing county-owned or controlled facilities to provide space for MHSA programs or activities.

FUNDING DISTRIBUTION

ACBHCS seeks approval to utilize all of the MHSA Capital Facility & Technology Needs funding allocated (\$16.2 million) as follows:

- \$8.1 million toward the purchase, installation and maintenance of a new behavioral health information system, to include: electronic health record, personal health record, e-prescribing functions, data interoperability and the necessary support staff during the implementation process, and other projects that provide access and supports to consumers and family members for access to their personal health record and other wellness and recovery supports.
- \$8.1 million to fund the acquisition, construction and/or rehabilitation of at least three large facilities in different regions of the County. These funds will be used to establish an estimated 20-30,000 square feet of additional MHSA program service space. Any funds remaining after the completion of these three projects will be utilized for small expansion or remodeling projects at existing county-owned or controlled facilities. These small projects will only be used to provide space for MHSA programs and activities.

Component Exhibit 2 (continued)

2. Stakeholder Involvement

PREVIOUS MHSA PLANNING PROCESSES

The comprehensive planning process, which Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (hereinafter “ACBHCS”) undertook for the previous MHSA Component Plans, CSS, PEI, and WET provided the foundation for the stakeholder process for the Capital Facilities & Technology Needs Component Proposal.

In order to gather input from an array of consumers, family members, community-based service providers, and representatives of communities traditionally underserved by the mental health system, ACHBCS implemented a broad outreach and engagement effort during the CSS and the PEI stakeholder processes. There were three phases of planning:

Planning Phase I: Community Input Process

Community input meetings were conducted in all regions of the county to educate the public on MHSA component guidelines and to gather input on mental health needs in various communities. These meetings engaged a diverse array of individuals and real-time translation was offered at all meetings. In order to solicit information from underserved communities, small focus group discussions of 20 people or less were held throughout the County and amongst a variety of populations. For the PEI planning process, surveys in five threshold languages were also used to gather data on mental health needs in various communities. In addition, community-based organizations were invited to submit reports that included needs assessment findings and recommendations for PEI strategies. For the WET planning process, needs assessment and input were conducted through a survey which was distributed to county staff and contracted service provider partners.

Planning Phase II: Strategy Development

In the prior MHSA component planning processes (CSS, PEI, and WET), stakeholder planning panels were convened and included DMH required and recommended sectors for participation. The planning panels reviewed community input and formulated strategies for each plan component. The CSS Planning Panels were formed according to age-groups: older adults, adults, transition age youth, and children. The PEI Plan had a different planning panel structure that included two planning panels: a general planning panel and an underserved ethnic languages and populations panel. Each panel addressed the needs of all age groups. The WET organized a planning panel to develop the preliminary WET Plan. The WET planning panel represented a group of diverse stakeholders, including consumers and family members, field experts and partners, and underserved ethnic and languages populations. Workgroups emerged from the general WET planning panel and addressed topics such as, consumer employment, career pathways and family employment.

Planning Phase III: Strategy Prioritization

The Alameda County MHSA Ongoing Planning Council (hereinafter, “OPC”) is the local MHSA stakeholder group formed after the initial release of CSS funds. The OPC was formed to provide specific feedback to ACBHCS regarding MHSA funding and programs. The OPC membership includes one-third consumers, one-third family members, and one-third providers. A variety of ACBHCS staff members attend OPC meetings as well. The OPC provided extensive feedback and review during the CSS, PEI and WET planning processes. During these processes, the OPC reviewed and prioritized strategies developed by

planning panels to ensure that funding decisions were driven by the combined needs and priorities of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. The OPC's processes consisted of multiple rounds of prioritization that included both individual and aggregated scoring, as well as a series of in-depth small group and council-wide discussions about the different strategies and overall plan. The OPC also worked with the MHSA Project Management Team and MHSA Planning Staff to assign further programming details and draft budgets to these prioritized strategies.

