

California Behavioral Health Planning Council

Legislation and Public Policy Committee In-Between Meeting

May 20, 2026
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Javier Moreno, Chairperson

Karen Baylor	Daphne Shaw
Erin Franco	Susan Wilson
Barbara Mitchell	Milan Zavala
Noel O'Neill	Uma Zykofksy
Liz Oseguera	

Staff Present: Jenny Bayardo, Maydy Lo, Naomi Ramirez

Agenda Item: Welcome and Introductions

Chairperson Javier Moreno called the meeting to order and welcomed Council Members and attendees. A quorum was established with 10 of 19 members present.

Agenda Item: Legislative Prioritization

Chairperson Javier Moreno emphasized the need for the committee to concentrate on bills that align with the Policy Priorities for 2026 and the Council Focus for 2026. Given the large volume of behavioral health bills during the legislative session, the committee will prioritize those that directly support these guiding documents. As time permits, additional bills that fall outside of these priorities may be incorporated. Javier also noted that future meetings would no longer include an overly large list of bills for the committee to consider, as the committee intends to narrow the list to a more manageable set of bills for intentional review.

Javier also highlighted that for bills that do not align with either guiding document but still significantly affect the public behavioral health system, In-Between Meetings may be used to discuss their importance and determine whether they should be placed on the agenda for the next quarterly meeting. These meetings can also be used to begin shaping the upcoming agenda.

Executive Officer Jenny Bayardo further explained that focusing on a smaller, more strategic list of bills will allow the committee to have greater impact. Chairs will identify

California Behavioral Health Planning Council

which bills require the committee's attention. As meetings progress, staff and members who become aware of bills not already identified should bring them forward so the Chairs can determine whether they align with the Policy Priorities for 2026 and the Council Focus for 2026.

Council Staff Maydy Lo also reviewed the Policy Priorities for 2026 with the committee, outlining the priorities that the committee suggested for the year.

The committee provided other recommendations to improve the process:

- Develop a document or other method where committee members can submit bills for consideration in advance of meetings.
- Ensure that equity and inclusion are incorporated into the process of selecting bills.

Additionally, committee members asked about the Council's Policy Platform and how it will continue to be used. Jenny explained that the Policy Platform will remain a resource for identifying bills the Council has historically tracked or taken positions on. While most areas of the Policy Platform are reflected in the Policy Priorities for 2026 and the Council Focus for 2026, any bill that does not align with these documents, but does fall within the Policy Platform, will be brought to the Chairpersons for further discussion.

Agenda Item: Proposed Legislation for Committee Consideration (Action)

Due to time constraints, the Committee was only able to discuss some of the listed bills on the Pending Legislative Positions Chart.

Senate Bill 989 (Blakespear)

The committee discussed Senate Bill (SB) 989 (Blakespear) which would allow first responders to request county behavioral health agencies to file a petition to commence the Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act process to assess a person's eligibility. It would also require the requested county behavioral health agency to complete a review of the request within 30 days and determine whether to file a petition. Additionally, county behavioral health agencies would be required to provide the requesting first responder with an update about the outcome of the request.

Committee members expressed the following points during the discussion:

- The bill would expand involuntary treatment of individuals.
- It would place additional responsibilities on counties, who are already overwhelmed, including filing the petition on behalf of the firefighter and notifying the first responder of the outcome.

California Behavioral Health Planning Council

Motion: Daphne Shaw made a motion to oppose SB 989. Susan Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed with 6 members voting “Yes”. Erin Franco, Javier Moreno, Noel O’Neill, and Milan Zavala abstained.

Designated Priority Tier: The bill was assigned as a high priority (tier 1) bill.

Public Comment: There were no public comments.

Senate Bill 1016 (Blakespear)

The Committee discussed Senate Bill (SB) 1016 (Blakespear) would, among other things, authorize a petitioner of a Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act petition to request that the court order a mental health evaluation under the Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act if the petitioner believes that the person may not be willing or able to participate in the CARE process and a CARE plan or CARE agreement due to the severity of their mental disorder or lack of insight into their mental disorder, and would require the Judicial Council to include on the mandatory petition form an option for the petitioner to request that evaluation.

Committee members expressed the following points during the discussion:

- It would expand a great deal of the number of 5150s that that will have to occur
- CARE has not been implemented long enough to allow for a thorough evaluation, yet the bill proposes significant changes. These changes would shift the philosophy and parameters of how care is delivered within community systems before the current model has been fully assessed.
- It also takes away significant rights from individuals to choose treatment from the community system.
- It would reduce engagement and hinder efforts made to connect people with treatment and services.
- Many individuals are unaware that they have a serious mental health condition, particularly those living with schizophrenia, who may lack insight into their condition. Because their experiences feel normal to them, they often do not seek treatment voluntarily. It is therefore essential for others to help connect them with the care and treatment needed to support their safety and well-being.

Motion: Daphne Shaw made a motion to oppose SB 1016. Susan Wilson seconded the motion.

Vote: A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed with 7 members voting “Yes”. Liz Oseguera and Milan Zavala abstained. Erin Franco voted “No”.

Designated Priority Tier: The bill was assigned as a high priority (tier 1) bill.

California Behavioral Health Planning Council

Public Comment: There were no public comments.

Assembly Bill 1556 (Haney)

The committee discussed Assembly Bill (AB) 1556 (Haney) which would require a recovery residence, defined as a residence that, among other things, satisfies the core components of Housing First as described above, to meet specified requirements in order to be eligible for state funding, including that residency is initiated by the resident and the resident is additionally offered at least one harm-reduction housing placement option, relapse is not cause for eviction and residents receive relapse support.

Committee members expressed the following points during the discussion:

- The concerns with this bill appear to stem from the state's current guidance, so the Housing and Homelessness Committee will re-examine the California Interagency Council on Homelessness (Cal ICH) guidance and develop recommendations for modifications.
- Recovery Housing providers would be required to offer a transfer to another permanent housing or transitional housing option; however, members noted that it is unrealistic to transfer someone who is actively using substances into another recovery housing placement.
- Recovery Residences are not qualified to provide treatment and should not be placed in a position where they are expected to do so, as this could categorize them as unlicensed treatment facilities. This is an approach the Council has consistently opposed.
- For individuals in recovery housing who continue to use substances, members stated that they may be more appropriately placed in a residential treatment program, and referrals may be a more realistic option.
- Individuals who use substances offsite without creating disruptions for other residents should not be evicted solely for that reason; however, those who violate their lease agreements should be discharged from the recovery housing.
- Members expressed support for the overall concept of recovery residences, noting that the state is not funding the development or expansion of recovery housing options within the substance use disorder care system.

The committee did not have sufficient time to take a position on the bill.

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

There were no public comments.

California Behavioral Health Planning Council

Agenda Item: Meeting Wrap-up, Next Steps, and Adjourn

The committee will continue discussions on the remaining bills and determine positions at the June Quarterly Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.