

Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA)

STATEWIDE ADVISORY GROUP

April 21, 2006

WELCOME AND DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Sherri Gauger, Deputy Director, Legislative and Public Affairs, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) opened the meeting by welcoming the Statewide Advisory Group members, interested parties, and invited guests. Ms. Gauger reviewed the agenda and the contents of the folder. Ms. Gauger turned the meeting over to the Director.

Kathryn P. Jett, Director, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) welcomed all to the Statewide Advisory Group meeting.

Director Jett reported there had been a methamphetamine summit in Los Angeles and the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) research team was able to make a presentation on the Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act Cost Analysis Report (first and second years). She acknowledged the outstanding work and dedication of Larry Carr, PhD, Deputy Director, Office of Applied Research and Analysis, ADP, his staff, and the UCLA research team.

Director Jett stated there is still more discussion on Senate Bill 803. She added since the design of the Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act was a cost benefit analysis, it brings forth some research questions. She highlighted the need to focus and prioritize future research requests.

Director Jett stated the UCLA Evaluation revealed a savings of \$2.50 for every \$1 spent on offenders and a savings of \$4 for every \$1 spent on offenders who complete treatment. She noted the UCLA report found a very small group of offenders are responsible for a larger share of Proposition 36 criminal justice costs. This 1.6% of the offenders had five or more convictions in a thirty-month period before their Proposition 36 eligible offense. She also stated the evaluation reports high cost offenders do not do well in community-based treatment.

Director Jett spoke about the article by Laura McCoy, published in the Sacramento Bee on February 26, 2006. She noted ADP has no authority over sober living environments and the article focused on co-occurring disorders. Director Jett is very proud of the improvements treatment has made to date and noted the Sacramento Bee, to their credit, has published some very supportive articles on Proposition 36 since the article written by Laura McCoy.

Director Jett stated Chief Deputy Director Tom Powers has moved on and is now the Executive Director of a youth program in Napa. She stated the next step for her was to find someone equally as passionate to fill his shoes. She announced ADP was fortunate to find someone with 32 years state service. She then introduced "the very bright and very talented Denzil Verarado".

Denzil Verarado, Chief Deputy Director, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs stated he has a different way to look at Proposition 36. He stated in 1971 one out of twenty state

employees worked for the Department of Corrections; today that statistic is one out of four. He commented on the need to change that statistic and if it wasn't for Proposition 36 more prisons would have to be built.

Director Jett then reported on her trip to the Netherlands.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

To expedite the agenda, Sherri Gauger referred the membership to the Legislative Tracking Report in the folders for the legislative update.

PROGRAM UPDATES FROM STATEWIDE ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

UCLA Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act

A member stated that in the first year of Proposition 36 there was a proposal for a media campaign and believes the advisory members need to come up with an approach to tell the anecdotal stories and get the success stories out to the public.

Proposition 36

Several members stated more money is needed for Proposition 36 clients who have hit the 12 month-limit.

A member reported the Minimum Based Allocation (MBA) counties number high in problems regarding Proposition 36. The member stated there are problems with the co-occurring disorders population. Many of the mental health departments are the sole providers of mental health services and have gone to MediCal only. The member noted that on the alcohol and drug side 65-75% of clients have co-occurring disorders and on the mental health side 85% have co-occurring disorders.

A member stated when the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) first received Proposition 36 funding there were 14 specialized parole agents. The member reported that CDCR is trying to get additional positions. The member noted treatment providers are not supplying sufficient information to the CDCR and parolee follow-up data is critical. The member reported that CDCR has implemented its own data base and by September will have a good assessment of the data and will address additional questions at that time.

A member was able to speak with several counties regarding Proposition 36. The member stated the major concern is funding, i.e., lack of, and \$120M is not enough. The member reported San Bernardino County is losing six probation officers which will cause a concentration on felons, not misdemeanants. The member expressed concern over next

year's funding and noted some counties would like to see incarceration or jail time for some clients.

A member reported the California Association of Addiction Recovery Resources (CAARR) is spending a lot of effort supporting \$209M for reauthorization. The member also noted CAARR is waiting for letters of support for Assembly Bill 926. The member stated a letter to the editor, regarding the McCoy articles, was written but was rejected.