Capital Facilities Planning

Capital Facilities planning for ACBHCS involves two distinct phases. The first phase included a review of facility priorities from prior planning efforts in consultation with MHSA stakeholder groups. This review led to a recommendation to focus on three core facilities with any remaining funds to be used for small expansion or renovation projects within existing county facilities. This recommendation, with associated documents, was reviewed by members of the MHSA Ongoing Planning Council (OPC) during their February 18, 2009 meeting. Responses to stakeholder feedback have been incorporated into the final version of this document. A summary of stakeholder feedback received during the 30-day public comment period is attached to this Component Plan proposal. (See Attachment A: Capital Facilities & Technology Plan – Public Comments and Responses).

The second phase of the Capital Facilities planning also began at the February 18th OPC meeting. At this meeting, members of the OPC were asked to give initial feedback on project-specific proposals for the wellness centers and crisis and consultation service center. Feedback was solicited regarding planning principles, stakeholder involvement, and MHSA program inclusion. Stakeholders also provided input on issues relating to improving service and language access for underserved ethnic populations. This feedback was compiled by MHSA planning staff and will be utilized by project-specific stakeholder groups that will work on the detailed, project-specific plans for each of the three identified facilities. Other project-specific groups may form, as needed and appropriate, to focus on project-specific ideas for the renovation or expansion county facilities for MHSA programs. The project-specific facility stakeholder groups will have diverse representation, including representatives from the underserved ethnic and languages populations, content experts, representatives from MHSA programs likely to be located at the new facility, consumers, family members, and BHCS staff. Subsequent to state approval of this component proposal, stakeholder groups will develop and support the submission of project-specific capital facility proposals to the state.

Technology Planning

ACBHCS has been involved with stakeholders in assessing ongoing technological needs through our support mechanisms for current Information Technology (IT) systems. There is regular communication with our contract provider community, both through meetings and web technology. Information Systems (IS) staff are also active in workgroups at the state level through the California Mental Health Directors Association and have participated in State coalitions to identify and review Behavioral Health Information Systems advancements. In addition, the county participates in an annual Information System Capabilities Assessment (ISCA) in conjunction with the California External Quality Review Activity (CAEQRO), a Department of Mental Health-sponsored initiative.

Throughout the earlier MHSA planning phases for CSS, PEI and WET, technology needs to support MHSA initiatives emerged from stakeholders. The OPC has also reviewed the Technology guidelines as issued by the Department of Mental Health and supports the implementation of a fully interoperable electronic health record and clinical data management system that can exchange data with other key health systems and provide personal health record information for consumers.

A detailed analysis to determine the functional requirements of Alameda County's new system will begin in March 2009. A stakeholder group including county staff, contracted provider staff, primary care clinical staff, consumers, family members, representatives from underserved ethnic populations, and other key partners will provide leadership in developing the requirements for a new system and the appropriate platform for personal health information access. ACBHCS will also meet with provider groups such as the Alameda Council of Community Mental Health Agencies.

Component Exhibit 3: Capital Facilities Needs

IDENTIFICATION OF CAPITAL FACILITIES NEEDS

Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services staff identified three primary facilities that will be developed with MHSA capital funds by using input from prior MHSA planning efforts and feedback from key internal and external stakeholders. Project categories were identified based on the state guidelines for capital facilities and locally-identified priorities. Based on prior planning processes, BHCS staff established that any capital facility project should:

- 1) Provide opportunities for system-wide access, use, and impact especially for underserved communities;
- 2) Expand opportunities for consumer and family leadership and involvement;
- 3) Increase geographic accessibility to BHCS-sponsored programs;
- 4) Offer space to MHSA programs with funds to cover ongoing facility operating costs.

