FINDINGS

Finding #1: Plumas County did not provide a description of the county demographics of age and gender in the adopted FY 2020-23 Three-Year Program and Expenditure Plan (Plan) and adopted FY 2020-21 Annual Update (Update). However, the County did provide a description of the size of the county, threshold languages, unique characteristics, and race/ethnicity. (California Code of Regulations, title 9, section 3300(b)(4); Mental Health Services Oversight & Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) FY 2015-2016 MHSA Annual Update Instructions (pg. 5); MHSOAC FY 2014-2015 Through FY 2016-2017 MHSA Plan Instructions (pg. 4)).

<u>Recommendation #1:</u> The County must provide a description of the county demographics including but not limited to, size of the county, age, gender, race/ethnicity, threshold languages, and unique characteristics, in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #2: Plumas County did not include a narrative description of the training provided to participants in the Community Program Planning Process (CPPP) in the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan and FY 2020-21 Update. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3300(c); MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Annual Update Instructions (pg. 3); MHSOAC FY 2014-2015 Through FY 2016-2017 MHSA Plan Instructions (pg. 3)).

<u>Recommendation #2:</u> The County must include a narrative description of the training provided to participants in the CPPP in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #3: Plumas County's adopted FY 2020-23 Plan and FY 2020-21 Update did not include a description of how stakeholder involvement demonstrates a partnership with constituents and stakeholders throughout the process that includes meaningful stakeholder involvement on: mental health policy, program planning and implementation, monitoring, quality improvement, evaluation, and budget allocations. (Welfare and Institution Code (W&I Code) section 5848(a); MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Annual Update Instructions (pg. 2); MHSOAC FY 2014-2015 Through FY 2016-2017 MHSA Plan Instructions (pg. 3)).

<u>Recommendation #3:</u> The County must include a description of how stakeholder involvement demonstrates a partnership with constituents and stakeholders throughout the process that includes meaningful stakeholder involvement on mental health policy, program planning and implementation, monitoring, quality improvement, evaluation, and budget allocations in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #4: Plumas County's adopted FY 2020-23 Plan and FY 2020-21 Update did not contain a narrative description of the local stakeholder process including date(s) of the meeting(s) and any other planning activities conducted. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, §§ 3310, 3300; MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Annual Update Instructions (pg 3); MHSOAC FY 2014-2015 Through FY 2016-2017 MHSA Plan Instructions).

<u>Recommendation #4</u>: The County must include a narrative description of the local stakeholder process including date(s) of the meeting(s) and any other planning activities conducted in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #5: Plumas County's adopted FY 2020-23 Plan and FY 2020-21 Update did not include documentation that the Board of Supervisors adopted the Plan or Annual Update and the date of that adoption. (W&I Code section 5847(a); MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Annual Update Instructions (pg 6); MHSOAC FY 2014-2015 Through FY 2016-2017 MHSA Plan Instructions (pg 5)).

<u>Recommendation #5</u>: The County must include documentation that the Board of Supervisors adopted the Plan or Update and the date of that adoption in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #6: Plumas County did not include any substantive written recommendations for revisions received during the 30-day comment period in the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan; however, recommendations were in the FY 2020-23 Plan. (W&I Code section 5848(b)).

<u>Recommendation #6</u>: The County must include any substantive written recommendations for revisions received during the 30-day comment period in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter. If no recommendations for revisions received, identify no recommendations received in the Plan or Update.

Finding #7: Plumas County did not summarize the recommended revisions received during the 30-day public comment period in the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan. (W&I Code section 5848(b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3315(a)(3); MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Annual Update Instructions (pg 3)).

<u>Recommendation #7</u>: The County must summarize the recommended revisions received during the 30-day public comment period in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter

Finding #8: Plumas County did not analyze the recommended revisions received during the 30-day public comment period in the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3315(a)(3); W&I Code section 5848(b); MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Plan Instructions (pg 3)).

<u>Recommendation #8</u>: The County must analyze the recommended revisions received during the 30-day public comment period in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #9: Plumas County did not include a description of any substantive changes made to the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan and FY 2020-21 Update that was circulated. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3315(a)(4); MHSOAC FY 2015-2016 MHSA Plan Instructions (pg 4)).

<u>Recommendation #9</u>: The County must include a description of any substantive changes made to each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter that was circulated. If no changes made, identify no changes made in the Plan or Update.

Finding #10: Plumas County did not include an assessment of the county's capacity to implement mental health programs and services in the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan that included:

a. The strengths and limitations of the county and service providers that impact their ability to meet the needs of racially and ethnically diverse populations. The evaluation should include an assessment of bilingual proficiency in threshold languages.

b. Percentages of diverse cultural, racial/ethnic and linguistic groups represented among direct service providers, as compared to percentage of the total population needing services and the total population being served.

However, the County did include:

c. Identification of possible barriers to implementing the proposed programs/services and methods of addressing these barriers. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3650(a)(5)).

<u>Recommendation #10</u>: The County must include an assessment of its capacity to implement mental health programs and services in each subsequent adopted Plan thereafter. The assessment must include:

a. The strengths and limitations of the county and service providers that impact their ability to meet the needs of racially and ethnically diverse populations. The evaluation should include an assessment of bilingual proficiency in threshold languages.

b. Percentages of diverse cultural, racial/ethnic and linguistic groups represented among direct service providers, as compared to percentage of the total population needing services and the total population being served.

c. Identification of possible barriers to implementing the proposed programs/services and methods of addressing these barriers.

Finding #11: Plumas County did not identify Full-Service Partnership (FSP) programs/services to all age groups: children (0-15), transitional age youth (16-25),

adult (26-59), and older adult (60 and older) in the adopted or FY 2020-21 Update. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3620(j)); W&I Code section 5847(b)).

<u>Recommendation #11</u>: The County must identify FSP programs/services to all age groups: children (0-15), transitional age youth (16-25), adult (26-59), and older adult (60 and older) in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #12: Plumas County did not indicate the number of children, adults, and seniors to be served in the FY 2020-21 Update. (W&I Code section 5847(e)).

<u>Recommendation #12</u>: The County must indicate the number of children, adults, and seniors to be served in each subsequent adopted Plan and Update thereafter.

Finding #13: Plumas County did not include the Three-Year PEI Evaluation Report as part of the adopted FY 2020-23 Plan or FY 2021-20 Update. (Cal. Code Regs., tit .9, § 3560.020).

<u>Recommendation #13</u>: The County must include the Three-Year PEI Evaluation Report as part of each subsequent adopted Plan or Update hereafter. DHCS will accept the Three-Year PEI Evaluation Report submitted to MHSOAC, as an addendum or attachment, as being a part of the Plan or Update; if it is clearly labeled and the location of the report is identified. The Three-Year PEI Evaluation Report is not in lieu of Cal. Code Regs., tit. 9, § 3755 (Prevention and Early Intervention Component of the Three-Year Program and Expenditure Plan and Annual Update).