A member stated the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC) is focusing on the financial issues of Proposition 36 and SB 803. The member reported statewide counties are in the process of completing county plans which are due on May 1. The member noted for Sacramento County it was the last year there would be any carryover and next year the county would have to reduce its budget by \$600,000. The member stated even if Proposition 36 is reauthorized at \$150, the county would still have to cut another \$500,000 in the following year.

Another member reiterated CADPAAC's continuous push for additional funding of Proposition 36. The member stated the Los Angeles Chief Administrator has taken an active roll in pushing for funding of Proposition 36. The member reported the county's investment in criminal justice has paid off. Criminal justice is pursuing Proposition 36 funding and is helping with their collaborative efforts. The member noted data collection is at the heart of their existence and they will continue to build on what they have established.

A member reported strikers stand out as an issue. The members stated in their county they believe as a group (strikers) there are two issues: 1) Are these heavy users of treatment and what is their criminal background; and 2) Are they a high risk to public safety even though they are eligible for Proposition 36? The member reported of the 163 defendants they are showing a 70% success rate; 23% have failed; the remaining 25% are still in treatment. The member believes there are ways to do a better job with Proposition 36 clients and this is one way.

Education

A member reported a-one day training was to be held on June 9, 2006 for all judicial teams. The member also stated they are seeking to make it mandatory for all judges to train on dealing with drug addiction.

Legislation

It was reported the California Therapeutic Communities are in support of SB 803.

One member reported the Police Chief's Association strongly supports SB 803. The member stated with respect to Proposition 36 the Association believes higher numbers are appropriate, but the Association's position relies on the fate of SB 803. The member noted the concern in treatment percentages being unacceptably low and SB 803 is necessary to increase the percentages. The member reported the Association is in support of Leno's mobile narcotic treatment plan. The member stated the Association strongly supports Migden's bill limiting alcohol marketing to youth. The member reported the Association supports SB 1299 making it

easier to apprehend those who transport the products to make methamphetamine as well as SB 1500 (Speier) dealing with a statewide campaign to deter initial and continued use of methamphetamine in California. The member noted California is actually a source state for methamphetamine materials. The member went on to say the Association supports SB 1318 (Cedillo) which puts a protective shield around treatment centers. The Association also supports AB 2192 (Bass) (CalWorks). The member reported the Association was opposing AB 2076 which will divert HIV and prevention money.

Another member stated the California Public Defenders Association supports SB 1500. The member believes everyone agrees on prevention. The member reported the association will continue to support SB 803 because they believe there is a compromise.

Miscellaneous

A member reported the American Society of Addiction Science is having a conference in May and mid October in San Francisco. The member stated Jackie Speir's office has asked California Society Addiction Medicine (CSAM) to comment on how to deal with methamphetamine. The member reported that if hospitals screen for this and find that alcohol or drugs are involved the insurance will not pay

It was reported by a member that the Chief Probation Officers of California will be meeting in mid May. The member also stated Ventura County Probation Department is now the lead agency for the Proposition 36 program.

A member stated although the methamphetamine problem in Placer County is not new, the local interest is. The member also noted Placer County is working on a survey to get best practices from other counties on treating co-occurring disorders.

SUBCOMMITTEE PRESENTATIONS

Narcotic Replacement Therapy (NRT) Subcommittee

Mr. Steve Maulhardt, Chairperson, reported on the first conference call for the subcommittee. He stated the goal of the subcommittee is to look at NRT therapy. The committee believes it needs to address certain issues and return to the membership with recommendations. The issues discussed at the conference call were based on tracking (why clients are not referred to treatment), uniformed assessment tools, completion rates for NRT services, and UCLA data. There are 144 NRT providers in California. The question is, "Which of these providers were offered contracts, and did they accept?" He mentioned the subcommittee intended on conducting surveys covering probation and their feeling on NRT; finding out which providers are under contract, etc. He reported ADP will look at internal CADDs data. He mentioned there is a narcotic treatment workgroup discussing jail dosing.

Many Statewide Advisory Group members stated the need for an educational campaign. They reported most people view NRT as giving the client a dosing of another drug, and nothing else.