The proposed facilities will provide space for a variety of MHSA programs and services. Each facility will be located in a different region of the county and will serve system-wide goals. Two of the proposed facilities are Wellness Centers, which will house a variety of consumer and family-directed programs and activities. Consumer and family involvement have been central in all three prior phases of MHSA planning efforts within Alameda County. Wellness Centers will provide an opportunity for the integration of a variety of services, resources and educational opportunities for the BHCS system of care. The third proposed facility will be a crisis and consultation service center that will further support the expansion of crisis and consultation services which was requested in prior MHSA planning efforts. This center will help build on efforts to improve the integration of health services for BHCS consumers. As outreach and education to consumers, families, and underserved ethnic and language groups occur with the implementation of the BHCS PEI plan, these new facilities will play a vital role in linking individuals with ongoing services and resources to meet their needs.

CAPITAL FACILITIES NEEDS LISTING

Type of Facility	Number of Facilities Needed	County Location for Facility	MHSA Programs & Services to be Provided	Target Population to be Served
Wellness Center	1	Northern	Wellness & Recovery Team, Recovery Resource and Education Center, Creating Homes, Stigma and Discrimination Reduction Campaign, Consumer-operated program offices, etc.	The center is intended to serve a diverse group of consumers and families including underserved ethnic communities. with a focus on serving individuals and families impacted by serious mental illness or serious emotional disturbances. Different programs within the facility will target different populations according to their original MHSA plans.
Wellness Center	1	Southern	Same as above.	Same as above (different geographic area)
Crisis and Consultation Service Center (Central County)	1	Central	Crisis Response Program, Geriatric Assessment Response Team (GART), Co-Occurring Disorder Consultation, and perhaps others.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facility will have a variety of target populations to be served. • The crisis response program will serve individuals and families impacted by a mental health crisis. • The GART will provide mobile integrated health services to older adults with mental health issues in a variety of settings. • The Co-Occurring Disorder consultation effort will provide mental health consultation for AOD providers and their consumers. • Other target groups may be included as well if other programs co-locate at this facility.
Renovation and/ or Expansion of County-owned/ County-controlled properties for use by MHSA programs/activities	Based of availability of funding	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	Based on target populations of MHSA program(s) located at the facility.

Component Exhibit 4: Technology Needs

IDENTIFICATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

ACBHCS has participated in statewide initiatives focused on promoting the development of fully integrated, interoperable Electronic Health Records for more than three years. ACBHCS participated with 27 other counties in the California Behavioral Systems (CBS) Coalition to evaluate available products. More recently, ACBHCS participated in the Department of Mental Health's (DMH) Request for Information (RFI) process to evaluate the vendor community according to system components and functionality.

Alameda County has determined that there is a need to significantly upgrade its current technology to achieve the DMH goals for every county to have a fully interoperable Electronic Health Records system and provide consumers access to personal health information. Like many other counties in California, the existing information system is outdated and inadequate and must be upgraded. ACBHCS plans to use the Technological Needs Component funds to support a number of initiatives discussed below.

- Implementation of **electronic health records** based on technology that supports interoperability with other systems to ensure a dynamic data exchange with other entities involved in the care of consumers. Given the vast network of ACBHCS service providers in Alameda County, ACBHCS' seeks to facilitate the use of an electronic health record by both county-owned and operated programs, as well as the contracted provider community. This will allow the most efficient data exchange and coordination of services. In cases where contracting providers already have an electronic health record system in place, standardized data exchange will facilitate the transmittal of data from one system to another to ensure a seamless integration of client data.
- Provision of **computer resources** in locations where consumers and family members gather and receive services to allow consumers to access the internet and other software. Computers will be used for educational purposes, accessing job-related information, public policy materials, accessing/managing personal health information and other tools to promote wellness and recovery such as Patricia Deegan's Common Ground shared decision-making software.
- Development of a **Personal Health Record (PHR)** that will be available to consumers to access important aspects of their Electronic Medical Record, including scheduled appointments, treatment information, options for completing a Wellness and Recovery Action Plan (WRAP) and options for communicating with clinical staff. The specific function of the PHR will be determined by emerging PHR standards, stakeholder processes, clinical care policy, security implications, and other technical and administrative issues that emerge with accessing health information electronically.
- Development of **electronic prescription functionality** that will be available for consumers in Alameda County. E-prescribing improves quality of care and reduces medication errors, including the possibility of a misread prescription by a dispensing pharmacist. E-prescribing applications alert doctors to potential drug-to-drug/food interactions and drug allergies, provide pregnancy and lactation alerts, provide peer medication dosing patterns and provide online access to clinical references.

