

Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group

August 7, 2019
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm
Centro Maravilla

Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Bob Ross began by opening the meeting and letting participants know that we would be discussing recommendations and would be unable to endorse recommendations during the August meeting. He thanked everyone for their work in refining the 77 recommendations.

Rigo introduced himself and began to explain the agenda would focus on understanding the recommendations through a gallery walk broken up by intercept points. He mentioned that this meeting would focus on a discernment discussion and prepare the group for a special session to endorse the recommendations. Rigo reaffirmed that the recommendations focused on the people experiencing mental health, substance use, and co-occurring disorders which was the population the group focused on for the interim report. It was explained that more recommendations cannot be added at this time. The endorsement process was displayed through a visual representation with sections titled understand, discern and decide. Rigo walked the group through the visual and shared that we would focus on understanding and discerning in today's session. The voting and endorsement of recommendations would take place in the decide phase during a special session. A visual of the intercept roadmap and infrastructure was displayed.

Diana thanked the attendees and explained the sequential intercept model on the screen. She told the attendees that a new intercept point was created and that the starting intercept is zero, meaning zero contact with law enforcement with a focus on prevention and supporting a holistic, decentralized community based system of care. Diana explained that the title for intercept one was changed from community services to community response and intervention services. This shift was made connect the recommendations to the point of a crisis occurring. It was shared that the major structural changes were done to intercept zero and one in the roadmap while all the others only shifted one number over. The model across all intercepts should give people access to intercept zero so that diversion and alternatives are employed whenever possible. The infrastructure section is the foundational work that needs to be created so that all the other recommendations can flow and function across the intercepts. The six components under infrastructure were briefly explained.

Rigo explained that the participants should move around to several different stations to ask questions and provide comments regarding the recommendations in each of the intercepts. The presenters present at each intercept station would write down the numbers of the recommendations that they received questions and comments about. The various note takers for each flip chart were identified for their willingness to assist and their participation in developing/refining the recommendations. The ad hoc committees, specifically Community Based System of Care and Justice System Reform, tried to define what the desired change was and held off on the planning and implementation.

Everyone can participate in the gallery walk and the group was instructed to plan which flip chart to go to. Attendees were encouraged to add questions to the respective flip charts too. Rigo let individuals

know that recommendations 32, 35 and 40 needed further discussion and experienced some form of divergence.

At 1:48 pm the group was encouraged to participate in the gallery walk and to bring their comments and questions to the flip charts around the room.

At 2:22 pm the group reconvened to review the flip chart content for each intercept in the gallery walk. Each respective scribe stationed at each flip chart read the comments and questions aloud for the group.

Intercept 0: Holistic and Decentralized Community-Based System of Care

(Brittney Weissman)

- 2. Cite VA UCLA campus as example and general incremental increases
- 8. Use VA funds
- 16. Add examples
- 18. Include housing and transportation

Intercept 1: Community Response and Intervention Services

(Kiwon Yoo and Peter Eliasberg)

- Mandatory reporters' obligations to call law enforcement?
- What are laws & regulations around this?
- What are measures? How will we hold people/agencies accountable?
- Incorporating credible messengers more where appropriate in crisis response

Intercept 2: Law Enforcement

(Eunisses Hernandez)

- 33. "Substantially increase number of police"
 - o Wording makes it sound like we will be further increasing budget & personnel of police
 - o Forces, rather than reducing or requiring a redistribution
 - o Issue of Timing

Intercept 3: Initial Detention and Court Hearings

(Gina Eachus)

- 40. Focus on independent cross-functional entity
 - o Feedback on the word "independent" and whether the agency had to be created or if any existing county resources/department could be used to coordinate the needs and strengths assessment if it was independent of law enforcement
 - o Concern about the term "law enforcement contact" and how it is defined – term is legally ambiguous
 - o Would take a lot of effort and coordination to execute the recommendation and ensure effectiveness – multiple groups need to work together
 - o Ongoing effort to look at how the strengths and needs assessment is actually working - implementation concern to measure validity/success, etc.
- At the County Jail/Police Lockup City Jail/Sheriff Substation point of contact, there should be the ability to release detained individuals to community organizations that can provide services to those who need it
- Instead of the term 'Cite and Release' it should be 'Cite or Release' or 'Cite and/or Release' because that is something that is already being done

Intercept 4: Jails and Courts

(Ruben Marques and Nicole Davis-Tinkham)

- 42. Ensure in custody involvement of CBOs for services
- 43. Focus on funding for legislation like AB 1810, etc.
- 44, 45, 47, & 48. Get judiciary involved, build ownership and regular updating in building process
- 46. Non-punitive protocol for people getting help and training
- 44. Add "County Counsel"
- 45. De-Silo County Counsel
- 47. Educate Public and Media...expand
- Reduce or eliminate court related fees/fines
- Provide support for sentencing to match people and programs

Intercept 5: Reentry and Intercept 6: Community Corrections

(Nicole Brown)