Many do not realize the counseling and support component to methadone maintenance as a part of the continuum of care.

Another member supported the need for NRT education and highlighted the fact that NTP programs need to be willing to work with other providers.

Several members suggested brief surveys with questions focused on the population. Some members suggested looking at the months of stay between modalities, checking to see if there is a decrease in jail days.

Another member highlighted the fact there is an added burden on the residential providers to transport clients to methadone with no one paying for the service. The member also stated there is a misconception that drug-free and methadone are two different treatment modalities and one client cannot occupy a spot in both at the same time.

Co-Occurring Disorders Subcommittee

Ms. Liz Stanley-Salazar, Chairperson, reported on the first conference call for the subcommittee. She stated the subcommittee determined its purpose to be accessing Proposition 63 funding for Proposition 36 clients. Ms. Stanley-Salazar, who is also a member of the Co-Occurring Joint Action Committee (COJAC) stated COJAC's purpose was to bring together the Department of Mental Health and ADP to improve outcomes for mental health clients especially those with co-occurring disorders (alcohol and mental health issues). She stated there is trouble determining what counties can and cannot do under Proposition 63. She stated there is a need for county level initiatives for a collaboration of Proposition 63 and 36 with state oversight.

Commissioner Darrell Steinberg and Dr. Gary Jaeger, Commission member, participated in the second teleconference. Ms. Salazar stated they both were in favor of collaboration and agreed on the need to get services to clients.

Ms. Stanley-Salazar reported collaboration between the two propositions is greatly dependent on the counties, but state oversight and leadership is needed. She suggested the advisory committee request money from Proposition 63 for Proposition 36 counties which are equipped to provide mental health services. She also stated removing technical barriers to funding and state-level allocation would help expedite the process.

Ms. Cheryl Trenwith added COJAC is working on a joint action statement. She stated there is a requirement in Proposition 63 addressing substance abuse, but not specifically Proposition 36 clients. She stated "Innovation funding", a component of P63 funds, is an area the advisory board can target.

Ms. Stanley-Salazar finished by announcing the next co-occurring disorders subcommittee meeting would be held in May at ADP.

Parolee Subcommittee

Chris Geiger, Chairperson gave a report on the subcommittee's first conference call. He reported the committee would be collecting various data including data from ADP and data provided by members of the subcommittee. This data will include such information as quarterly parolee data divided by region and county and identifying treatment providers who have demonstrated successful parolee outcomes. He reported the next meeting would be a face-to-face in early May will include presentations from specialized Proposition 36 parole agents.

DISCUSSION OF THE EVALUATION OF THE SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND CRIME PREVENTION ACT

The membership discussed the Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act, Cost Analysis Report (first and second years).

It was pointed out the high cost offenders identified in the UCLA evaluation (1.6% or 1,010 of the total SACPA participants) had five or more convictions 30 months prior to SACPA participation.

A member asked if it was unusual for an offender to have 5+ arrests. Another member responded by explaining the arrests are like traffic tickets. Misdemeanor offenses could only require five days or less stay in jail and the offender could have cases pending for up to one year. The member stated an offender could be arrested on the same case up to ten times.

Another member stated the need to know more about the drug offenses of the 1.6% population reported in the UCLA evaluation report. The member highlighted the need to not lose sight that the data shows five prior convictions seem to be a predictor of successful completion rates.

The advisory group was requested to assist in defining and prioritizing the next steps in research requests. The following is a prioritized list of those recommendations:

1. Co-Occurring data across the entire population
2. Pipeline of 1.6% population and the type of drug offenses (felonies vs misdemeanors)
3. Homelessness data across the entire population
4. Cost of SB 803 (increased supervision and treatment)
 - a. Specialized parolee study (no show information)
5. How many typical offenders are in Proposition 36
6. Cost associated with women and children

NEXT STEPS

Members suggested the following agenda items for the next meeting:

- Review of the data prepared for the legislature
- Report out from the three subcommittees: Co-Occurring, Parolee, and Narcotic Replacement

The next meeting is schedule for July 28, 2006 from 8:30 AM to 2:00 PM at the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs.