

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP



Public Safety Realignment Act

(Assembly Bills 109/117)

FY 2014-2015 PLAN

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

**County of Santa Barbara
Public Safety Realignment Act
FY 2014-2015 Plan**

Executive Committee of the Community Corrections Partnership

Bill Brown, Sheriff

Larry Ralston, Lompoc Police Chief

Takashi Wada, M.D. MPH, Interim Director Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services

Joyce Dudley, District Attorney

Arthur Garcia, Presiding Judge of the Santa Barbara County Superior Court

Rai Montes De Oca, Public Defender

Beverly A. Taylor, Chief Probation Officer (Chair)

Community Corrections Partnership at large members

Bill Cirone, Superintendent of County Schools

Daniel Nielson, Director, Department of Social Services

John Gannon, Director, Directions Educational Services (CBO member)

Ray McDonald, Workforce Investment Board

Megan Rheinschild, Victim Witness Program Director (victim advocate member)

Janet Wolf, 2nd District Supervisor

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
I. Overview of 2011 Public Safety Realignment	2
II. Local Planning and Oversight	4
A. Community Corrections Partnership	4
B. Planning and Development Team	4
III. Community Corrections Partnership Objectives	6
IV. Population	8
V. Program Strategies	9
A. Jail Population Management	9
B. Alternative Sentencing Strategy	10
C. Assessment	11
D. Supervision	12
E. Discharge Planning	13
F. Victim Services	14
G. Housing and Treatment	15
H. Compliance Response Teams	16
I. Collaborative Courts	17
VI. Plan Revisions	18
VII. Data Collection, Outcomes and Evaluation	18
VIII. Results	19
IX. Spending Plan	21
X. Closing	28

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Results First Initiative	31
Attachment 2	Transition from Jail to Community (TJC) Initiative	32
Attachment 3	Smart Justice	34
Attachment 4	Assembly Bill 109 (AB109) Data Tracking	36
Attachment 5	Quality Assurance Committee	42
Attachment 6	County Realignment Population Data	43
Attachment 7	Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) Population Projections	44
Attachment 8	Correctional Offender Management and Profiling Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)	48
Attachment 9	PRCS/Post Sentence Supervision (PSS) Guidelines	49
Attachment 10	Probation Report and Resource Center (PRRC) Services	51
Attachment 11	Collaborative Courts Enrollment Report	54
Attachment 12	Santa Maria/Santa Barbara Drug Court Evaluations	55
Attachment 13	AB109 Monthly Operational Impact Reports	63
Attachment 14	Santa Barbara County Realignment Executive Summary	72

INTRODUCTION

The Santa Barbara County Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) is proud to introduce the updated plan for fiscal year (FY) 2014-2015. This represents the fourth plan submitted since Realignment commenced on October 1, 2011. This latest plan builds upon and refines the balanced and collaborative plans previously submitted and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The prior plans continue to be valuable resource documents in understanding the local implementation of Realignment. The prior plans can be accessed on the Santa Barbara County Probation Department website:

<http://www.countyofsb.org/probation>.

This fourth plan is a testament to the local stakeholders' commitment to a shared vision and while understanding the fiscal limitations, it continues to put forth a balanced and efficient deployment of the resources. The CCP continues to advocate at the State level for a county allocation formula, which will ensure more equitable distribution of funds across the State and is optimistic that with additional funds even greater success could be achieved.

I. OVERVIEW OF 2011 PUBLIC SAFETY REALIGNMENT

In an effort to address overcrowding in California's prisons and assist in alleviating the State's financial crisis, the Public Safety Realignment Act (Assembly Bill 109 [AB109]) was signed into law on April 4, 2011. AB109, as subsequently revised by AB117 on June 29, 2011, transferred responsibility for specified lower level inmates and parolees from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to counties. This change was implemented on October 1, 2011.

Additionally, §1230.1 of the California Penal Code (PC) was added, which reads "(a) Each county local Community Corrections Partnership established pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1230 shall recommend a local plan to the county board of supervisors for the implementation of the 2011 public safety realignment. (b) The plan shall be voted on by an executive committee of each county's Community Corrections Partnership consisting of the chief probation officer of the county as chair, a chief of police, the sheriff, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, the presiding judge of the superior court, or his or her designee, and one department representative listed in either subparagraph (G), (H), or (J) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 1230¹, as designated by the county board of supervisors for purposes related to the development and presentation of the plan. (c) The plan shall be deemed accepted by the county board of supervisors unless the board rejects the plan by a vote of four-fifths of the board, in which case the plan goes back to the Community Corrections Partnership for further consideration. (d) Consistent with local needs and resources, the plan may include recommendations to maximize the effective investment of criminal justice resources in evidence-based correctional sanctions and programs, including, but not limited to, day reporting centers, drug courts, residential multiservice centers, mental health treatment programs, electronic and Global Positioning System (GPS) monitoring programs, victim restitution programs, counseling programs, community service programs, educational programs, and work training programs."

Key elements of AB109 include:

- Redefined Felonies: Revised the definition of a felony to include specified lower-level (i.e., non-serious, non-violent, non-sex offenses) crimes that would be punishable in jail or another local sentencing option.

Pursuant to §1170(h)(5) PC, felony offenders no longer eligible for commitment to the CDCR can be sentenced to jail for the full term or a portion of the term, with the balance suspended for a period of post sentence probation supervision.

1. Referenced representatives listed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 1230 are "the head of the county department of social services, the head of the county department of mental health and the head of the county alcohol and substance abuse programs."

- Established Post Release Community Supervision Population: Parolees whose committing offense is a non-violent, non-serious felony and who are not deemed to be high risk sex offenders.
- Local Post Release Community Supervision: Offenders released from state prison on or after October 1, 2011, after serving a sentence for an eligible offense, shall be subject to, for a period not to exceed three (3) years, Post Release Community Supervision provided by a designated county agency. Each county agency shall establish a review process for assessing and refining a person's program of post release supervision.

A Post Release Community Supervision agreement shall include the offender waiving his/her right to a Court hearing prior to the imposition of a period of "flash incarceration" in a county jail of not more than ten (10) consecutive days for any violation of his/her release conditions.

- Revocations Heard & Served Locally: Revocations for Realigned offenders and parole revocations will be served in local jails (by law the maximum parole revocation sentence is up to 180 days), with the exception of paroled "lifers" who have a revocation term of greater than 30 days. The Courts will hear revocations of Realigned offenders subject to county supervision and beginning July 1, 2013, will conduct violation hearings for state parolees, which is a role currently assumed by the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH).
- Changes to Custody Credits: Pursuant to §4019 PC, jail inmates serving prison sentences earn four (4) days credit for every two (2) days served. Time spent on home detention (i.e., electronic monitoring [EM]) is credited as time spent in jail custody.
- Alternative Custody: Pursuant to §1203.018 PC, EM is authorized for inmates being held in the county jail in lieu of bail. Eligible inmates must first be held in custody for 60 days post-arraignment or 30 days for those charged with misdemeanor offenses.

§1203.016 PC expanded and authorized a program under which inmates committed to a county jail or other county correctional facility or granted probation, or inmates participating in a work furlough program, may voluntarily participate or involuntarily be placed in a home detention program during their sentence in lieu of confinement in the county jail or other county correctional facility or program under the auspices of the Probation Officer.

- Community-Based Punishment: Authorized counties to use a range of community-based punishment and intermediate sanctions other than jail incarceration alone or traditional routine probation supervision.

II. LOCAL PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT

A. COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

Each year, the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) develops an Implementation Plan for the Public Safety Realignment and the Executive Committee of the CCP votes to approve the implementation and annual spending plan submission to the Board of Supervisors. As required by statute, the annual plan and recommended programs are to be consistent with local needs and resources as applied to the Realigned population.

