PROBATION DEPARTMENT

"Protection, Service & Accountability"

Main Office (805) 781-5300 ~ 1730 Bishop Street, San Luis Obispo
Juvenile Services Center * (805) 781-5352 ~ 1065 Kansas Avenue, San Luis Obispo
Juvenile Hall * (805) 781-5389 ~ 1065 Kansas Avenue, in San Luis Obispo
***Mailing Address:**
Juvenile Services Center and Juvenile Hall - SLO County Government Center~ Attn: Probation JSC ~ 1050 Monterey Street ~ San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

James E. Salio
Chief Probation Officer

Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)
January 13, 2014, 3:00 p.m.
Probation Classroom
Jim Salio, Chair

MINUTES

Attendees:

Community Corrections Partnership Title (or designee) – Name
Chief Probation Officer – Jim Salio
The Presiding Judge of the Superior Court – Susan Matherly, Court Executive Officer
A County Supervisor or CAO – Geoff O'Quest
The District Attorney – Gerry Shea, Linda Dunn
DA Victim Witness – Not available
Sheriff – Ian Parkinson
The Public Defender – Patricia Ashbaugh
A Chief of Police – Not available
Department Head of County Employment – Not available
Drug and Alcohol Services –Star Graber, Melanie Serrou
Department Head of Social Services – Not available
The Head of the County Office of Education – Not available
Probation – Chief Deputy Robert Reyes, Wendy White, Amy Gilman, Virginia Collie
Health Agency – Not available
35th State Assembly Representative – Kevin Drabinski
A representative from a community-based organization, Grace McIntosh, CAPSLO

AGENDA-

I. Welcome and Introductions
II. Approval of Minutes
III. Public Comment
IV. Planning/Training
V. Finance Committee Update
VI. Program Updates
VII. Presentation on sober living homes – Star Graber
VIII. Topics for next month's meeting

I. **Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 pm.

II. **Approval of Minutes**

There was a correction by Star Graber to the 12/16/2013 minutes. Remove the word "substitute" from line 10 of Program Updates section. Gerry Shea announced that he is deferring his presentation of the DA case management system until the meeting in February. A motion was made by Patricia Ashbaugh and seconded by Star Graber to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion carried.

III. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

IV. **Planning/Training**

The Sheriff would like to send some employees to the "California Pre-Trial Justice Orientation for System Stakeholders" training being held in January at a cost of about $1,100 dollars. Probation would like to send some officers to CPOC's Realignment training series: "Practical Guide to Incentives and Sanctions" training being held in April at a cost of about $1,600. Both trainings have been approved by the CCP Finance committee. A motion was made by Gerry Shea and seconded by Ian Parkinson to approve the expenditure of training funds for these trainings. All in favor, motion carried.

V. **Finance Committee Update**

Wendy White provided a spreadsheet with an updated projection for expenditures in FY 2014/15. There is an increased projected shortfall of approximately $304,000. We do have unallocated funds to carry over with a projected modest savings at the end of FY 2013/14. The growth money was received back in October and the balance in our one time/training fund is $112,000. The anticipated FY2013/14 one time/training money brings our total unallocated funds to 2,048,844. The governor released his January budget projections for next fiscal year, which included the growth money for FY 13/14, but we still don't know the exact amount as it can fluctuate in relation to sales tax projections.

Wendy stated all figures were prepared by the finance committee. Salary and benefits costs were derived using the BP salary projection tool. None of the current programs were enhanced or expanded; this is just a reflection of the quantitative increases in salary, services and supplies. Discussion ensued about the increase in cost of the home detention program. A sliding fee schedule has been put in place for home detainees so there are more people taking advantage of the program. Sheriff stated it averages about 60 in population. Any jail stays over 20 days are considered eligible for home detention. Sheriff has explored the possibility of contracting for private home detention for those sentenced less than 20 days. Perhaps the first time DUI offenders could be eligible and would serve their full time and be tested while at home detention.

Linda Dunn asked if we have recognized any benefit from the rollout of the affordable care act. Robert Reyes responded the goal is to enroll as many currently incarcerated as possible, especially the medically fragile but no start date has been determined yet. An MOU was introduced at the last Programs committee meeting to work out details. It would not really save any in-custody medical costs anyway except for emergency care. Ian reported this is where the costs are highest, when an inmate needs to be transported and stays in the hospital; they have extremely high costs for security services. Sheriff is

looking into the possibility of contracting for medical care. Right now with the current jail medical facilities, it may not be feasible, but perhaps when the new facility is built, the contractor could administer care at the jail itself. If the average jail sentence is over two years then medical costs can become significant.

The Sheriff asked about funding for an intern position in his programming unit. He would like to extend this position for the rest of the fiscal year and asked if he could use salary savings to fund or if there was an approval process. He will need to include this funding with the next budget process to continue the position.

Discussion ensued about the Stanford report's ranking of county allocation of funding between custodial and treatment services. Our county was ranked as a high custodial county but the report defined any cost at a jail as custodial, not taking into account the type of program the money was spent on, such as treatment services within the jail environment. We did allocate a lot of money to custody in year one, but after that most of the money has been spent on programming and custody numbers have not changed. Other counties, who did not deliberately grow their jail populations, have numbers that reflect positively on the treatment services side. Gerry Shea commented it seems like we have more money invested in treatment than supervision, and we have more jail treatment programs then we have had before. Robert Reyes reported there is still a high level of treatment resistance from those incarcerated. Some clients may need to be sentenced to jail several times before they decide to enter treatment. This is especially true for the persons coming out of state prison. James Salio mention the SB 105 money is still in the state budget which is the money the governor received approval for to house inmates out of state. If the state gets a two year extension from Superior Court, then that money will be reallocated to the counties for funding of rehabilitation programs.