Component Exhibit 4**COMPONENT PROPOSAL: TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS**

Please check-off one or more of the technological needs, which meet your goals of modernization/transformation or client/family empowerment as your county moves toward an Integrated Information Systems Infrastructure. Examples are listed below and described in further detail in Enclosure 3. If no technological needs are identified, please write "None" in the box below and include the related rationale in Exhibit 1.

Electronic Health Record (EHR) System Projects (check all that apply)

- Infrastructure, Security, Privacy
- Practice Management
- Clinical Data Management
- Computerized Provider Order Entry
- Full EHR with Interoperability Components (for example, standard data exchanges with other counties, contract providers, labs, pharmacies)

Client and Family Empowerment Projects

- Client/Family Access to Computing Resources Projects
- Personal Health Record (PHR) System Projects
- Online Information Resource Projects (Expansion / Leveraging information sharing services)

Other Technology Projects That Support MHSA Operations

- Telemedicine and other rural/underserved service access methods
- Pilot projects to monitor new programs and service outcome improvement
- Data Warehousing Projects / Decision Support
- Imaging / Paper Conversion Projects (already funded through CSS)
- Other (Briefly Describe)

Attachment A
Draft MHSA Capital Facilities & Technology Component Plan
Public Comments and Responses

Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (ACBHCS) in accordance with Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) principles and requirements, solicited public comment on its draft Capital Facilities and Technology Component Proposal during a 30-day review period from February through March, 2009. Substantive comments were defined as feedback that would impact component proposal language, targeted capital projects, and the project-specific planning process. The majority of the comments received came from members of the MHSA Ongoing Planning Council (OPC). Substantive public comments received on the capital facilities and technology component proposal centered on four areas:

- A) ACBHCS should consider locating more facilities and programs in eastern Alameda County (Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin), also known as, the Tri-Valley Area.
- B) Target populations and programming for particular facilities should be considered carefully – age, culture, service provider, consumer, and family mix.
- C) ACBHCS should weigh the benefits and risks associated with centralizing versus decentralizing facilities and program activities.
- D) Project-specific planning should follow some core general principles.

The table below highlights specific feedback received and ACBHCS analysis of the feedback.

Summary of ACBHCS Analysis to Substantive Public Comment

Topic A. East County Facilities and Technology Services	
Public Comment	Analysis
<i>“Why isn’t East County mentioned in the plan? We need more services and facilities in East County.”</i>	The proposed capital facility categories specifically cite regions of the county for 2 of the 3 proposed facility categories. These regional recommendations were based on the amount of funds available, the distribution of need in the County, DMH regulations on approved use of capital funds, and the target regions for previously approved MHSA activities. Capital funds may be used in East County for the proposed fourth facility category of renovation or expansion of facilities to accommodate MHSA activities. ACBHCS remains committed to finding ways to expand and improve services to the eastern portion of the county and has a variety of efforts planned for this region with MHSA funds, including a family education and resource center, crisis support services, prevention and early intervention programming, and an MHSA supportive housing project. ACBHCS also hopes to explore ways to expand activities using technology, e.g., psychiatric consultation using telemedicine.
<i>“More services for youth are needed in East County.”</i>	See response above and note that a variety of youth-focused MHSA initiatives are currently under development. The ACBHCS Prevention and Early Intervention Plan contains a variety of new programs targeted toward youth, including one focused on meeting the needs of youth experiencing the initial onset of serious mental health symptoms. In addition, efforts to reduce stigma, discrimination, and ethnic/racial disparities will also include efforts in the eastern part of the county. As these programs develop, it will be important to continue discussion about how these efforts can best meet the needs of eastern Alameda County.