The CCP Executive Committee, which oversees and reports on the progress of the Implementation Plan, is chaired by the Chief Probation Officer. The CCP Executive Committee makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for the application of funding to the various components of the plan. The Board of Supervisors maintains full authority over the appropriation of Realignment funds. Voting members of the CCP Executive Committee include:

Bill Brown, Sheriff

Larry Ralston, Lompoc Police Chief

Takashi Wada, M.D. MPH, Interim Director Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services

Joyce Dudley, District Attorney

Arthur Garcia, Presiding Judge of the Santa Barbara County Superior Court

Rai Montes De Oca, Public Defender

Beverly A. Taylor, Chief Probation Officer (Chair)

B. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TEAM

This Implementation Plan was developed by the CCP and the members of the Executive Committee of the CCP, their designees and other key partners. Staff and volunteers assigned to workgroups included:

Probation Department

Tanja Heitman, Deputy Chief Probation Officer

Heather Bennett, Probation Manager

Kim Shean, Probation Manager

Dean Farrah, Probation Manager

Ben Meza, Accountant

Sheriff's Office

Laz Salinas, Chief Deputy

Jenny Sams, Commander

Tim McWilliams, Lieutenant

Doug Martin, Chief Financial Officer

District Attorney's Office

Mag Nicola, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Kimbra McCarthy, Director of Administration

Public Defender's Office

Rai Montes De Oca, Public Defender

Superior Court

Darrel Parker, Superior Court Executive Officer

Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services

Michael Craft, Deputy Director/Clinical Operations
Suzanne Grimmesey, Chief Strategy Officer

County Law Enforcement Chiefs (CLEC)

Ed Lardner, Captain - Lompoc Police Department

University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB)

Jill Sharkey, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Merith Cosden, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
Kayleigh Welsh, Ph.D., M.A. Graduate Student Researcher
Danielle Dougherty, B.A. Graduate Student Researcher
Michela Lenzi, Ph.D., Project Scientist

Community Based Organizations

Sylvia Barnard, Good Samaritan Shelter Services (Good Sam)
Jon Benson, Community Solutions, Incorporated (CSI)
Robert Calandra, Mission House
Tina Calandra, Mission House
Jeff Essex, CSI
Donna Flores, Good Sam
Steve K. Goralski, Stalwart Clean & Sober Inc.
Margie Lopez, CSI
Chuck Madson, Coast Valley Substance Abuse Treatment Center (Coast Valley)
Crystle Murphy, Willbridge of Santa Barbara
Pat O'Connor, Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse (CADA)
Brenda Reida, Sanctuary Psychiatric Centers of Santa Barbara
Brett Reynolds, Good Sam
Eric Rowan, CADA
Fathiah Shahin, CADA
Timothy Tibbetts, Goodwill
Carmen Uribe, Casa Esperanza
Lourdes Vargas, Goodwill
Wim Verkaik, CADA
Katie Ward, CSI
Vicky Wolf, Coast Valley

III. COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP OBJECTIVES

Public Safety Realignment places enormous responsibility on the local jurisdiction and brings with it numerous challenges; however, by extending considerable flexibility it also can be a great opportunity. The local CCP is committed to mitigating or overcoming the challenges to the extent possible and to consistently seize the opportunities to improve our local criminal justice system. To guide their efforts and focus on the work before them, the objectives listed below have been adopted:

- Enhance public safety by reducing recidivism.
Recidivism reduction is the primary focus of Santa Barbara County's Realignment efforts. Given the predominantly high risk population being served, any reduction in recidivism is to be seen as an achievement. The CCP has endorsed "Results First" (attachment #1) as a means of ensuring the program strategies are consistently focused on the most cost effective programs which have been proven to reduce recidivism in a high risk population.
- Provide for successful re-entry of offenders back into the community.
Local stakeholders recognize that the re-entry period is a crucial window of opportunity to influence offender success but equally can be fraught with challenges that increase an offender's likelihood to re-offend. To move strong evidence-based re-entry principles and programs forward, the CCP has adopted the Re-Entry Steering Committee (RSC) as a standing committee.
- Coordinate efforts to eliminate duplication, increase efficiencies and promote best practices.
One of the opportunities that Realignment has afforded local criminal justice stakeholders is related to joint planning and sharing of resources. The success of Realignment and the effective use of the funds became common goals that brought all of the system partners together. Santa Barbara County has a strong history of collaboration; however, there were many areas where collaborative approaches had not yet been applied. An example of this is the discharge planning process. Through Realignment and the Transition from Jail to Community (TJC) Initiative (attachment #2), a diverse group of stakeholders are actively involved in a team approach to discharge planning that highlights this objective.
- Provide services and treatment to offenders in partnership with existing community providers.
The CCP recognizes the need for a wide array of professionals with many different specialties to support treatment of Realigned offenders. Existing community providers have been sought out to provide treatment and programming to the Realigned offenders under prior contracts as well as new contracts through Realignment funding. Feedback for changes, enhancements and improvements to service delivery and collaboration with County staff are regularly sought out and incorporated into practice.

- Identify additional resources that address gaps in services and leverage funding collaboratively whenever possible.
A recent grant awarded to the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Office (SBSO) is evidence of this objective. The Sheriff sought and was awarded additional funds to support re-entry and treatment options within the jail. The CCP recognizes that Realignment funding will not address the many needs and gaps with the local criminal justice system. Pursuing additional resources has been and will consistently be a priority.
- Focus funding on evidence-based and data driven programming that is matched to offender risk and needs.
The Results First and TJC Initiatives are compelling evidence of the CCP's commitment to this objective. Both of these efforts required commitment and allocation of resources by the CCP with the specific intention of focusing funding on evidence-based and data-driven programming matched to offenders risk and needs.
- Partner with local law enforcement for information sharing, compliance checks, and warrant apprehension.
Although there are challenges to the funding, CLEC and CCP have shown their commitments to working closely and sharing information related to the Realigned populations in the local city jurisdictions. The Compliance Response Teams (CRT) and the County's commitment to implementing "Smart Justice" (attachment #3) embody this objective.
- Capture and integrate data necessary to measure outcomes.
Santa Barbara County has been on the forefront of data integration under Realignment. A very robust list of data elements (attachment #4) have been identified for collection, integration and submission to UCSB for evaluation. Although the automated departmental case management related software is not always as advanced as would be ideal, the data team has worked together to overcome the various system limitations to ensure quality, meaningful data are collected.
- Strive to maximize jail capacity by appropriately identifying offenders who can safely be released and those who should be held in physical custody.
Under Realignment, this objective became one of the highest priorities. Resources were immediately allocated to deploy Deputy Probation Officers (DPO) to the jail to assess inmates with evidence-based assessment tools. These assessments are used primarily to determine which post-sentence inmates should be released and under which release conditions. There is also an effort underway to pilot a pretrial assessment tool that would assist in addressing potential release options for pre-sentence inmates as well.
- Encourage the use of alternative detention (pre and post sentence) for appropriate offenders.
The CCP has allocated significant funding for alternative detention resources. These resources are currently focused on post sentence offenders. However, it

is anticipated that this would be enhanced further to include pre-sentence offenders as more data and procedures are put in place.

