

B-54

County of Los Angeles Department of Mental Health

E&R PAPERS

Date: December 28, 1978 Vol. VI No. 3

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AND
GEOGRAPHICAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Gloria Fowler, Ph.D.

George H. Wolkon, Ph.D.

Director
J. R. Elpers, M.D.

Program Development Bureau
George H. Wolkon, Ph.D., Chief

Evaluation and Research Division
Sol M. Roshal, Ph.D., Head

**COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AND GEOGRAPHICAL
RESPONSIBILITY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

by

Gloria Fowler, Ph.D.

George H. Wolkon, Ph.D.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The community mental health centers in Los Angeles County that are federally funded and receive Short-Doyle funds operate under two conflicting mandates. The federal responsibility is to serve all the residents in their catchment area whereas the local Short-Doyle policy has been to serve clients within the County without geographical restrictions.

Given the conflicting mandates, whom do mental health centers serve? Only 25 percent of the total Short-Doyle units of service delivered to the residents of the catchment areas are delivered by the respective CMHCs. In addition, 48 percent of all clients served by the CMHCs live outside of their catchment area.

If the CMHCs were to assume complete responsibility for the Short-Doyle services to residents of their catchment areas, presumably resources now committed to non-residents could be used for services to area residents. If, in the first half of FY 1977-78, all the Short-Doyle services recorded at discharge from the CMHCs (Table D) had gone to catchment area residents, the centers could have provided the following proportions of the County's total Short-Doyle services (Table 1) which were reported for catchment residents: outpatient, 109 percent; rehabilitation/partial, 127 percent; local inpatient, 35 percent; and all inpatient, including Camarillo and Metropolitan LPS, 8 percent.

In considering the health districts in which the CMHCs are located, it was pointed out that current health district boundaries may not be appropriate for the CMHCs. Nevertheless, the data suggest some potential difficulties for the centers in assuming responsibility for a larger geographical area. Only 18 percent of the total Short-Doyle units of service delivered to the residents of the six health districts were delivered by the CMHCs located in those districts.

If all of the CMHCs' Short-Doyle services (Table H) were assumed to be directed to residents of the relevant health districts, then the centers could provide the following proportions of the total Short-Doyle services (Table 4) which were reported for residents of the six health districts: outpatient, 54 percent; rehabilitation/partial, 54 percent; local inpatient, 14 percent; and all inpatient, including Camarillo and Metropolitan LPS, 3 percent.

If the centers were to assume full geographical responsibility, the greatest need is for inpatient services and/or other services for the most acutely and seriously disturbed patients.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AND GEOGRAPHICAL
RESPONSIBILITY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

In 1977-78 there were in Los Angeles County six community mental health centers (CMHCs) the funding of which included both Short-Doyle and Federal monies. These centers and their catchment areas were:

Didi Hirsch,	89
Thalians,	91
Central City,	97
Hope,	76
Kedren,	110
SFV CMHC,	73

All of these centers had outpatient and rehabilitation/partial hospitalization Short-Doyle contracts. Only Central City, Hope and SFV offered Short-Doyle inpatient services.

In order to estimate the extent to which the Federally funded centers were assuming responsibility for Short-Doyle services to residents of their particular geographical areas, we prepared an analysis of client residence by CMHC. The basic purpose is to show roughly how much the centers would have to change their service delivery patterns in order to assume complete responsibility for the Short-Doyle patients residing in the CMHCs' geographical areas. At present, of course, the centers are operating under two conflicting policies. The Federal government provides CMHC funds to serve the catchment area residents, whereas local Short-Doyle policy is that there are no geographical restrictions on where a client may receive services.