Wendy stated that when we receive our final allocations then that money can be figured into the budget so we won't have a deficit. At that point the Executive committee will decide if there is a gap that needs to be closed and how best to do that.

VI. **Program Updates**

Robert Reyes reported the jail treatment program is doing fine. They are still in the process of hiring a mental health therapist for the co-occurring disorder treatment team. Amy Gilman reported on the Probation Department's data point statistics. Along with the data she would like to add text that describes the data points. The current data is inclusive back to FY 2012/13; eventually we will have data going back to 2011. Data points are categorized by PRCS, Mandatory Supervision (MS) and Felony probationers using CPOC (Chief Probation Officers of California) hierarchy guidelines. The various tables reflect a one day snapshot taken of the data in Monitor at the end of December, 2013. There is a slight decrease in overall numbers of PRCS offenders, the mandatory probation is still a very small population and the bulk of probationers are in the felony probationer category. A lower percentage of PRCS and MS probationers are out to warrant compared to the percentage of felony probationers. 62% of the PRCS population scores as high risk using the LSI risk assessment tool (based on static and dynamic factors) compared to 26 % for MS and 17% for Felony probationers. Robert Reyes reported that the criminal history helps to drive up the PRCS score due to number of prior violent convictions. Nearly one-third of the PRCS category has had at least one prior violent conviction. One of the major gaps in our data collection right now is what is happening during supervision, specifically any treatment program involvement. Amy is currently working with Behavioral Health to

get their data for the AB 109 re-entry population. Going forward Probation will include statistics and outcomes on enrollment in contracted programs such as sober living, residential treatment, domestic violence, etc. 35% of the PRCS population went 12 months without any incarceration and a little over 1/3 of the PRCS finish in a year and are discharged. 41% finish supervision in a year and a half. 51.6% of the PRCS population had one or more bookings for violations compared to 69.7% for the felony probationers. Linda Dunn questioned why the regular felony population was higher and Robert suggested it may be because of how we've gone about introducing clients back into society with PRCS in regard to services, which is much more directed than with the regular felony probationers. We looked at the total number of bookings per arresting agency which equates to the number of bookings, not the number of persons booked, as one person could have multiple bookings. We also looked at the total number of days in custody. PRCS had higher numbers in the 1-10 day range which reflects what is called flash incarcerations of 10 days or less and a second peak from 91-180 days. 90-365 days seemed to be the overall average length of stay in jail. The new filings table reflects how many times a client was sent back to court for either a violation or new charge. Amy will filter out the filings that involved probation violations to get a clearer picture.

There was some discussion as to whether felony convictions should include the number of counts filed against a person. For right now the table reflects a single conviction no matter the number of counts. Patricia Ashbaugh and Grace MacIntosh felt it was more significant to look at the idea it is a new felony and new crime and the level of sophistication in the crime. Gerry Shea stated it needs to be defined consistently internally and when looking at previous data and new data. Linda Dunn felt it should be looked at in the context of overall public safety, for example a person might have committed 5 burglaries but there is only one conviction but the event actually involved 5 separate crimes. Gerry requested that a note be put at the top of the overall report stating all data in the tables are a reflection of data after an event has been closed. Jim Salio stated that Probation will continue to work on refining the data, will look at the idea of calculating numbers of counts and convictions, and will start graphing trends in the data.

VII. **Presentation on sober living homes – Star Graber**

Star presented a PowerPoint on the status of the sober living environments. Overall there are eight SLE facilities with 157 beds in the County and currently they have a waiting list. Two new SLEs are willing to be opened, one in North County and one in the south and the start-up cost for those is approximately $5,000 each. The number of offenders has increased in the current fiscal year and lengths of stay have increased beyond the previous projections. The need for additional housing is high and the completion status is better for those who are housed in SLEs. For FY 2013/14 it is projected that $60,000 is needed to maintain the currently housed individuals through FY 2013/14, $10,000 for the two new SLE startups, and $50,000 for purchase orders with the new facilities, for a grand total of $120,000. This is over and above the original $230,000 that has been allocated. SLE funding is projected to continue to increase beyond the current year's requested total. Currently there is no cap on stays and no policy to set a cap for the length of stay or the percentage to be paid by clients. The average daily rate is $30 in comparison to about $100 for housing at the jail. Gerry commented that it looks like 80% of the people in SLEs are PRTS and not just PRCS so that needs to be separated out. Jim commented that CCP funds should be spent on the PRCS clientele but all others should be receiving funding from the County General Fund. Additional funding requests for PRCS clients should be brought before the CCP Executive committee. Options for consideration include (1)

providing more funding for SLE stays in the current year; (2) increasing client accountability for payments and/or reduce or cap the length of stay; (3) permanent housing solution; (4) provide no expansion and utilize waiting lists to prioritize offenders; (5) when funding is spent out (anticipated in May 2014) begin moving offenders to other housing options; or any combination of the above. Grace Macintosh stated it will be interesting to compare the recidivism rate for those who complete the sober living. Recommendations are a combination of options 1 and 2, increase funding through end of FY 2013/14 and increase client accountability and decrease amount of time paid by County; and option 3 as an end goal, to develop permanent housing solutions in the County.

VIII. Topics for next month's meeting: Overview of DA's new case management system

Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 24, 2014 at 3 pm, Probation classroom.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginia Collie