- Explore best practices for evidence-based sentencing and adjudication.
The District Attorney's (DA) Office has shown considerable leadership in the implementation of this objective through the development of the DA's Misdemeanor Diversion Program. The County's Collaborative Courts are also examples of the local criminal justice system seeking opportunities to apply evidence-based sentencing and adjudication principles. The CCP has, in fact, shown their commitment through the funding of a Senior Deputy DA for the Collaborative Courts.
- Facilitate access to sober living and transitional housing as well as long-term housing.
Prior to Realignment, there were very limited options for County-approved or subsidized sober living. The CCP recognizes the importance of housing in the engagement of offenders in treatment and ultimately reducing their recidivism risk. Unfortunately, the infrastructure to support improvements in the clean and sober housing community is somewhat limited. This is an important objective that will need a long-term focus.
- Support professional training to advance system-wide knowledge of evidence-based practices in the criminal justice field.
Through Realignment training funds, the CCP has established the local criminal justice system as a learning community focused on evidence-based practices and systems change. There have been numerous opportunities for professional training afforded to a diverse group of County and community provider line staff, as well as management and policy makers. Additionally, a Quality Assurance (attachment #5) effort is underway and has established an advancement of the learning environment and expansion of professional training opportunities as primary elements of its mission.

IV. POPULATION

Realignment introduced two (2) new populations under the supervision and responsibility of local County jurisdiction. The first is the Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) population of offenders who are exiting prison after serving a commitment for a non-violent, non-serious felony and who are not deemed to be high risk sex offenders. The second population consists of offenders convicted of a non-violent, non-serious offense and who are not registered sex offenders (NX3) without disqualifying offenses (current or prior), who will serve their felony sentence locally. These NX3 offenders can be sentenced pursuant to §1170(h)(5) PC to a straight commitment to County jail known locally as a PRAIL sentence or subject to a split sentence of a period of jail time followed by mandatory supervision by Probation (Post Sentence Supervision [PSS]), as ordered by the Court. At the start of Realignment, it was projected that approximately 22 offenders per month would be sentenced under §1170(h)(5) PC. This projection held true for the first two (2) years. For the first nine

(9) months of FY 2013-2014, there has been considerable month-to-month variance with the high being in July 2013 when 25 offenders were sentenced and December 2013 when only 12 were sentenced. The nine-month average rests at just over 18 offenders a month.

Projections through June 2015

It is projected that by June 2015, Santa Barbara County's population of Realigned offenders will be 616 (attachment #6). These projections are broken down into 262 PRCS offenders and 354 PSS offenders. It is noteworthy that 57% of the overall population is anticipated to be PSS offenders. This will require increased focus on the unique needs of these offenders versus those of the PRCS population who are exiting prison.

These projections were formulated utilizing local population trends, as well as information provided by the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) (attachment #7). It is noted however, that the PSS population projections in particular are being formulated with limited information and variance continues to occur, which could impact the accuracy of the projections.

V. PROGRAM STRATEGIES

A. JAIL POPULATION MANAGEMENT

Realigned Inmates

The average daily population (ADP) of Realigned inmates in Sheriff's custody in the time period July 2013 to March 2014 was 151. The SBSO housed an average of 120 inmates in facilities and an ADP of 31 participating in EM.

Proposed Strategies for County Inmate Population Control

In December 2012, the SBSO and Probation collaborated on and successfully secured a technical assistance grant. The Transition from Jail to Community (TJC) Initiative, in conjunction with the Urban Institute and National Institute of Corrections, provides an analytical review of statistical data being gathered on Santa Barbara County's Realigned population and will ultimately provide recommendations regarding the collection of additional data to measure how effectively services and resources are matched to respond to the needs of this population.

In conjunction with the TJC project, the SBSO developed and implemented evidence-based programs for medium-to-high risk inmates. In 2014, the Sheriff's Treatment Program (STP) was modified to include the Thinking for a Change curriculum. Inmates are being assessed and evaluated for STP, with the targeted population being those inmates who are assessed at a high risk to recidivate and who are within six (6) months of their release date. The goal is to have these individuals successfully complete the 90-day STP and transition onto the EM Program for the remainder of their sentence.

To further strengthen the effort to control the inmate population, the SBSO and criminal justice partners have teamed up in the development of pre-trial and pre-sentence release programs. The SBSO works closely with the Court staff to identify inmates who qualify for pre-trial release and the EM Program.

This year, Santa Barbara County was successful in obtaining \$38.9 million in Senate Bill 1022 (SB1022) Construction Funding for Local Jails, which places emphasis on the provision of additional programming capabilities. This funding requires a 10% match towards the cost of construction. The funding that this grant provides will allow the County to build an additional 228 beds to the North County jail that is currently being designed under the Assembly Bill 900 (AB900) Construction Funding and is expected to be open and operational in 2018. The Board of Supervisors is to be applauded for their continual support of a multi-year plan, which began in FY 2012-2013 and sets aside annually increasing funds into an account for future operational costs.

B. ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING STRATEGY

Alternatives to incarceration managed by the SBSO have been expanded and made available to the Realigned population providing they meet eligibility criteria. Offenders who are not automatically disqualified because of their conviction charges are assessed with evidence-based instruments to determine their eligibility for release on an alternative program. The SBSO is working with Probation's Adult Special Programs and High Priority Supervision Units and the Alternative Sentencing Bureau (ASB). AB109 currently funds two (2) full time DPOs who are embedded at the ASB office. These DPOs conduct evidence-based assessments on all inmates, targeting those who have remained in-custody for 14 days or longer. These assessments are used to help determine placement into the EM Program.

In addition to the evidence-based instruments, the presentence report and court commitment period, in-custody behavior, participation and progress in jail programs and services, eligibility based on current charges and prior convictions, and the availability of alternatives to incarceration best suited for the offender are considered in the decision making process. Depending on the status of the offender and jurisdiction, SBSO or Probation staff provides supervision in the community.

ASB implemented a three-tier supervision system for those individuals on EM. Supervision of high risk inmates is accomplished through monitoring by ASB staff and in coordination with the CRTs.

There has been general success in increasing participation on Alternative Sentencing EM Programs. In 2013, the Alternative Sentencing ADP for inmates on EM was 129; as anticipated, this number leveled out in 2013. The ADP of Realignment inmates participating in the EM Program in 2013 was 30. This represents approximately 17% of the Alternative Sentencing population.

Alternative Sentencing has been diligently working with Probation to provide a release plan for those individuals who will require Probation supervision at the conclusion of their jail sentence. This collaborative effort allows Alternative Sentencing to more pro-

actively manage the jail population, while also providing the services and programs unique to the Realigned population.

As stated above, jail and Probation personnel will continue to coordinate an enhanced early release/re-entry program using Senate Bill 678 (SB678) funds for traditional probationers and AB109 funds for NX3 or PRCS populations. Two (2) Social Workers, in tandem with two (2) assessment DPO's and two (2) Early Release/Re-Entry Officers will assist in the assessment process and supervision of offenders who have been released early from jail and who are under the community supervision of the Probation Department.

Using the same criteria as described for alternative sentence releases, evidence-based assessment tools are used for both populations to determine the appropriateness for early release and to develop the re-entry service case plans. Ideally, the assessment and planning activities will occur 45 days prior to an offender's release to ensure the connectivity of the offender to the services required prior to his/her release from incarceration.

To ensure that limited resources are appropriately directed and effectively coordinated, these staff members work closely with custody personnel, jail medical/mental health staff, drug and alcohol counselors, and local community providers. The Social Workers also provide offenders with assistance in obtaining valid government issued identification, applying for benefit entitlements such as Medi-Cal, supplemental and disability social security income, veterans benefits and housing programs. Assessment, supervision and social worker staff work collaboratively to design and implement individualized release plans that will ensure offenders receive needed treatment and services directed towards their success in the community.

C. ASSESSMENT

The jail has incorporated evidence-based screening and assessment tools in the identification of offenders eligible for alternative detention and programming. This was an important change and has been given priority focus by the SBSO and the Probation Department. To assist in this venture and utilize the training and experience of the Probation Department, two (2) DPOs are assigned to the jail full time as Assessors. Their primary role is to assess inmates so as to assist in determining appropriate alternative sentencing approaches, in-custody programming, and re-entry services. Additional duties include reviewing parole and PRCS revocations with offenders and completing the waiver protocol as appropriate, as well as serving as gatekeepers for the Discharge Planning Team. Through the use of waivers, hundreds of Court hours and associated transportation costs have been saved. Between July 2013 and March 2014, the assessors completed over 918 Initial Screen Tools (IST) and over 460 Correctional Offender Management and Profiling Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) risk assessments. Over 80 PRCS revocations were also served with at least 56 of those resulting in waivers. Approximately 93 parole revocations were also served with 63 waivers being obtained.

Data collection related to the risk levels of inmates in County jail is now a reality. Through a database hosted by the Probation Department, risk scores of inmates, as well as those offenders assigned to Probation, can be queried in an automated fashion. The initial focus was on sentenced inmates; however, as this effort continues to gain momentum and has become more efficient, it is anticipated that all offenders taken into the jail will have at minimum an IST completed.

D. SUPERVISION

The cornerstone for effective supervision of both the PRCS and PSS offenders is the use of a validated risk and needs assessment and the subsequent development of individualized case plans facilitated by the COMPAS instrument (attachment #8). Since the onset of Realignment, the Probation Department has asked the supervision staff to be nimble and creative in their approach of supervising these offenders while maintaining evidence-based supervision strategies. Toward that end, specific supervision guidelines have been developed and are frequently reviewed (attachment #9). All Realigned offenders are maintained on caseloads of one (1) to 40 in order to ensure the DPOs assigned have opportunities to employ effective techniques such as Motivational Interviewing.

The population risk levels break down as follows:

Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS)		Of 574 offenders assessed
High Recidivism/High Violence		56%
High Recidivism/Low-Med Violence		5%
High Violence/Low-Med Recidivism		19%
Low-Med Violence/Low-Med Recidivism		20%

Mandatory Supervision (PSS)		Of 280 offenders assessed
High Recidivism/High Violence		57%
High Recidivism/ Low-Med Violence		8%
High Violence/Low-Med Recidivism		9%
Low-Med Violence/Low-Med Recidivism		26%

Data representative of October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2014

To further address the high level of supervision needed by this population, there have been two (2) GPS DPOs assigned. Unfortunately due to budget limitations, the GPS DPO compliment has been reduced to one (1) full time equivalent (FTE) staff. Efforts to continue utilizing GPS for all offenders who require this level of intensity to reduce the likelihood of specific criminal behaviors, will be made utilizing general supervision resources. However, it is likely that a cap will need to be utilized to ensure the offenders on GPS are monitored at the required level and that use does not exceed the capacity of staff resources.

Supervision success cases have been numerous. The key to success with such a high risk population appears to be ensuring there is capacity for building of relationships between staff (Probation staff or staff from partner agencies) and the offenders. These

relationships work best when they truly allow for the staff to identify and utilize creative approaches to overcome obstacles and to motivate the offender. Staff engaging in these techniques are uniquely positioned to capitalize on the treatment and offender supports within Realignment to achieve the best outcomes. Unfortunately, despite these efforts not all offenders are able to successfully embrace the changes necessary. Flash incarcerations and revocations can sometimes be used to affect offender motivation, but even these tools have their limitations. One of the most significant challenges within Realignment is how to effectively supervise those offenders who have not yet shown a willingness to engage in treatment and who are unresponsive to attempts to motivate them or to redirect them through sanctions. Fortunately despite these challenges, the hard work of all involved appears to be paying off as 65% of the Realigned offenders have had their case closed successfully since Realignment commenced through March 31, 2014.

E. DISCHARGE PLANNING

In December 2012, the County of Santa Barbara received two (2) years of technical assistance through the Urban Institute and the National Institute of Corrections to facilitate a comprehensive approach to community re-entry, referred to as Transition from Jail to Community (TJC). A primary focus of this system change initiative has been the development of an integrated and collaborative jail-to-community transition model to address the unique challenges for jail re-entry and discharge planning resulting from the implementation of AB109.

A Discharge Planning Team comprised of personnel from the SBSO and Probation, along with the Public Defender's Release Services Coordinators (RSC), the Sheriff's Discharge Planners, and a community based representative coordinate re-entry services at the jail. These discharge planning services include, but are not limited to residential program screening, coordination and transportation; assistance with eligibility for entitlements such as Medi-Cal, supplemental and disability social security, and veterans' benefits; referrals/linkage with mental health and/or public health; referral to and coordination with Collaborative Courts including Re-Entry Drug Court, Veteran's Treatment Court, Substance Abuse Treatment Court, Mental Health Treatment Court, Dual Diagnosis Court, and Clean and Sober Drug Court; and aftercare coordination with parole agents and DPOs who monitor the inmates upon release.

The target population for discharge planning includes all offenders exiting the jail. The level and extent of assistance is based on the inmate's risk and needs as determined through the use of COMPAS, an evidence-based screening and assessment tool. A "Gatekeeper" position has been established on the team to receive, screen and assign referrals. Referrals are received from a variety of sources, including the offender, family members and defense counsel. Each team member targets a unique portion of the inmate population. Offenders with pervasive mental health issues, along with other significant destabilizing factors, such as chronic homelessness, are referred to the community based representative member of the team. The Public Defender's RSCs primarily serve pre-sentenced offenders not on probation and those offenders on probation with special needs limiting their access to services. The Sheriff's Discharge Planner positions target population includes offenders with co-occurring disorders,

those serving lengthy PRAIL sentences without any supervision or case management services when returning to the community, inmates requesting discharge planning to facilitate release on EM, and requests for re-entry services from the STP. With the assistance from TJC, this model of re-entry incorporates the fundamental evidence-based practice of a collaborative structure and joint ownership between County departments and community based organizations (CBO). Additionally, a focus on regular analysis of objective data, including analysis of jail population characteristics, will continue to inform and drive decision making and policy formation.

An integrated data management system is being piloted that allows multi-agency personnel to view and update release planning efforts which will greatly enhance efficiency and reduce duplicative efforts. Additionally, in September 2013, a small team of local TJC members attended the annual TJC multi-site meeting in Colorado. All national TJC sites were represented and insight, methods, and lessons learned were shared. Throughout the next two (2) months, additional focus will be placed on team members' role development and target population, and intake and referral screening responsibilities will be further established.

F. VICTIM SERVICES

Victim Services are being added as a funded program strategy for the first time in this plan. A part-time Victim Witness Advocate will work with victims associated with the Realigned populations. The Victim Witness Advocate's duties will include:

- Ensure notifications of case and custody status are made.
- Provide accompaniment to violation hearings.
- Assist with safety planning as appropriate.
- Provide case and custody status including defendant eligibility for EM.
- Work with Sheriff's Office custody records division and Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) system related to victim notification of inmate's release and any change in scheduled release, e.g. early release eligibility for safety planning purposes.
- Identify victim losses and provide restitution information to the DPO or Probation's Revenue Recovery Unit if it is an unsupervised case.
- Notify victims of their Constitutional Rights per Marsy's Law.
- Provide data to be included in the Realignment Evaluation so that the impacts of the position can be incorporated into the overall Plan.

G. HOUSING AND TREATMENT

Treatment and case planning begin with an evidence-based risk/needs assessment. Housing as well as programming options are matched to offender needs and risk factors. While certain treatment modalities and interventions are welcomed by the offender, others are mandated based on risk or offense type. Appropriate treatment dosage delivered through evidence-based treatment modalities remains the foundation for successful treatment strategies. Outpatient treatment services remain the cost-effective and are the preferred course of treatment whenever possible.