- Title Change: Release/Re-entry/Probation and Parole
- Defining Terms:
 - o Release-People released out of jail/prison
- Re-entry: Explicit connection to Intercept 0 and Gender specific/inclusive
- Discuss how to include Probation/Parole and State hospitals
- 49, 50. Community -based
- 51. Not exclusively downtown

Infrastructure

- 53. Specifics on accountability and oversight, connecting to a commission with a proactive agenda
- 56, 57. Data specifically tracking trans and LGBTQ folks
- 56, 57. HMIS Database included as well (ex: Long Beach system of care)
- 77. Way for community to volunteer and support
- 63. A Pause is needed to lead to a better outcome
- 67. Internal coordination and training of county folks; limiting "Scope Creep" of County – Led revisions
- Where is measure for decreasing disparities in the system?
- Is a reduction in jail size driving recommendations?
- Where did linguistic completely land?
- Release dates and coordination with localities (56) municipalities
- Research agenda after hearing from community engagement

Dr. Ross also asked what the difference between release and reentry is while intercept 5/6 was presenting. About three participants including Susan Burton, Irvin Alvarez, and Thomas Smith replied. They collectively stated there is a difference between release and reentry which is that release is walking out of jail gates into freedom and the community. Reentry means working through all the barriers and it's a long process of reintegration for people. The group proposes to correct the intercept by separating reentry and release from each other.

Rigo highlighted that the main commentary is to make slight modifications to recommendations already in place.

Public Comment

C: Intercept 5 and 6 we are wondering is setup coming straight out of jail or prison. Why can't they divert people to a CBO to help provide services. For intercept two what is the time span to be assessed?

C: Intercept 1 and 4, in speaking to law enforcement for persons affected by incarceration and number 47 that references conduct educational seminars, we need to add a lived-experience component from family members.

C: What are the standards regarding who may be seriously considered for diversion? Everybody ought to be eligible for it. Who is deciding this? The programs success rely on how these decisions are made. It should be continuously evolving.

C: We need to be reminded what else needs to be done. After this report is submitted, we need to be diligent about how this work can be continued. How will be able to have an accountability process? We do not want this work to be in vain. Those most impacted need to benefit from this process. There needs to be oversight that has power.

C: Regarding intercept 5 and 6 there are not enough employees at twin towers and people are already gone before they get handed off to services. Maybe we need to hire more people to work there.

C: Overall, creating the systems of care is exceptional. The goal is to reduce the number of people who are incarcerated, especially those with mental health diagnosis. The article that the LA Times released a few weeks ago regarding strip searches reminds us that women need to be prominently supported in this process.

C: Intercept number two doesn't have timing which is crucial. I came out with PTSD which was never addressed. We should not leave it to the police who do not deserve that power. There needs to be more folks with lived experience participating in this process.

C: We need people that have been impacted. It's hard for people to get back out there. I am in this work because I hit a barrier and I overcame it. We need that new energy for every single youth who might take over this work.

C: Intercept two, number 33, to increase amount of police, there are already enough law enforcement in the system. We need to train police in how to address those with mental illness. Police often shoot when someone is armed instead of dealing with it appropriately. They need to know not to shoot without addressing the situation.

Public Comment Themes

- Divert to community-based org as a part of reentry (5/6)
- Time frame to for assessment to occur in #40 (issue shared twice)
- 34/47: CIT law enforcement training
 - o Lived experience component especially with family member
- Standards needed for who is eligible for diversion
 - o Evolve using research
- Need strong implantation and accountability
- Those most impacted benefit_(issue shared twice)
- Oversight body
- Reduce # of people incarcerated

- Issue of strip searches and need to talk with women
- Train community and law enforcement about how to de-escalate
 - o Show how to leverage community already connected to the person's family/friends

Questions and Comments throughout meeting

Q: When members vote at the next meeting will it only be regarding the recommendations, or will it be corresponding language that accompanies each recommendation?

A: We will be voting on each actual recommendation. We do have some copies of the interim report recommendations combined that contains the analysis that was already submitted to the board. There was research to develop an analysis to support each recommendation and provide understanding. We are not adding any new recommendations, we are voting on the recommendations already generated and not the analysis. The recommendations are all about solving specific problems.

Q: Is there another page for intercept six?

A: Intercept five and six are combined.

Q: Will there be room for more recommendations?

A: Yes, the opportunity will be available later.

Q: Define CBSOC and alternative clinical settings.

A: The pieces we are focused on are the holistic and speak to housing, behavioral health villages, families and support services, restorative justice, and mental health issues. We are also looking at a decentralized approach to equitably distribute resources across the county, which connects to the broader categories.

Closing

Dr. Robert Ross thanked the crowd for participating in the process. He mentioned a few things that he noted. The first was reminders about the community engagement process. Number two more clarity about the missing subgroup populations like LGBTQ, etc. Lastly, at some point, we must engage the department heads that are impacted by these recommendations for that accountability piece. We do not want to wait until February to do it. We need to find a way to engage the judges more formally. We also need the funding ad hoc committee to ramp up to see where the dollars are going to materialize.

Rigo mentioned for ATI work group voting members we would send a doodle poll to decide on the special meeting date to endorse the recommendations.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:03 pm.