Catchment Area of Residence

Services reported are for July through December of 1977, the last period of catchment area data available at the time this study was begun. The same types of data are available also for the 1976-77 fiscal year and are consistent with the findings in the present report.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AND GEOGRAPHICAL
RESPONSIBILITY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Page 2

From the discharge data, it is evident that the six CMHCs serve only a small portion of the Short-Doyle clients who reside in their catchment areas (Table 1). Only 25 percent of the total Short-Doyle units of service delivered to the residents of the relevant catchment areas are delivered by the appropriate CMHCs. Certain types of service are simply not provided by the CMHCs to Short-Doyle clients: only three of the six CMHCs provide inpatient services, and only 11 percent of the local Short-Doyle inpatient services to residents of the six catchment areas were provided by the CMHCs. When Camarillo and Metropolitan State Hospital services* to the six catchment areas are included, the portion of the inpatient services provided by the CMHCs is only two percent. Breakdowns of the data by CMHC/catchment area are presented in supplementary Tables A (discharges) and B (units of service).

The usually expensive Short-Doyle funded mobile services to residents of the six catchment areas are largely provided by the Department of Mental Health. Of the six CMHCs, only Hope reports any mobile response, field units of service, to Short-Doyle clients residing in its catchment area. For July-December 1977 discharges who were residents of catchment area 76, Hope reported 42 Short-Doyle field units, which is 66 percent of the total for catchment 76 residents and 15 percent of the 280 county-wide total field units of service recorded for residents of the six catchment areas.

*As most state hospital units do not report a census tract of residence for their clients, the residence catchment area must be estimated. To those state hospital discharges with no census tract of residence reported we therefore assigned the census tract (and therefore catchment area) of residence which was reported on a County admission, if any, for the same person. This estimation method had been applied to 1976-77 fiscal year data, half of which were used as the estimate for the July-December 1977 period in the present analysis. The percentage of 1976-77 discharges without a known catchment area of residence declined after the estimation procedure from 42 percent to 22 percent for Camarillo unit 0002 and from 100 percent to 29 percent for Metro unit 0006.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AND GEOGRAPHICAL
RESPONSIBILITY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Page 3

A great many of the Short-Doyle services of the six Federally funded CMHCs are delivered to non-residents of the relevant catchment area. Table 2 shows the proportion of the July-December 1977 Short-Doyle units of service and discharges from the six CMHCs which is represented by residents of the catchment area served by each center. In all cases, those proportions are less than half. There is, however, some variability from center to center, as can be seen in the breakdowns by CMHC in Tables C (discharges) and D (units of service).

Even when the non-Short-Doyle clients of the CMHCs are included, the percentage of the caseloads who are catchment area residents is relatively small for some centers. From NIMH we obtained counts of unduplicated clients (Table 3), which include both Short-Doyle and non-Short-Doyle cases. Note that the overall percentage who are residents of the relevant catchment area is 52 percent, and the range for individual centers is from 17 percent to 81 percent.

Health District of Residence

Similar tables were prepared using a larger geographical unit, the health district, as a hypothetical catchment area. Client residence was analyzed according to the health district in which the CMHC is located:

Didi Hirsch, Santa Monica - West
Thalians, Hollywood
Central City, Southeast
Hope, East Valley
Kedren, South
SFV CMHC, West Valley

As several of the CMHCs are located near the borders of health districts, the data presented are only suggestive of the centers' service to a unit larger than a catchment area. Data are for clients discharged in the first half of FY 1977-78.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AND GEOGRAPHICAL
RESPONSIBILITY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Page 4

Table 4 shows service data for clients residing in the health districts in which CMHCs are located and the proportion of these which are attributable to the CMHCs. Overall, as would be expected, the CMHCs provide a smaller percentage, 18 percent, of the total services to the relevant health district than of those to the smaller catchment area, 25 percent. Distributions by CMHC are presented in supplementary Tables E (discharges) and F (units of service).

In Table 5 are presented service data bearing on the extent to which the CMHCs draw their clients from the health districts in which they are located. Although a majority of services are to health district residents, 60 percent of the total for all modalities combined, a sizeable proportion still are from outside the health district of CMHC location. Supplementary Tables G (discharges) and H (units of service) give the more detailed breakdowns by CMHC.