Significant headway has been made towards addressing homelessness in the PRCS population. As of May 2, 2014, less than six percent or 17 of the PRCS offenders in the community were transient. Stable, clean and sober housing is often the first step toward an offender's success. Unfortunately, many of the local clean and sober housing options are not good matches for the Realigned population. Efforts continue to increase the number of local facilities that are staffed with personnel who possess knowledge in the basics of evidence-based supervision and treatment issues, and to educate providers on the need to ensure that those managing the living environments have been drug and crime free for sufficient amounts of time to effectively serve as positive role models and to work collaboratively in addressing behavioral issues and relapse. Limited infrastructure in many of the facilities results in high turnover of staffing, which is counterproductive to the efforts to educate and establish improved protocols and communication. It should be noted, however, that there are a few facilities that have gone above and beyond to work with Realigned offenders and establish new protocols or creative approaches to address their needs. Unfortunately, these facilities also tend to be the ones with waiting lists for the same reasons.

The Probation Report and Resource Centers (PRRC), located in the cities of Santa Barbara and Santa Maria, provide an ideal setting for offenders to receive a wide array of services in a client-friendly, treatment oriented environment. In Lompoc, employment services, cognitive behavioral and substance abuse treatment are provided through community partners. Occasionally offenders are also provided with bus tokens in order to participate in services at the Santa Maria PRRC. Services at the PRRCs are constantly being reviewed for potential enhancements. Most recently a pilot group for Moral Reconciliation Therapy was started at the Santa Barbara PRRC. A full list of services available at the PRRCs is available in attachment #10.

Specific treatment interventions for sex offenders and domestic violence offenders are required by law. §1203.097(a)(6) PC requires participation in a Batterers Intervention Program for a minimum of one (1) year when a person is convicted of a crime of domestic violence. Additionally, §1203.067(b) PC requires offenders convicted of crimes that require sex offender registration to participate in Containment Model sex offender management programs, requiring a minimum of one (1) year of sex offender treatment through a certified sex offender treatment provider. Further, participation in polygraph programs shall be part of the Containment Model. These treatment interventions are provided by various community based providers and organizations throughout the County of Santa Barbara.

Psychiatric services are provided to all PRCS offenders who are exiting prison having received mental health services while incarcerated. Approximately 20% of the PRCS population is referred to services provided onsite at the PRRC or Probation Department by staff from Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services (ADMHS) through a dedicated AB109 Clinic (AB109 Offenders' Mental Health Screening and Treatment Program). A psychiatrist and psychiatric technician provide a full range of psychiatric services including assessment, medication management, case management, and direct communication links with Probation. All levels of care are available to this population including access to inpatient services, medications, and high intensity services such as Assertive Community Care, when required. All services and medication are offset by any eligible Medi-Cal reimbursements. It is anticipated that County costs for services to this population will decline in the coming year, as most of this population is Medi-Cal eligible under the new Affordable Care Act. Probation, ADMHS, and Department of Social Services staff are working together to ensure offenders are enrolled in Medi-Cal as soon after release from prison as possible.

Significant success has been seen with a very high risk, high need population of offenders when the treatment team has collaboratively addressed the client's needs and shared information that would position each treatment component for the best outcomes. Innovative interventions, such as the use of Vivitrol (Naltrexone for extended-release injectable suspension) to treat heroin addicted offenders who have not been able to remain drug free with more conventional treatment alone, are routinely sought out and considered when appropriate. It is very apparent that in addition to innovative treatment options, the team approach is crucial as the needs far exceed what any one agency or staff person can effectively address.

H. COMPLIANCE RESPONSE TEAMS

There are currently three (3) CRTs. Two (2) teams are made up of a Deputy Sheriff and a Senior DPO, each funded through Realignment funds overseen by the CCP. The third team consists of a Lompoc Police Officer and a Senior DPO and is funded through State funds disbursed by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). The County Law Enforcement Chiefs (CLEC) determine the use of these funds at the local level and have designated the County's allocation to support this third CRT. With prudent use of the funds it is anticipated that this third team will be funded through FY 2016-2017 and possibly longer.

The CRTs conduct compliance monitoring checks through random home visits, conduct searches, facilitate and lead warrant apprehension teams, respond to high level GPS alerts, transport offenders to and from other facilities, and perform other identified duties that support local Realignment efforts. In the one-year period between January 1, 2013, and January 1, 2014, the CRTs logged over 329 arrests, 175 offender field contacts, and 350 hours transporting offenders.

Under the original program design the CRTs have been overseen by a Supervising Probation Officer (SPO). This model has become increasingly challenging and prompted a change for FY 2014-2015. Due to the nature of the very fluid field dynamics when working with this very high risk population, as well as the nature of surveillance

for absconders who may be engaging in criminal activity, it was agreed that the CRTs would be better served by oversight of a SBSO Sergeant who would be available in the field and directly assist the teams. This change will ensure the teams receive more timely response to field inquiries and improved coordination with partner law enforcement agencies.

These CRTs have been very successful at maintaining relatively low number of warrants and ensuring that absconders are returned to custody as soon as possible. At the end of March 2014, there were only 30 PRCS offenders with an outstanding warrant out of 305 under supervision. It is anticipated that by increasing the staffing of the unit with a dedicated Sergeant, the teams will have continued success with the warrants while also being able to be deployed to assist with the more difficult PRCS offenders who have not yet responded favorably to sanctions or incentives.

I. COLLABORATIVE COURTS

The Collaborative Court (CC) system in Santa Barbara County is a joint venture between the Superior Court, ADMHS, the offices of the DA and the Public Defender, the Probation Department, UCSB, and local CBOs. Within the adult criminal justice system there are currently six (6) unique programs targeting specific offender populations; the Substance Abuse Treatment Court, the Dual Diagnosis Court, the Re-entry Drug Court, the Mental Health Treatment Court, the Clean and Sober Drug Court, and the Veterans Treatment Court.

The DA continues to address Realignment through a collaborative and holistic effort to reduce crime while preserving jail resources. Populations served and enrollment trends can be seen in attachment #11. Realignment funds currently provide full-time staffing of the CCs in the northern and southern regions of the County. This strategy of investing in CCs is specifically authorized under California PC §1230(d), which states that drug courts are one way to “maximize the effectiveness of criminal justice resources.” Because offenders assigned to these courts are usually charged with Realignment eligible felony offenses, CCs can provide a therapeutic and positive alternative to jail that can end the cycle of recidivism. Additionally, CCs are especially useful for this population who, because of their addictions, are at a high risk to reoffend.

As a result of this strategy to work collaboratively with other stakeholders in monitoring and maintaining accountability of offenders who are admitted into these programs, the number of offenders obtaining help in the CCs has remained consistently full. Additional accountability and monitoring of these programs from a prosecutorial perspective during Realignment strives to increase their viability, as Realignment places these offenders with various substance abuse issues, addiction and mental health disorders back into our local communities.

The DA's strategy includes identifying and treating these issues, striving to boost these programs' efficacy and, in turn, reduce recidivism while protecting public safety and achieving just criminal outcomes.

VI. PLAN REVISIONS

FY 2014-2015 will be a year of continued program improvements and collaboration to achieve increased efficiencies in jail assessment, discharge planning, and the use of clean and sober housing. Each of these program components have been in place since the initial Realignment plan was adopted; however, they involve significant resources and are directly related to significant system improvements. They each involve multiple agencies and are crucial to the success of the Realignment population as well as other offenders within the criminal justice system.

In order to move towards achieving a balanced budget based on the current allocation projection, a number of reductions were made. The vast majority of them will not result in operational impacts and were achieved by a reduction in job classifications and line items that were not being fully expended. The only reduction that will result in adverse impact was a reduction in the allocation of DPOs to supervise offenders on GPS from two (2.0) FTE to one (1.0) FTE. This reduction may be mitigated by the decreasing PRCS population as the majority of offenders on GPS are currently PRCS offenders needing additional supervision and oversight as they return to the community from prison. Due to the staffing reduction, a cap of 22 offenders will be administered for GPS.

