

SHASTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Tuesday, November 12, 2024

SPECIAL MEETING

9:02 a.m.: Chair Crye called the Special Session of the Board of Supervisors to order on the above date with the following present:

District No. 1 - Supervisor Crye
District No. 2 - Supervisor Garman
District No. 3 - Supervisor Rickert
District No. 4 - Supervisor Jones
District No. 5 - Supervisor Kelstrom

County Executive Officer/Clerk of the Board - David J. Rickert
County Counsel - Joseph Larmour
Deputy Clerk of the Board - Valerie Ibarra

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Supervisor Crye.

REGULAR CALENDAR**BOARD MATTERS****PRESENTATIONS REGARDING OPIOID LITIGATION SETTLEMENT FUNDS**

The Board received the following presentations regarding the Opioid Litigation Settlement Funds (Funds):

Betty Cunningham, Executive Director of Shasta County Chemical People, Inc.

Shauna Stratton, Community Development Coordinator, for Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA)-Public Health on behalf of the Shasta Substance Use Coalition

Sheriff Michael L. Johnson for the Shasta County Sheriff's Office

John Nigro, Superintendent/President of Shasta College

Kim McKinney Tighe for River Recovery Services

Ashley Jones, Public Defender, for the Shasta County Public Defender's Office

Dessie Baxter, Executive Director of The Manor

Tianna Lucarelli, Clinical Supervisor and Women's Sober Living Environment Manager of Visions of the Cross

Troy Payne, Veterans Services Officer, for the Shasta County Veterans Services

Jennifer Coulter, Program Director of Youth Options Shasta

Marrisa Martin, Tri County Community Network Executive Director of Mayers Memorial Healthcare District (Mayers)

Tracie Neal, Chief Probation Officer, for Shasta County Probation

Jake Duncan, Board Chair, and Jenna Berry, Executive Director of Raising Shasta, the Shasta County Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council

Dr. Mercedes Patee, Chief Executive Officer of Renewed Life Medical Group (RLMG)

Beth Tappan, Market Manager of Redding of Results Media Solutions (RMS)

Art Sevilla, Executive Director of Empire Recovery Center (ERC)

Justin Wandro, Director of Development of Good News Rescue Mission

Carrie Guilfoyle, Interim Chief Medical Officer of Hill Country Community Clinic (HCCC)

Kathy Rutan-Sprague, Vice President of Roughout Ranch Foundation

Dr. Promila Dhanuka for Shasta General Mental Health and Drug Rehab Center

Steve Kohn; Margaret Hansen; Brandon Thornock, Chief Executive Officer of Shasta Community Health Center; Jenny; Marci Fernandez; Amanda Faith Eubanks; Matt Plummer; Dolores Lucero; Lillian; Brenda; Adam Schwartz; Nick Gardner; and Gianna Starks spoke during public comment.

The Board discussed the presentations and proposed projects and asked the presenters to return after the noon break for questions and follow-up.

12:04 p.m.: The Board of Supervisors recessed.

12:32 p.m.: The Board of Supervisors reconvened.

The Board called up the presenters in turn to answer questions and clarify their proposals.

In response to questions by Supervisors Garman and Rickert, Ms. Cunningham explained that Shasta County Chemical People (SCCP) didn't have the capacity to provide services for elementary school grades but had active programs with middle and high schools. She discussed the programs offered by SCCP, particularly in the Intermountain area.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Ms. Stratton stated that she was part of the Shasta Substance Use Coalition and that she believed it would be of assistance with determining best uses for the Funds. Ms. Stratton explained that the naloxone vending machines would be regional, with locations in Shingletown, Round Mountain, Anderson, Shasta Lake, and Redding.

In response to questions by Supervisor Kelstrom, Ms. Stratton discussed the proposed vending machines and stated that, based on information from other counties, vandalism tends to be lower for vending machines dispensing naloxone. She explained that Public Health was creating a campaign toward education about drug use and the proposed vending machines would be combined with that in order to make naloxone more widely available.

In response to questions by Supervisor Crye, Ms. Stratton explained that naloxone was freely available through Public Health, but dissemination throughout the more rural areas of the county was a challenge which the vending machines would assist in overcoming.

A motion was made by Supervisor Jones to direct staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency-Public Health on behalf of the Shasta Substance Use Coalition, as presented. The motion failed for lack of a second.

A motion was made, seconded (Rickert/Garman), and failed 2-3 with Supervisors Crye, Jones, and Kelstrom voting no, to direct staff to bring back to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Shasta County Chemical People, Inc., as presented.

