

Alternatives to Incarceration Working Group

Meeting Notes

April 11, 2019

1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Hubert H. Humphrey Comprehensive Health Center

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began with a welcome from Bob Ross who introduced our facilitator Rigo Rodriguez to the group. He thanked Karen, Diana and Corrin. The members went around and did verbal introductions.

Rigo Rodriguez, facilitator of the meeting, initiated the introductions of the voting members starting with the district appointments. Next the voting members from government offices did introductions. Introductions from the public and staff followed.

Rigo explained the contents of the presentation from the agenda. Public comment procedure was explained to the group. Norayr Zurabyan from County Counsel's office spoke about the Brown Act for local legislative bodies. He explained that certain types of communications are prohibited, involving more than a quorum of voting members outside of an official meeting, whether in person, by email or by passing along information from one to the next. He cautioned that members should avoid hitting "reply all" to any email. He stated the agenda had to be posted 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Next on the agenda was the work group foundation. Diana Zuniga spoke about the mission of the work group. She stated the mission of the group from the presentation slide. The three key pieces were action-oriented, implementation and care-first. The process values that received the most feedback from the last meeting were Equity and Racial Justice, Inclusion of many voices and human-first language. The working group foundation retreat is scheduled for April 26, 2019 8:00 am – 1:00 pm at the California Endowment to discuss process values and solidifying guiding principles.

Dr. Ross spoke about the County Board of Supervisors who are in support as well as the Sheriff, the advocates, community members and formerly incarcerated. He plans to first describe what the data says about the injustice of the system. He explained that a representative from the Advancement Project will present, and Kelly Lytle-Hernandez who will talk about her research on the history of incarceration in Los Angeles. He implored in particular County members to attend the retreat and join the Ad Hoc committees.

Rigo then asked if any members of the public or voting members had any comments. He explained they will be voting on Motion 1: Alternate Members which is to permit alternate member representatives to attend in each other's place. Diana counted the number of members having a voting clicker. The gradients of agreement were explained in terms of consensus. Instructions were given on how to use the voting clicker to the voting members. It was noted that "D" supports the motion while "E" blocks the group from proceeding. The 60% threshold was explained as a voting method in the event no consensus was reached.

Dr. Ross explained the reason we are voting on the first motion is to be certain the County departments and community members are represented. Motion 2: To Adopt the Decision Method. Eunisses

Hernandez asked how the 60% number came to be the standard for decision-making. It was explained that it was based upon experience. The question was asked if there would also be a vote to decide who the alternates would be. It was explained by Diana to the group that the person chosen as an alternate needs to understand the issue of focus. Another voting member asked if the alternate needed to be part of the district as a requirement. It was pointed out that voting members were chosen based upon their expertise and that should be taken into consideration when designating an alternate.

Diana Zuniga explained that if a person wanted to designate an alternate that it only be one person to keep it a consistent process. Also, we need to be told 24 hours in advance that the alternate will be in attendance as a proxy.

To start we will be using the simple majority voting method until the first motion is voted in or out for adoption. Of the voting members, 19 members voted for it with no against and 1 abstention. The decision method was adopted. There were 18 A's and 2 B's. The clicker voting system was then tested for functionality.

Rigo introduced Karen to speak about the Interim Report and Timeline Draft which has a deadline of early June 2019. It was stated we would continue to work after that date however are focused on the short-term goal currently. Each Ad Hoc committee is scheduled to report their recommendations to the full committee later. She reviewed the outline:

- Introduction setting context for mass incarceration and mental health crises
- Process describing work group, committees, community engagement strategy
- Recommendations from each committee:
 - Community-Based System of Care
 - Data & Research
 - Funding
 - Justice System Reform

The interim report is set to include our plans to expand the work group mission for the final report.

Question of Understanding: (Voting Member) Is there anywhere the demographics of the population will be outlined? That data and research will be providing completed study information soon about the demographics for the population to be in the facility. There is information out now and also additional studies being done currently for use as a baseline for the Ad Hoc committee.

A member wanted to confirm substance abuse is also as essential as mental health in this work. Corrin confirmed that it was also included.

A voting member said a structured report needs to mirror what the work is. The decision given the timeline was to focus on those with a clinical mental health need first as well as co-occurring disorders.

Eunisses Hernandez said she would hate that we exclude the SUD population if they are not having a co-occurring disorder. It was mentioned that the definition of the populations served be expanded to include co-occurring disorders such as SUD as the document reads in a limited way.

The initial meeting focused on the first report described the focus first on people with clinical needs in the initial document.

Comment: The Board has been interested in gender responsive issues and we need to note it as we discuss equities in this report. On February 12th motion 2 and 3 were passed and gender responsiveness and racial equity were a focus. In the final report, we will focus on the additional subpopulations.

Comment: A voting member wanted to ask about the consultant to be brought on for the group.

Corrin from ODR spoke about a contractor who is being brought in to provide more information about this population.

Comment: Concerned about how most people in the system are poor and why economic equality has not been discussed.

It was mentioned that would be included in the scope as the people who are most impacted and why that has been.

The Ad Hoc committee is really the place to work through these issues and concerns.

Comment: Poverty happens and how do we address it?

The Ad Hoc meeting is where these different issues need to be worked through.

Diana presented to the group that there will now be a Community Engagement Ad Hoc committee to the group as a 5th subcommittee.

Diana also discussed and reviewed the interim report timeline for the report to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors. She mentioned that earlier today there was a co-chair convening meeting to discuss the ad hoc committee first meetings. It was mentioned that between May 2 and May 23 there will be another co-chair convening to discuss progress in each ad hoc committee.

It was noted there cannot be more than 14 voting members in an ad hoc committee.

Next meeting schedule:

Data & Research: April 29 1:30-3pm location TBD

Justice Reform: April 24, 2-3:30pm location TBD

Funding: between April 29 and May 1 perspective dates being looked at

Retreat: April 26 8 am- 1pm

Comment: This work is a way to reframe thinking about making substance abuse not a moral issue, but a health issue

Comment: In the process of collaboration we are setting a model for efficiency and behavioral function of our systems.

Comment: When you are seeking solutions, you should keep in mind the most important aspect is getting information from those who are directly impacted. Do not decide what is good for them without asking them.

Comment: Think outside of the norms and look for different solutions. The answers are within the communities, not within the systems.

Comment: Question: How are the Ad Hoc committees' progress being recorded and then reported. We want to give each committee the flexibility to figure out what kind of process they want to use. A reentry landing page on One Degree has been created and is one of the ways we hope the Ad Hoc committee will weave into its process. We also plan to list out what the gaps are to share with the committees to inform them so their recommendations reflect what is happening in the community.

What happens to the recordings of each committee meeting?

The notes are being shared as they are continuing to be created and will be shared within the committees.

Comment: The question is about the relationship about the motion of pre-trial and the County's Bail reform efforts, so far community voices have not being centered in that space.

They are working with members of that work group as well.

Comment: Who are we consulting with? I worry about the impulse to lean towards consultants and away from the community that may provide regressive suggestions. Justice LA submitted a report already to help us carry out this vision. We need to be sure we do not move away from that.

Where can we get or find the Decarceration report?

It can be shared with Karen and then circulated as part of the reading list for the group.

Comment: How are prisoners going to be actively involved in these Ad Hoc committees?

We will figure out ways in which to involve everyone's voice.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.