The CRT strategy was prioritized for additional resources. The CRTs have been very successful, but over time it has become increasingly clear that they require a higher level of supervision in the field due to the nature of the operations in which they are involved. The supervision has been provided primarily through a SPO who has had direct responsibility for a number of other case-carrying staff and, therefore, is unavailable to respond to the field to provide assistance or supervision. Through an enhancement in this year's plan, the CRTs will be assigned a dedicated SBSO Sergeant to oversee this effort and work collaboratively with the Probation Department as well as local law enforcement.

The DA's Office was also allocated a one-half (0.5) FTE Victim Witness Advocate to launch a new Realignment strategy. This will allow services to be specialized and enhanced for victims of Realigned offenders. Data will be collected in this first year to aid in determining the advantages and impacts of this additional strategy.

VII. DATA COLLECTION, OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION

Santa Barbara County is very committed to data collection to support meaningful outcomes and an independent evaluation process. Early on a data working group was established and identified a wide array of data elements that would need to be collected by a variety of agencies. It is recognized that Realignment funding is best matched to meaningful outcomes that will aid the CCP in future funding discussions. In fact, when the CCP determined that funding the DA's Office to maintain staffing in the CCs would be a beneficial prevention strategy, it was also quickly agreed that a portion of evaluation funding would be paired with this effort to ensure that the funds spent in

the CCs would continue to reap the same, if not better, results than had previously been seen. Executive Summaries for the northern and southern region drug court process evaluations are included as attachment #12. The full reports can be seen at [Santa Barbara Report](#), [Santa Maria Report](#).

The CCP is also reviewing Realignment-specific outcomes in a variety of ways. A monthly Realignment impact report was developed and provides a monthly snapshot of the population, sentencing trends, jail impacts and the use of fiscal resources (attachment #13). On a quarterly basis, local data are submitted to the CPOC. An interactive data dashboard is electronically accessible at <http://www.cpoc.org/assets/Realignment/splitsentencedashboard.swf>, where local data as well as statewide data were available. Through CPOC's data effort, outcomes regarding PRCS and PSS recidivism can be compared statewide.

Local data collection far exceeds the requirements provided through CPOC. The primary emphasis has been on types of closings, recidivism, treatment types and mental health conditions, risk levels, services provided, types of violations and sanctions imposed as well as basic demographic information. Data are regularly reviewed and disseminated to stakeholders within the County. It is anticipated that this will be an ongoing and continually developing project as there are always additional data elements of interest that can also be a source of information to guide the Realignment effort locally.

UCSB is also very much engaged in evaluating local outcomes, which include a variety of data elements (attachment #4). UCSB has released its first report and although it is a very preliminary look, it allows for a more in-depth review of local Realignment programming and will become more robust as each new year of data becomes available. The full report is available at [AB109 Preliminary Evaluation](#) and the executive summary is included as attachment #14 to this report. It is anticipated that the second report will be available by the fall of 2014.

VIII. RESULTS

Santa Barbara County has been eager to determine if their Realignment results have been favorable as compared to other counties. As previously mentioned, CPOC has been accumulating Realignment data and have made it available on their website. These are some highlights of the data available from the period of October of 2011 through September of 2013:

- Locally 47% of the sentences pursuant to §1170(h)(5) PC have been split sentences. This is well above the State average of 27%.
The Court partners have worked closely to increase the percentage of split sentences versus straight jail sentences (PRAIL). There is absolute consensus that a period of supervision post release from County jail is better for the offender and the community and will lead to better outcomes than incarceration without any re-entry support or accountability. Offenders many times do not appreciate this period of supervision despite its benefits for them individually, so the work to achieve

higher percentages entails overcoming resistance from the offenders during the Court process.

- Locally only 3% of the PRCS offenders have a warrant issued for failing to report to Probation within 48 hours of release from prison as compared to the State average of 8%.

Ensuring the completion of an initial report is a priority that sets a foundation for successful supervision. Success in this area is attributed to the Probation Department's use of three (3) regional offices for PRCS intake, which assures that offenders do not have insurmountable transportation issues that might interfere with reporting and also facilitates the ability of Intake Officers and the CRTs to take a proactive approach to making contact with any offenders that do not immediately report.

- Locally only 8% of the PRCS population is in abscond status. This matches the trend for the southern region of California, but is far more favorable than the northern region which has a 15% abscond rate.

This success can be attributed to the jail, CRTs and DPOs who ensure that absconders are returned to custody as quickly as possible and with sanctions imposed.

- Approximately 65% of all PRCS and PSS offenders being discharged have done so successfully. Although statewide-comparable data are not readily available, this appears to be very favorable to the State's previously reported rates of approximately 70% of their supervised offenders returning to prison custody.

Success in this area must be attributed to the variety of supervision and treatment strategies being utilized. Perhaps in the future the evaluation being conducted by UCSB will be able to more keenly hone in on specific strategies resulting the best returns. At this point it appears to be the combination of efforts and it is not yet possible to attribute the success to one effort over another, as each individual offender has different experiences, needs and resiliency factors that contribute to their engagement and responsivity.

IX.SPENDING PLAN

<u>JAIL CUSTODY</u>	<u>FY 2014-2015</u>
Jail Staff	\$1,919,830
Parolee Custody	275,000
Services and Supplies	55,000
Total Jail Custody:	<u>\$2,249,830</u>

To address public safety and guarantee that those offenders who require a custody setting have a jail bed, and to provide short flash incarcerations as needed, Realignment funding must include additional jail resources. The funded jail positions are commensurate to the average daily population of Realigned inmates, equating to the required supervision for three (3) modules of 50 inmates each.

State Realignment brings a significant impact to local detention facilities. Prior to the implementation of the Realignment Act, the SBSO was able to collect approximately \$375,000 annually from the State to help offset the cost of incarcerating State parolees who were held solely on a parole revocation. Post Realignment Act implementation, the State is no longer required to provide money to house State parole offenders in local jails. By funding jail positions commensurate to an average daily Realigned population of 150, the elimination of State funding for incarcerated State parolees is mitigated.

<u>DETENTION ALTERNATIVES</u>	<u>FY 2014-2015</u>
DPO Assessor (2 FTEs)	\$ 258,260
Alternative Sentencing Staff	460,036
GPS Units	120,000
Services and Supplies	5,000
Urinalysis	1,000
Total Detention Alternatives:	<u>\$ 844,296</u>

The jail has incorporated evidence-based assessment tools in the identification of offenders eligible for alternative detention and the STP. Probation staff conduct these assessments for offenders under probation supervision and have expanded services to include all inmates who remain in custody for two (2) weeks or more.

In order to mitigate the need for increased jail bed days, additional GPS units and Alternative Detention Service staff are required.

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CASE MANAGEMENT

<u>Supervision and Support</u>	<u>FY 2014-2015</u>
Probation Manager (0.5 FTE)	\$ 86,899
SPO (2 FTEs)	321,747
AOP (2 FTEs)	166,599
<i>Subtotal Supervision and Support:</i>	<u>\$ 575,245</u>

PRCS and PSS

Sr. DPO (1 FTE)	\$ 145,687
DPO (14 FTEs)	1,844,369
DPO for GPS (1 FTE)	<u>133,006</u>
<i>Subtotal PRCS and PSS:</i>	<i>\$ 2,123,062</i>

Operating Expenses

Vehicle Costs and Travel Expenses	\$ 46,100
Services and Supplies	<u>33,000</u>
<i>Subtotal Operating Expenses:</i>	<i>79,100</i>

Urinalysis

Urinalysis	\$ <u>10,000</u>
<i>Subtotal Urinalysis:</i>	<i><u>10,000</u></i>
Total Community Supervision and Case Management:	<u>\$ 2,787,407</u>

Additional Probation workload is associated with the supervision programming and related violations, and Court actions for Realigned offenders. To provide the appropriate level of supervision for these predominantly high-risk/high-need offenders, Probation will provide caseloads of 40 offenders per DPO, as well as dedicated GPS DPOs based on the population needs.

COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS**Compliance Response Teams****FY 2014-2015**

Sr. DPO (2 FTEs)	\$ 291,989
Deputy Sheriff (2 FTEs)	346,101
SBSO Sgt. (1 FTE)	201,850
Services and Supplies - Sheriff	2,420
Vehicles Sheriff	<u>50,878</u>
<i>Subtotal Compliance Response Teams:</i>	<i>\$ 893,238</i>

Regional Realignment Response Activity Fund

Regional Realign. Resp. Activity Fund	\$ <u>5,000</u>
<i>Subtotal Reg. Realign. Resp. Activity Fund:</i>	<i><u>5,000</u></i>
Total Collaborative Efforts:	<u>\$ 898,238</u>

Compliance Response Teams (CRT)

Two (2) of the County's three (3) CRTs are supported via use of Realignment funds. Each is made up of a Deputy Sheriff and a Sr. DPO, and a SBSO Sergeant is being added in this budget to provide direct supervision in the field and oversee tactical operations. These Officers will provide enhanced monitoring for offenders on the PRCS and PSS caseloads, as well as for offenders on alternative detention from the jail. The teams will also support local law enforcement in incidents involving the Realigned population and will be deployed as needed on a countywide basis.

The CRTs will conduct compliance monitoring checks through random home visits, conduct searches, facilitate and lead warrant apprehension teams, respond to high level GPS alerts, and other identified duties.

Regional Realignment Response Fund

Overtime funds have been allocated for local municipal police departments to respond to incidents related to the Realigned offender population and to participate in multi-agency operations to conduct warrant apprehensions or other operations as coordinated by the CRTs. Unfortunately, due to budget reductions, in FY 2014-2015 most of the funds were redirected to support the CRTs. The remaining \$5,000 will be distributed to the Guadalupe Police Department (GPD) to support operations as outlined above. As the smallest police department, it was determined that GPD required this funding to continue their activities under Realignment.

<u>MENTAL HEALTH, AOD, RELATED TREATMENT, SUPPORTIVE SERVICES</u>		<u>FY 2014-2015</u>
Psychiatric Services & Pharmaceuticals	\$	440,314
Sr. DPO - PRRC		146,472
DPO - PRRC		131,095
AOP - PRRC		83,106
Community Release Specialist - Sheriff		163,948
Services and Supplies - Sheriff		2,420
District Attorney – Collaborative Courts		212,040
Public Defender – Social Workers		176,700
Treatment and Re-Entry Services		<u>1,051,292</u>
Total Mental Health, AOD, Related Treatment, Supportive Services:		<u>\$2,407,387</u>

Psychiatric care and medications are budgeted, as up to 20% of AB109 clients have required psychiatric services with up to 10% requiring more intensive services. Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services (ADMHS) has in place a dedicated AB109 Clinic to accommodate the immediate and unique needs of this clientele. A psychiatrist and psychiatric technician are dedicated to serving AB109 clients throughout the County, providing a full range of psychiatric services including assessment, medication management, case management, and direct communication links with Probation. Some clients have needed access to inpatient services, medications, and high intensity services such as Assertive Community Care. The dedicated funding is inclusive of all levels of care.

In conjunction with the DPOs, several CBOs are located at the PRRCs and continue to provide re-entry services that are evidence-based with a focus on cognitive behavioral interventions and treatment, employment services, substance abuse education and treatment and other offender supports such as transportation and employment certification or equipment needs.

A wide array of treatment services are provided to Realigned offenders based on their risk and needs assessments, as well as any statutorily-required programs. Treatment

services are provided primarily at the PPRCs. Funding supports the operating costs of the PPRCs, as well as contracts with numerous CBOs. Treatment options include: alcohol and other drug (AOD) treatment, dual diagnosis services, batterers intervention programs, sex offender treatment and polygraph examinations, job development, cognitive behavioral treatment, transportation, and offender supports.

The SBSO also will employ two (2) Pre-Release Coordinators who will be assigned to the jail and serve on the Discharge Planning Team.

Collaborative Courts

Realignment supports a full-time prosecutor to ensure there is a dedicated Deputy DA assigned to the Collaborative Courts in both the Santa Maria and Santa Barbara regions. This ensures a more successful and intensive effort at rehabilitating offenders who will likely qualify for sentencing under Realignment.

Rehabilitation Service Coordinators (RSC)

The Public Defender's Office employs two (2) RSCs; one (1) is assigned to the Santa Barbara region and the other to the Santa Maria/Lompoc region. The RSCs prepare treatment plans for offenders, identifying treatment needs and matching them with available treatment programs. They also collaborate with the jail and Probation staff on the Discharge Planning Team.

VICTIM SERVICES

FY 2014-2015

Victim Witness Advocate (0.5 FTE)

48,000

Total Victim Services:

\$ 48,000

Commencing in FY 2014-2015, the DA's Office will employ a 0.5 FTE Victim Witness Advocate to work with the victims of Realigned offenders (PRCS, PSS, and PRAIL cases). The Victim Witness Advocate will assist victims with safety plans, restitution determinations, hearing accompaniment, and general education and support. The DA's office will collect data on the work that is done so that it can be incorporated into the larger evaluation of local Realignment activities.

HOUSING, SOBER LIVING, DETOX

FY 2014-2015

Housing, Sober Living, Detox

320,000

Total Housing, Sober Living, Detox:

\$ 320,000

A significant barrier for the Realigned population is housing. To maximize treatment effectiveness and positive outcomes, housing options are essential. Sober living, transitional housing, detox, and Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM) are all essential components in the effort to stabilize these offenders. Unfortunately, local capacity for many of these options is extremely limited. In addition to continuing current partnerships, collaborative efforts have been made to engage the housing community in seeking affordable options and expanding capacity for this population.

EVALUATION & DATA ANALYSIS**FY 2014-2015**

UCSB	\$ 67,326
FOP (0.5 FTE)	<u>37,270</u>
Total Evaluation & Data Analysis:	<u>\$ 104,596</u>

Evaluation of the outcomes attained by the strategies propositioned herein will be critical in order to guide future decisions in the investment of subsequent AB109 funds. Consequently, it is important to appropriate funding to support formal data analysis and outcome measurement assessment.

ADMINISTRATION**FY 2014-2015**

Probation Admin	\$ 168,586
Sheriff Admin	67,509
District Attorney Admin	7,801
Public Defender Admin	5,301
Auditor-Controller Admin	<u>48,299</u>
Total Administration:	<u>\$ 297,496</u>

To ensure the proper administration of AB109 funding, a very modest administrative expense of 3% of direct program expenditures is recommended. Each department will receive 3% of the direct project expenditures they oversee. Realignment also requires additional Auditor Controller resources resulting in the dedication of 0.5% of all direct program expenditures to fund these requirements.