GF:GEW:vw

11/78

Table 1. Short-Doyle services to residents of catchment areas served by the six federally-funded community mental health centers (CMHCs)

	Modality			
	<u>Outpatient</u>	<u>Rehab/Partial</u>	<u>Local Inpatient</u>	<u>Local Inpatient * plus Cam & Metro</u>
<u>Discharges:</u>				
Total Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of one of the six relevant catchment areas	4,755	271	662	1,447
Percentage who were served at the relevant CMHC	31%	4.7%	11%	5%
<u>Units of Service:</u>				
Total U/S recorded for Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of one of the six catchments.	36,769	13,191	8,523	38,469
Percentage delivered by the relevant CMHC	48%	28%	11%	2%

* Only IPS billable patients are included. Data for Camarillo and Metropolitan are largely estimates. See footnote on Page 2.

Los Angeles County/Dept. of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division
GF:jh
11/78

Table 2. Short-Doyle services provided by the six federally-funded CMHCs: Discharges who were catchment area residents

Discharges:	Modality		
	<u>Outpatient</u>	<u>Rehab/Partial</u>	<u>Local inpatient</u>
Jul-Dec 1977 CMHC Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of the relevant catchment area	1,456	128	73
Percentage which above number represents of the total*			
Short-Doyle discharges from the six CMHCs, Jul-Dec 1977	46%	35%	33%
<u>Units of Services:</u>			
Total U/S recorded for Jul-Dec 1977 CMHC Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of the relevant catchment area	17,491	3,717	908
Percentage which above number represents of the units of service recorded for all* Short-Doyle discharges from the six CMHCs, Jul-Dec 1977	44%	22%	30%

* Represents the total with residence reported.

Table 3. Unduplicated clients,
Short-Doyle plus non-Short-Doyle, served
by the six CMHCs: Percentage who are
catchment area residents

CMHC and Relevant Catchment	1976 Reporting Period*	
	Unduplicated clients	Percent of clients who reside in the relevant catchment area
Didi Hirsch, 89	2,820	81
Thalians, 91	3,185	43
Central City, 97	7,834	75
Hope, 76	4,262	56
Kedren, 110	1,809	79
SFV CMHC, 73	8,254	17
TOTAL	28,164	52

*Source: 1976 Inventory of Community Mental Health Centers (Question 13, Pt.A. lines 1 and 2).

Los Angeles County/Department of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division
GF:vm
11/78

Table 4. Short-Doyle services to residents of health districts in which the six federally funded CMHCs are located

	<u>Modality</u>			
	<u>Outpatient</u>	<u>Rehab/Partial</u>	<u>Local inpatient</u>	<u>Local inpatient plus Cam. and Metro*</u>
<u>Discharges:</u>				
Total July-Dec. 1977				
Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of a health district in which a CMHC was located	8,856	601	1,647	3,265
Percentage who were served at the relevant CMHC	23%	36%	7%	3%

Units of Service:

Total U/S recorded for July-Dec. 1977	74,609	31,725	21,427	91,881
Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of one of the CMHC health districts				
Percentage delivered by the relevant CMHC	35%	24%	7%	2%

*For Camarillo and Metropolitan, half of the 1976-77 estimates were used. Health districts were assigned to clients from the same data as used for the catchment area State Hospital estimates.

Table 5. Short-Doyle services provided by the six federally-funded CMHCs: discharges who were residents of the health district in which the CMHC is located

Discharges:	Modality		
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local inpatient
Total Jul-Dec 1977 CMHC Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of the relevant health district	2,012	217	114
Percentage which above number represents of the total* Short-Doyle discharges from the six CMHCs, Jul-Dec 1977	65%	60%	51%
<u>Units of service:</u>			
Total U/S recorded for Jul-Dec 1977 CMHC Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of the relevant health district	26,350	7,688	1,450
Percentage which above number represents of the units of service recorded for all* Short-Doyle discharges from the six CMHCs, Jul-Dec 1977	66%	45%	48%

*Represents the total with residence reported.

Los Angeles County Dept. of Mental Health
 Evaluation and Research Division
 GF:jh
 11/78

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES A-H

Table A

Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle Discharges
 who were Residents of Catchment Areas
 served by Federally Funded Community
 Mental Health Centers

CMHC and Relevant Catchment	Total Short-Doyle Discharges Residing in the Relevant Catchment				Percent of the total who were served at the relevant CMHC			
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local Inpat plus Cam and Metro*	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local Inpat plus Cam and Metro*
Didi Hirsch, 89	1,198	66	75	191	58%	64%	0%	0%
Thalians, 91	447	38	112	227	11%	8%	0%	0%
Central City, 97	919	29	128	298	16%	17%	10%	4%
Hope, 76	641	63	176	274	48%	56%	29%	19%
Kedren, 110	1,196	58	71	295	10%	50%	0%	0%
SFV CMHC, 73	<u>354</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>37%</u>	<u>82%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>6%</u>
Total	4,755	271	662	1,447	31%	47%	11%	5%

* Only IPS billable patients are included. Data for Camarillo and Metropolitan are largely estimates. See footnote on Page 2.

Los Angeles County/Dept. of Mental Health
 Evaluation and Research Division
 GF:jh
 11/78

Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle
Units of Service Delivered to
Residents of Catchment Areas Served by
Federally Funded Community
Mental Health Centers

CMHC Relevant Catchment	Total Short-Doyle Services Recorded at Discharge for Residents of Relevant Catchment Area				Percent of the total which were delivered by the Relevant CMHC			
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local Inpat plus Cam and Metro*	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local Inpat plus Cam and Metro*
Didi Hirsch, 89	10,054	1,811	930	5,524	70%	27%	0%	0%
Thalians, 91	2,773	1,934	1,474	5,938	17%	5%	0%	5%
Central City, 97	5,339	2,159	2,036	7,623	22%	11%	19%	6%
Hope, 76	7,304	3,365	1,586	7,230	61%	32%	0%	0%
Kedren, 110	6,287	3,397	1,280	6,806	16%	22%	10%	2%
SPV CMHC, 73	<u>5,012</u>	<u>525</u>	<u>1,217</u>	<u>5,348</u>	<u>66%</u>	<u>28%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>2%</u>
Total	36,769	13,191	8,523	38,469	48%			

*Only LPS billable patients are included. Data for Camarillo and Metropolitan are largely estimates. See footnote on Page 2.

Los Angeles County/Dept. of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division
GP:Jh
11/78

Table C

Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle Discharges
 from the Six CMHCs: Proportion
 who were Residents of the Relevant
 Catchment Areas

CMHC and Relevant Catchment	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Inpatient	Percent of the total Short-Doyle Discharges from this CMHC who were residents of the relevant catchment		
				Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Inpatient
Didi Hirsch, 89	1,154	111	0	60%	38%	0%
Thalians, 91	101	15	0	50%	20%	0%
Central City, 97	624	27	45	23%	19%	29%
Hope, 76	423	52	132	73%	67%	39%
Kedren, 110	361	84	0	35%	35%	0%
SFV CMHC, 73	<u>473</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>20%</u>
Total	3,136	364	222	46%	35%	33%

* Represents the total with residence reported. Numbers may differ slightly from those in Table G because additional data are added to the file almost daily.

County of Los Angeles/Dept. of Mental Health
 Evaluation and Research Division
 GF:jh
 11/78

TABLE D

Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle Units of Service Recorded for
Discharges from the Six CMHCs:
Proportion Delivered to Residents of the Relevant Catchment

CMHC and Relevant Catchment	Total Short-Doyle Units of Service Recorded at Discharge from this CMHC*			Percent of the Total Short-Doyle Units of Service Recorded at Discharge from this CMHC which were Delivered to Residents of the Relevant Catchment		
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient
Didd Hirsch, 89	12,114	1,378	0	58%	35%	0
Thalians, 91	1,145	752	0	41%	14%	0
Central City, 97	4,281	749	1,114	28%	31%	34%
Hope, 76	7,468	1,797	1,123	60%	74%	0
Kedren, 110	3,111	7,157	0	33%	15%	16%
SFV CMHC, 73	11,930	4,973	748	28%	10%	30%
TOTAL	40,049	16,806	2,985	44%	22%	

*Represents the total with residence reported. Numbers may differ slightly from those in Table H because data are added to the file almost daily.