Topic B. Facility Target Populations	
Public Comment	Analysis
<i>Wellness Centers should include programs for “Youth”, “0-5 age group”, “Older adults”, “different ethnic/cultural groups”, “consumers only”, “consumers and family members”, etc.</i>	ACBHCS received a variety of suggestions on potential target populations and MHSA activities for the Wellness Centers. Some of the suggestions potentially conflicted with each other, e.g., consumer focus ONLY vs. consumer and family focus; youth only vs. multiple age groups, etc. The feedback made it clear that members of the public have a wide variety of opinions and visions for the proposed Wellness Centers. ACBHCS will further refine the Wellness Center concept during the project-specific planning phases and will strive to balance the benefits and challenges of blending particular target populations and activities. It is anticipated that the Wellness Centers will focus primarily on serving the adult population.
<i>“One of the family education resource centers should be located with the crisis and consultation service center.”</i>	This suggestion will be considered during the project-specific planning for the Crisis and Consultation Service Center.
Topic C. Centralization versus Decentralization of Programming and Facilities	
Public Comment	Analysis
<i>The proposed plan calls for a small number of facilities with lots of programs – is this the best approach? Would it be more effective to have more site/programs in more locations throughout the County?</i>	The proposed plan calls for three large facilities and additional smaller renovation or expansion projects. The three proposed large facilities are a crisis and consultation service center and 2 Wellness Centers. All of these large facility projects will serve as hubs of activity that branch out to other parts of the county. For example, the crisis and consultation service center will serve as a home-base for staff members that provide services throughout much of Alameda County via telephone consultation, telemedicine, home visits, and other approaches. The proposed Wellness Centers will not be the only locations for wellness and recovery-oriented programming throughout the County. A variety of other locations will link with the Center to expand the geographic reach of these facilities. It is hoped that the three core facilities will help raise awareness and strengthen the impact of the Mental Health Services Act in the ACBHCS system.

Topic D. Project Specific Planning Principles for Capital Facilities	
<p>Members of the public had a wide variety of suggestions regarding principles and concepts for the project-specific planning of the proposed capital facilities.</p>	<p>ACBHCS will utilize this feedback during the project-specific planning for the proposed facilities. According to this feedback, the proposed facilities should be...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accessible – close to public transportation, safe neighborhoods, evening and weekend hours, ADA, child care resources ▪ Consumer and family-friendly and centered – “welcoming” locations, designs, and atmosphere; supports confidentiality ▪ Culture and age-appropriate ▪ Integrated into the community - non-stigmatizing building and location, safe neighborhood ▪ Inclusive of multiple related programs and services ▪ Designed to have appropriate separations for different programs and target populations ▪ Developed with consumer and family involvement ▪ Developed with project-specific content experts involved with planning, e.g., architects, real estate, etc. ▪ Developed with an understanding of the pros and cons of centralized versus decentralized programming and facilities

Topic E. Project Specific Planning Principles for Technology Projects	
<p>Members of the public had a wide variety of suggestions regarding principles and concepts for the project-specific planning of the proposed technology projects.</p>	<p>ACBHCS will utilize this feedback during the project-specific planning for the proposed facilities. According to this feedback, the proposed technology projects should be...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Developed with input from future users (i.e., community based service providers, consumers, and families, etc.) ▪ Geographically Accessible to users throughout regions of Alameda County ▪ Consumer-friendly and increase consumer access to electronic health records, ▪ Accessible in multiple languages ▪ Infused with a prevention/ wellness component, to enable individuals to move into recovery before having a crisis. ▪ Confidential