



Prop 47 Local Advisory Committee Minutes
February 19, 2019, 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.
1111 Jackson St., Oakland, Rooms 226-228

Attendance:

Local Advisory Committee Members:

- Colleen Chawla, Health Care Services Agency
- Wendy Still, Probation Department
- Danielle Brunswick, Collaborative Courts
- Kelly Glossup, Sheriff's Office
- Sholonda Jackson Jasper, Community Representative
- Dan Simmons, Community Representative
- Eric von Geldern, District Attorney's Office
- Brendon Woods, Public Defender

Other Attendees:

- Janet Biblin, Alameda County Behavioral Health
- Rodney Brooks, Public Defender
- Myeeka Calhoun, La Familia Counseling Services
- Lisa Heintz, Probation Department
- Emily Kaplan, Health Care Services Agency
- Sophia Lai, Alameda County Behavioral Health
- Debbie Mayer, Resource Development Associates
- Ande Pena, La Familia Counseling Services
- Monica Uriarte, Probation Department

1. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of October 22, 2018 – Discussion & Action

Rodney Brooks, Public Defender's Office, requested to add that the discussion regarding the Prop 47 Second Round proposal include his statement that a diversion program include clients pre-plea to divert people with serious mental illness from the criminal justice system.

Director Colleen Chawla, Health Care Services Agency, moved to adopt the minutes with the amendment, and Eric von Geldern, District Attorney's Office, seconded; all voted in favor.

2. Proposition 47 RFP Administration – Action Only



Emily Kaplan, Foundation Director for Health Care Services Agency, collected signatures from the LAC members for the second-round grant application. Kaplan also announced that she is drafting a letter for local agency leaders to affirm that proposed Proposition 47 programs will not have any negative impact on their work.

3. Announcement of LAC Community Representative Opening – Discussion & Action

Sophia Lai, Prop 47 Project Director, noted that a community representative of the LAC resigned and proposed adding a new member so that there would be a total of five community representatives. Lai proposed using the same Community Representative selection process previously implemented to select the candidates, including an application submission (due April 15), followed by a closed meeting of the LAC to vote on the candidates. Director Chawla and Chief Still agreed that their preference is to have 5 Community Representatives.

Danielle Brunswick, Collaborative Courts, moved to approve the proposal, and Chief Wendy Still, Probation Department, seconded. All voted in favor.

4. Presentation of Next Prop 47 Grant Proposal – Discussion & Action

Emily Kaplan presented the proposal framework for the second round of Prop 47 funding, for which the Board of State and Community Corrections issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) on January 18. Kaplan noted that Alameda County is eligible for up to \$6 million, and the proposal was due on March 18 for a project which begins August 15.

The drafted proposal is to continue to serve on adults with serious mental illness and substance use disorder, with a focus on those with co-occurring disorders. The proposal would include similar services to the current Prop 47 program, including:

- A new mental health treatment/case management team, which would include a nurse and housing case manager
 - o Kaplan noted that the two teams currently funded by Prop 47 would be continued through other County funding after the first round of Prop 47 funding ends
- Substance use disorder recovery residences – 11 beds
- Housing supports for clients with serious mental illness and/or substance use disorder



There was consensus that these services from the first round were generally successful and should be continued.

Kaplan also described new diversion services included in the second round proposal: the target population would be Transition Age Youth (18-24), but all adults would be eligible. The goal would be to divert clients pre-arrest as well as those charged with misdemeanors or non-violent felonies involving substances. Chief Still noted that she still planned to discuss the proposal with the public safety partners, and that she would work with a racial ethnic disparity workgroup at the Joint Safety Table with stakeholders including the District Attorney, Public Defender, and Oakland Police Department. She also noted that Probation would leverage additional funds beyond the \$475,000 requested.

The first part of the diversion program would be a community-based pre-arrest and front-end diversion program that is available 24 hours a day to adult clients experiencing a mental health or substance use disorder issue, and it would operate in partnership with public safety partners.

The second part of the diversion program would be a specialized mental health and/or SUD caseload within Probation managed by a deputy probation officer with a behavioral health license who could provide more intensive case management and referrals to targeted interventions.

During the discussion regarding diversion services, von Geldern asked about the timeline. Monica Uriarte, Probation Department, responded that a request for proposals would be issued within 6 to 8 months of receiving the award, and the services would be available by 10 to 12 months after program start. Uriarte also noted that Probation would work on a memorandum of understanding with police departments and the public safety partners concurrently to ensure that the implementation could occur within 24 months of award.

Director Chawla asked whether this proposal was similar to the LEAD program in Seattle. Uriarte responded this was more similar to a program in New York City. Public Defender Brendon Woods also noted that LEAD is post-arrest, whereas this is pre-arrest.