By motion made, seconded (Jones/Kelstrom), and carried 4-1 with Supervisor Crye voting no, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency-Public Health on behalf of the Shasta Substance Use Coalition, with an additional \$10,000 to include a vending machine to be located at Mayers Memorial Hospital.

In response to questions by Supervisor Crye, Lieutenant Dale Marlar stated that the body cameras and the TruNarc handheld narcotics analyzer were not part of the Sheriff's upcoming Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-26 budget but were part of the retrofit of the transportation unit, in order to reduce contraband entering the jail. Erin Bertain, Deputy County Executive Officer, explained that using the Funds for those items would require permission from the State, and that her understanding was that the Sheriffs would not be able to prosecute anyone detected with contraband through the use of systems paid for by the Funds. She stated that she would contact the State for clarification.

The Board discussed the possibility of creating an oversight committee to help determine how the Funds would be spent.

A motion was made, seconded (Garman/Rickert), and failed 2-3 with Supervisors Crye, Jones, and Kelstrom voting no, to postpone making decisions regarding the Funds and gather additional public input.

The Board discussed the request from the Shasta County Office of Education to set aside 10% of the Funds to put toward prevention programs in the county schools.

In response to questions by Supervisor Jones, Lt. Marlar stated that the estimates given for the Sheriff's Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) program were from the medical provider used at the jail, based on the provider's MAT programs with other counties, and from comparison with similarly sized counties with existing MAT programs. He explained that the cost could vary widely, depending on the specific medications needed and the consistency of their use. Lt. Marlar discussed the high success rate of MAT programs and the need for further cognitive behavioral therapy in conjunction with the MAT. He explained that the Sheriff's Office was asking for money to establish the expanded funding, as there were other funding sources that could be accessed in the future to help sustain the program.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Lt. Marlar explained that many connections the Sheriff's Office had made with other agencies to assist with post-release treatment and other support options had been disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic, but they were working on reestablishing that network. He stated that the current contract with Wellpath did not include a robust MAT program and amending that contract to expand the MAT program would increase the cost of that contract.

By motion made, seconded (Jones/Crye), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed MAT and treatment program and budget from Shasta County Sheriff's Office.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Ms. Bertain stated that the time necessary to release any of the Funds depended on the readiness and complexity of the program.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Mr. Nigro stated that Shasta College's proposal was for three separate programs, including the former foster youth program, the basic needs center, and the Shasta Technical Education Program-Unified Partnership (STEP-UP), and the amounts requested could be adjusted as necessary.

In response to questions by Supervisor Jones, Mr. Nigro and Sandra Hamilton Slane, Dean of Student Services, explained that many STEP-UP participants could be either post-custody or completing an alternative to custody. She stated that STEP-UP works with many agencies

throughout the community, including sober living homes and other treatment and rehabilitation facilities and programs.

By motion made, seconded (Garman/Rickert), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, a more focused proposal regarding the programs and budget from Shasta College.

In response to questions by Supervisors Crye and Kelstrom, Ms. McKinney Tighe stated the family interventions offered by River Recovery Services were unique in the county and discussed plans to increase the program, as she was already receiving an increased number of inquiries. Based on those numbers, she expected the program to be sustainable.

Ms. Bertain clarified that the Funds were considered public money, so could not be used to turn a profit.

By motion made, seconded (Garman/Rickert), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from River Recovery Services, as presented.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Ms. Jones discussed the positive impact of social workers on clients of the Public Defender's Office.

In response to questions by Supervisor Kelstrom, Ms. Jones stated that the department wanted to improve existing services, including having one of the current managers take trainings on grant writing and other methods that could increase available funding to sustain the program. She also stated that she was willing to have a sunset date on the expansion if the use of Funds was approved.

A motion was made by Supervisor Kelstrom to direct staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from the Public Defender's Office, as presented.

A substitute motion was made and seconded (Garman/Rickert) to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from the Public Defender's Office to fund the position with a sunset date of June 30, 2026, and have it included in the Public Defender's annual budget in future years. The motion failed 2-3 with Supervisors Kelstrom, Jones, and Crye voting no.

By motion made, seconded (Kelstrom/Jones), and carried 3-2 with Supervisors Garman and Crye voting no, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from the Public Defender's Office, as presented.

In response to questions by the Board, Ms. Bertain stated that there was further opioid litigation pending and that the timeline for resolution of the lawsuits was unknown. County Counsel Joseph Larmour clarified that the Funds were not General Fund dollars and that their usage must follow Exhibit E of the Opioid Litigation Settlement.

In response to questions by Supervisor Crye, Ms. Baxter stated that The Manor would be moving forward with their expansion plans regardless of whether they received any of the Funds.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Ms. Baxter stated that, out of 40 people, 37 were still in permanent housing. She discussed the types of housing available and the timeline for getting people into permanent housing situations. She also described the various educational and vocational programs offered by The Manor. Ms. Baxter confirmed that The Manor was still working with the City of Redding. Christy Coleman, Acting Director of the Health and Human Services Agency, stated that The Manor's proposals could potentially take advantage of Proposition 1 funding, depending on the particular projects.

In response to questions by Supervisor Jones, Robert Cronin, managing partner of C&M Opportunities, the owner of The Manor, stated that there was no rent being charged to Abundant Life Academy, the nonprofit that managed the program, as the revenues were not

currently large enough to support rent. He explained that rent would be required once the building is full. He stated that the program was about 18 months old. Mr. Cronic explained that he had seen gaps in the transitional living opportunities for people in need and that the building had been purchased for that purpose. He stated that once rent was charged, it would be equivalent to the going rate for other apartments, although low-income programs cap the potential rent for individuals in those programs, and the other residents' rents would come from their own incomes or other programs.

County Executive Officer (CEO) David J. Rickert observed that, regardless of the owner, if a program or facility received public funds, it was subject to paying prevailing wage.

Supervisor Jones stated that he would like to have a post-release program that included a County-owned building with a nonprofit running it, in order to put all their money into staffing and programming, as opposed to having to pay rent.

The Board agreed that they would need more information about the specifics of the purchases and programs proposed by The Manor and encouraged them to work with other agencies.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Ms. Lucarelli stated that the amount of Funds requested by Visions of the Cross (VOTC) had decreased from over \$1 million to \$600,000 needed to match grants. She explained that the length of residents' stays at VOTC depended on the level of care needed, and described VOTC's continuum of care from a 30- to 90-day program to Sober Living, with six months paid through Partnership HealthCare Plan while the residents are in outpatient services. She said that longer terms were better for residents, as VOTC is a social model. Steve Lucarelli, Executive Director of VOTC, stated that they had started using Enhanced Care Management and had put over 100 people in permanent housing over the last year.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Ms. Lucarelli stated that they already had the staff for the newest 60-bed expansion. Mr. Lucarelli explained that it was considered a public works project, so paid prevailing wages, and that VOTC was working with the City of Redding. He stated that they already had infrastructure in place with their sober living and outpatient programs, as well as case management on site, but would be able to work more with other agencies and take more people out of jail.

By motion made, seconded (Garman/Kelstrom), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and \$600,000 budget from Visions of the Cross, as amended during the presentation.

In response to questions by Supervisor Kelstrom, Mr. Payne stated that he believed the Veterans Services Office (VSO) would be able to make the program sustainable once the initial money was received through the Funds. He clarified that the request included addressing one office that was unusable due to non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, renovation of the VSO, and annual ongoing costs.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Ms. Bertain explained that there would be cost to add an Addiction Counselor, but no additional costs to utilize HHSA staff. She stated that the VSO would look into doing Medi-Cal billing at a later date.

By motion made, seconded (Kelstrom/Jones), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from the Veterans Services Office, as presented.

A motion was made by Supervisor Crye to have Youth Options Shasta, Raising Shasta, and Amanda Faith put together a joint presentation for \$3-4 million over the first two years, with the input of Columbia School District Superintendent Clay Ross, without including the Shasta County Office of Education, and to bring it back at a later date for discussion and possible action.

The Board discussed the specifics of the programs presented by Youth Options Shasta and Raising Shasta and agreed that other agencies could be included.

By motion made, seconded (Kelstrom/Jones), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed Youth Options Shasta, Raising Shasta, and Amanda Faith put together a joint presentation for \$3-4 million over the first two to three years, with the input of Columbia School District Superintendent Clay Ross, without including the Shasta County Office of Education, and to bring it back at the December 19, 2024, meeting for discussion and possible action.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Ms. Martin explained that the goal of Mayers was to create a program robust enough to be sustainable through billable services. Ms. Martin discussed the programs offered by Mayers, including teaching skills that focus on prevention.

By motion made, seconded (Rickert/Garman), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Mayers Memorial Healthcare District, as presented.

In response to questions by Supervisor Rickert, Ms. Neal stated that Probation's request would be ongoing, for \$255,000 annually. She explained that the total requested amount wasn't necessarily used, as the cost fluctuates according to the population, and that the services in question were currently funded through General Fund and Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act funds, through a contract with Northern Valley Catholic Social Services. Ms. Neal stated that the proposal also included the cost of a one-time body security scanning system for the Juvenile Rehabilitation Facility to decrease contraband.

A motion was made (Rickert/Kelstrom) to direct staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Probation, as presented.

By motion made, seconded (Jones/Garman), and carried 4-1 with Supervisor Rickert voting no, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Probation for the purchase of the body scanning security system only.

In response to questions by Supervisors Jones and Crye, Ms. Neal explained that the request for Funds to use for the treatment services came from concern about future budgets and the need to ensure continuity of treatment services. Supervisor Crye stated that the treatment should be brought back during the annual budget hearings.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Dr. Patee stated that Shasta County had the slowest ambulance offload times and would be facing fines unless they improved.

In response to questions by Supervisor Kelstrom, Dr. Patee explained that RLMG's proposal was for new programs and that the majority would be grant funded. She clarified that the money RLMG was requesting was actually pending the approval of the grant funding from the Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program (BHCIP), which would be determined in May 2025, and that the request was for \$3.7 million to match the BHCIP grant.

In response to questions by Supervisor Crye, Dr. Patee stated that she chose where to send her patients based on their needs and that she had very good relationships with other agencies in the area. She explained that she had started with only MAT and already fills her programs, so anticipates expanding them due to an influx of referrals.

In response to questions by Supervisor Jones, Dr. Patee stated that half of the Funds would go to purchase property, while the other half would go toward necessary renovation, including prevailing wages. She explained that she did not want any of the Funds if the BHCIP grant was not approved.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Dr. Patee explained that she was already in talks with the University of California-Davis, and they were very interested in bringing their addiction services and fellowship program to the area.

In response to questions by Supervisor Crye, Dr. Patee stated that she was very interested in collaborating with Dr. Dhanuka, since their plans overlapped. She stated that she might be able to obtain Proposition 1 funding but would need confirmation that the County would provide the

Funds for her proposal. Ms. Bertain stated that staff would work with Dr. Patee to arrange a letter of support.

By motion made, seconded (Garman/Crye), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Renewed Life Medical Group, as presented.

In response to questions by Supervisors Crye and Garman, Ms. Tappan stated that the best use of radio advertising was for six continuous months, although a year would be better, so that the message was consistent. She explained that the proposal would use all five radio stations owned by RMS, with matching on two, plus the use of RMS' social media platforms. She agreed that using Public Service Announcements to keep the message going after six months was possible.

By motion made, seconded (Garman/Rickert), and carried 4-1 with Supervisor Crye voting no, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Results Media Solutions, as presented.

In response to questions from Supervisor Rickert, Mr. Sevilla stated that the request for \$1 million per year for two years would cover ERC's transition from a social detox model to a clinical model, including the addition of clinicians and nurses. He stated that ERC already had a medical director in place.

In response to questions by Supervisor Jones, Mr. Sevilla stated that the Funds requested would be startup money to start ERC's clinical program. Once that program was in place, ERC would be able to charge Partnership Healthcare Plan at a higher rate and could start charging private insurance, all of which would require ERC to renegotiate their contracts with their service providers.

In response to questions by Supervisor Crye, Mr. Sevilla explained that ERC had requested Funds for two years in order to establish the program in the first year and use the second year to determine the costs moving forward and arrange funding. He stated that the clinical program would allow ERC to tap into grants previously unavailable to them due to that lack.

By motion made, seconded (Rickert/Crye), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Empire Recovery Solutions, as presented.

In response to questions by Supervisor Garman, Ms. Guilfoyle stated that the Funds requested were all one-time implementation costs, as a new integrated Electronic Health Records (EHR) system would take two years to implement. She explained that the proposal included costs for the system itself as well as staff training and hiring a new specialist and staff to support them. Ms. Guilfoyle stated that HCCC already has a teen center in Round Mountain, so the additional staff would expand on the youth services already offered in the Intermountain area.

In response to questions by Ms. Bertain, Ms. Guilfoyle stated that the \$501,000 requested for lost revenue during implementation was due to the reduced number of visits that could be scheduled during the EHR implementation, which impacts access and is a loss of revenue to the organization. Ms. Bertain clarified that the County would not be able to pay for lost revenue either normally or through the Funds.

By motion made, seconded (Rickert/Garman), and carried unanimously, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to bring to a later meeting, for discussion and possible action, the proposed program and budget from Hill Country Community Clinic, as amended.

In response to questions by the Board, Ms. Bertain stated that the County had approximately \$10 million in Funds in the bank and that the remainder of the approximately \$39.5 million would be received in payments over future years. She requested the opportunity to come back to the Board to give a presentation to clarify how the Funds will come in.

CEO Rickert stated that staff would work with the Supervisors and the providers to formulate a plan and bring it back to the Board.

3:11 p.m.: The Board of Supervisors adjourned.

Chair

ATTEST:

DAVID J. RICKERT
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By _____
Deputy

DRAFT