County of Los Angeles/Dept. of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division
GF:db 11/78

Table E

July-Dec. 1977 Short-Doyle discharges who were residents of health districts in which the six CMHCs are located

CMHC	Total Short-Doyle discharges residing in the relevant health district				Percent of the total who were served at the relevant CMHC			
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local Inpatient plus Cam and Metro *	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local Inpatient plus Cam and Metro *
Didi Hirsch	2,465	182	291	639	40%	44%	0%	0%
Thalians	1,628	140	319	732	4%	4%	0%	0%
Central City	909	29	128	298	15%	17%	10%	4%
Hope	1,080	87	345	530	30%	46%	20%	13%
Kedren	1,188	58	70	293	10%	50%	0%	0%
SFV CMHC	<u>1,586</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>494</u>	<u>773</u>	<u>23%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total	8,856	601	1,647	3,265	23%	36%	7%	3%

* For Camarillo and Metropolitan, half of the 1976-77 estimates were used. Health districts were assigned to clients from the same data as used for the catchment area State Hospital estimates.

Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division

GF:jh
11/78

Table F

July-Dec. 1977 Short-Doyle units of service delivered to residents of health districts in which the six CMHCs are located

CMHC	Total Short-Doyle units of service recorded at discharge for residents of the relevant health districts				Percent of the total which were delivered by the relevant CMHC			
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local inpat. plus Cam and Metro*	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Local inpat. plus Cam and Metro*
Didi Hirsch	20,445	5,926	4,624	26,324	50%	16%	0%	0%
Thalians	10,084	10,461	4,511	18,639	7%	2%	0%	0%
Central City	5,339	2,159	2,036	7,623	22%	11%	19%	5%
Hope	12,328	4,010	3,538	12,120	39%	35%	15%	4%
Kedren	6,287	3,397	1,278	6,804	16%	32%	0%	0%
SFV CMHC	<u>20,126</u>	<u>5,772</u>	<u>5,440</u>	<u>20,371</u>	<u>42%</u>	<u>66%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total	74,609	31,725	21,427	91,881	35%	24%	7%	2%

*For Camarillo and Metropolitan, half of the 1976-77 estimates were used. Health districts were assigned to clients from the same data as used for the catchment area State Hospital estimates.

Los Angeles County Dept. of Mental Health
 Evaluation and Research Division
 GF:vw
 11/78

Table G

Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle discharges from the six CMHCs: Proportion who were residents of the health district in which the CMHC is located

CMHC	Total Short-Doyle discharges from this CMHC*			Percent of the total Short-Doyle discharges from this CMHC who were residents of the relevant health district		
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient
Didi Hirsch	1,151	111	0	86%	72%	0%
Thalians	101	15	0	64%	33%	0%
Central City	595	26	45	23%	19%	29%
Hope	426	52	134	77%	77%	51%
Kedren	360	84	0	34%	35%	0%
SFV CMHC	<u>473</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>78%</u>	<u>77%</u>	<u>73%</u>
Total	3,106	363	224	65%	60%	51%

*Represents the total with residence reported. Numbers may differ slightly from those in Table C because additional data are added to the file almost daily.

Los Angeles County Dept. of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division
GF:jh 11/78

Table H

Jul-Dec 1977 Short-Doyle units of service recorded for discharges from the six CMHCs: Proportion delivered to residents of the health district in which the CMHC is located

CMHC	Total Short-Doyle units of service recorded at discharge from this CMHC*			Percent of the total Short-Doyle units of service recorded at discharge from this CMHC which were delivered to residents of the relevant health district		
	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient	Outpatient	Rehab/Partial	Local Inpatient
Didi Hirsch	12,114	1,378	0	84%	69%	0%
Thalians	1,145	752	0	61%	28%	0%
Central City	4,281	749	1,114	28%	31%	34%
Hope	7,471	2,162	1,135	64%	64%	45%
Kedren	3,111	7,157	0	33%	15%	0%
SFV CMHC	<u>11,930</u>	<u>4,973</u>	<u>748</u>	<u>71%</u>	<u>77%</u>	<u>75%</u>
Total	40,052	17,171	2,997	66%	45%	48%

*Represents the total with residence reported. Numbers may differ slightly from those in Table D because additional data are added to the file almost daily.

Los Angeles County Dept. of Mental Health
Evaluation and Research Division

GF:jh 11/78