Director Chawla asked how this would differ from a crisis response team. Uriarte responded that this would be for people who are not necessarily at the level of requiring arrest.

Lai asked whether there would be a set location for the 24 hour part of the diversion program. Uriarte responded that there would be.



Lai asked what the plan would be to leverage resources. Lisa Heintz, Probation Department, responded that community based providers would place consumers in housing, and that they would be assigned to a case manager who would connect them to wraparound services. Chief Still noted that clients under Probation supervision would also receive other resources.

Ande Pena, La Familia Counseling Services, asked how the community based organizations would focus on Transition Age Youth. Uriarte responded through targeted outreach.

Chief Still noted that a potential location for the diversion program was off Hegenberger Road in Oakland, where Probation has a potential partnership or co-location program with state parole. Director Chawla asked whether law enforcement officers would transport people to this location instead of arresting them. Kelly Glossup, Sheriff's Office noted that many law enforcement agencies are limited in their ability to transport clients and have to rely on paramedics plus. Public Defender Woods asked to clarify whether law enforcement agencies "can't" or "won't" transport these individuals, and Glossup responded she was not sure. Heintz noted that Fremont Police Department is considering policies that would allow them to transport individuals. Chief Still noted that Probation just issued a transportation services RFP out that could include these services.

Von Geldern expressed concern about a client's ability to consent to transport. Chief Still noted that they would discuss this proposal with those at the Safety Table, and Uriarte noted that they could consider other models. Von Geldern asked what other models are being reviewed, and Uriarte responded that San Diego and Seal Beach have potential programs.

Von Geldern requested to ensure that the program be inclusive of individuals who are further along the criminal justice system, not just pre-plea. Uriarte noted that this could be incorporated into the RFP.

Brunswick asked how much funding this program would require overall to be successful. Uriarte responded that Probation would seek other grant opportunities to fund this program and leverage other funds. Chief Still noted that Probation has recently successfully received multiple grants, including \$2.5 million for addressing opioid use, juvenile gang prevention, and warm handoffs from parole.



Public Defender Woods recommended the Career Best model, which would focus on “no reentry” and not just reentry. He also recommended looking at the Living Room Model and requested more information regarding models in New York and Texas.

Public Defender Woods questioned whether the data indicated a need to focus on TAY since his office’s experience is that clients with mental health concerns tend to be older than the TAY population.

Public Defender Woods confirmed that the justice-involvement eligibility for Proposition 47 programs is anyone with any type of justice involvement, not dependent on charges.

Uriarte noted that the diversion program would aggressively collect performance data.

Brunswick asked whether the specialized mental health caseload model had yet begun since the reentry court has a deputy probation officer with only mental health clients. Chief Still noted that the Probation Department has moved toward dedicated mental health caseloads, but did not yet have a licensed clinical deputy probation officer.

Brooks stated his concern about what happens to a client if a police officer chooses to arrest the client even after bringing them to a contracted community based organization. Uriarte noted that law enforcement has decision making power, but that the focus would be on training them so they know about this alternative. Brooks clarified that law enforcement has to be aware that this organization is providing these services. Public Defender Woods noted that this may be challenging to implement because even if police department leadership is on board, line cops may not follow through.

Director Chawla asked which jurisdictions would be the focus, and Chief Still said Oakland and Hayward. Director Chawla noted that while she supports pre-arrest diversion, this would be complicated for multiple law enforcement jurisdictions. Heintz stated this should be an Alameda County-wide model.

Brooks also asked whether there is any possibility of purchasing more slots for Behavioral Health Court, especially in South County since the program does not exist there and it is an identified need. Chief Still asked for clarification; she suggested using the Transition Day Reporting Center services for those in need of Behavioral Health Court Services. Chief Still also noted that she would be supportive of using AB 109 resources to



provide more Behavioral Health Court services in South County. Public Defender Woods noted that Proposition 47 services are not limited by clients' charges, but AB 109 services are, so he wanted to ensure that areas like Fremont and Dublin, which have a high volume of clients with mental health concerns, would have access to behavioral health court services since they frequently cannot make it to the current site in Oakland. Uriarte noted that the County could seek a grant for collaborative court funding since the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance may have resources for these programs.

Von Geldern stated that for fundamental jurisdictional reasons, District Attorney Nancy O'Malley needed to be part of the discussion on the diversion program before submitting the proposal, and reiterated that the program should be inclusive. Chief Still agreed to meet. Kaplan stated that the next steps are she will work with the stakeholders to continue developing the proposal based on the meeting's conversation.

5. Future Meetings

The LAC's future meetings are as follows:

- Monday, April 29, 2019, 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.
- Monday, July 29, 2019, 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.
- Monday, October 28, 2019, 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

6. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

For more information on AC Prop 47, please contact Sophia Lai, Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services – Sophia.Lai@acgov.org – (510) 567-8146