TOTAL FY 2014-2015 BUDGET:**\$9,957,249**

Public Safety Realignment Act Budget

JAIL CUSTODY	<u>FY 2014-2015</u>
Jail Staff	1,919,830
Parolee Custody	275,000
Services and Supplies	55,000
Total Jail Custody:	<u>\$2,249,830</u>
 DETENTION ALTERNATIVES	
DPO Assessor (2 FTEs)	258,260
Alternative Sentencing Staff	460,036
GPS Units	120,000
Services and Supplies	5,000
Urinalysis	1,000
Total Detention Alternatives:	<u>\$844,296</u>
 COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CASE MANAGEMENT	
<u>Supervision & Support</u>	
Probation Manager (0.5 FTE)	86,899
SPO (2 FTEs)	321,747
AOP (2 FTEs)	166,599
<i>Subtotal Supervision & Support:</i>	<i>575,245</i>
 <u>PRCS & PSS</u>	
Sr. DPO (1 FTE)	145,687
DPO (14 FTEs)	1,844,369
DPO for GPS (1 FTEs)	133,006
<i>Subtotal PRCS & PSS:</i>	<i>2,123,062</i>
 <u>Operating Expenses</u>	
Vehicle Costs and Travel Expenses	46,100
Services and Supplies	33,000
<i>Subtotal Operating Expense:</i>	<i>79,100</i>
Urinalysis	10,000
Total Community Supervision & Case Management	<u>2,787,407</u>

COLLABORATIVE EFFORTSRegional Response Teams

Sr. DPO (2 FTEs)	291,989
DSO (2 FTEs)	346,101
Deputy Sgt. (1 FTE)	201,850
Services and Supplies - Sheriff	2,420
Vehicles Sheriff	50,878
<i>Subtotal Response Teams:</i>	<i>893,238</i>
Regional Realignment Response Activity Fund (city PDs)	5,000
Total Collaborative Efforts:	898,238

MENTAL HEALTH, AOD, TREATMENT, SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Psychiatric Services and Pharmaceuticals	440,314
Sr. DPO - PRRC	146,472
DPO - PRRC	131,095
AOP - PRRC	83,106
Community Release Specialist - Sheriff (2 FTEs)	163,948
Services and Supplies - Sheriff	2,420
District Attorney – Collaborative Courts	212,040
Public Defender – Social Workers	176,700
Treatment and Re-Entry Services	1,051,292
Total Mental Health, AOD, Treatment, Supp. Service:	2,407,387

VICTIM SERVICES

Victim Witness Advocate (0.5 FTE)	48,000
Total Victim Services	\$48,000

HOUSING, SOBER LIVING, DETOX	\$320,000
-------------------------------------	------------------

EVALUATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

UCSB	67,326
FOP (0.5 FTE)	37,270
Total Evaluation and Data Analysis:	\$104,596

ADMINISTRATION

Probation Admin	168,586
Sheriff Admin	67,509
District Attorney Admin	7,801
Public Defender Admin	5,301
Auditor-Controller	48,299
Total Administration:	297,496

TOTAL FY14-15 Budget:	9,957,249
------------------------------	------------------

X. CLOSING

Two and a half years into Realignment, a great deal has been learned and it is clear that Santa Barbara County's initial Implementation Plan contained very balanced and well thought out strategies. It has served the County well and allowed it to stay well ahead of many other jurisdictions. In this latest round of planning, it was recognized that there are certainly areas where the plan can be further developed and refined, as well as gaps that could be addressed. However, the fundamentals needed to serve these unique populations are in place and are gradually improving each year without any need to dramatically change directions.

Not only have the resources been well aligned with the needs for our jurisdiction, all of the Court partners have worked together to capitalize on their working relationships to achieve the Court orders, terms and conditions, and re-entry planning that supports offender success. Having achieved so much so early into Realignment has allowed the stakeholders to work together on more complex issues, such as increasing the percentages of split sentences over straight jail sentences in the offenders sentenced pursuant to §1170(h)(5) PC and utilizing creative approaches to maximize the sentencing options available.


The whirlwind of changes required under Realignment left little opportunity to focus on other efforts; however, as Realignment continues to stabilize at the State level and County level, it is anticipated that the coming year will afford the CCP greater opportunities to impact system changes that will benefit non-realigned offenders. It is recognized that local success will not be defined solely by recidivism reduction in Realigned offenders, but also by the impacts on all offenders within the criminal justice system. Although resources are scarce and the challenges many, Realignment has affirmed that when the stakeholders band together to address issues and work toward common goals, dramatic changes can successfully be made.

ATTACHMENTS

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Approach

Five simple steps to evidence-based policymaking



- 1 Results First provides a national database of evidence on program effectiveness.
- 2 The state adds and analyzes their own state-specific population and cost data.
- 3 The model calculates long-term costs and benefits for each program.
- 4 The model ranks programs according to their return on investment.
- 5 Policymakers consider the information during the budget process.

For further information, please visit:

pewstates.org/resultsfirst



MacArthur
Foundation

Why Do We Need a TJC Approach?

Focusing on reentry from jail presents an opportunity to have a significant impact: there are 13 million releases from jail each year.

The jail population has numerous challenges:

- 68% have a substance abuse problem
- 60% did not graduate high school
- 30% were unemployed at arrest
- 16% suffer from mental illness
- 14% were homeless in previous year

Treatment/service capacity in jails is limited.

Reentry planning is complex:

- The jail population is highly diverse, housing pretrial and sentenced probation and parole violators, and local, state and federal inmates
- Length of stay is short: 80% stay less than one month

No single designated organization or individual is responsible for facilitating transition and managing risks after release.

With 2,860 independent jail systems in the United States, policy reform is challenging.

Transition from Jail to Community is an initiative of:




URBAN INSTITUTE
Justice Policy Center

For more information:
www.jailtransition.com

Jesse Jannetta
Urban Institute
jjannetta@urban.org

Pat Taylor
National Institute of Corrections
petaylor@bop.gov


The Transition from Jail to Community Initiative



to improve public safety and
reintegration outcomes

TJC Overview

The *Transition from Jail to Community* (TJC) initiative was launched in 2007 by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and the Urban Institute developed a transition model to address how local reentry collaboratives can implement effective transition strategies.




TJC Goals

The TJC initiative team will work with six jurisdictions to improve public safety and enhance reintegration. Target outcomes include:

- reduced reoffending
- reduced substance abuse
- reduced homelessness
- improved health
- increased employment
- increased family connectedness
- increased systems collaboration

The Transition from Jail to Community Initiative



TJC is about Systems Change

Leadership, vision, and organizational culture to set expectations and empower stakeholders and staff.

Collaborative structure and joint ownership by both jail and community stakeholders to develop and share responsibility for joint outcomes.

Data-driven understanding of the local issue, including characteristics of the returning population and local barriers and assets.

Targeted intervention strategies to assess individuals, plan for release, and provide services and training in jail and in the community.

Self-evaluation and sustainability to guide and improve the effort.

TJC Targeted Interventions

Screening and assessment quickly determine an inmate's risks and needs and guide transition planning and service provision.

Transition case plan development prepares individuals for release and reintegration.

Tailored transition interventions begin in jail and continue after release.

Interventions:

- enlist multiple service sectors
- involve community "in reach" to build relationships before release
- utilize low-cost interventions such as reentry resource guides
- involve informal support networks
- enhance the role that supervision can play, when applicable

CALIFORNIA **SMARTJUSTICE**



QUESTIONS FROM OUR PARTNERS

- Q.** How much will it cost for law enforcement and public safety agencies to access California SmartJustice?
- A.** Agencies will be able to access the California SmartJustice web portal free of charge. The Department of Justice will build direct interfaces to one law enforcement system per county and one probation system per county. In addition, the DOJ will make web services available to law enforcement and public safety agencies that choose to build connections to California SmartJustice.
- Q.** What data will authorized law enforcement and public safety users be able to access through California SmartJustice?
- A.** Law enforcement and public safety agency authorized users will be able to search and view offender profile information housed in multiple DOJ databases, including: the Automated Criminal History System, the Armed and Prohibited Persons System, the California Restraining and Protective Order System, the CalPhoto System, the California Sex and Arson Registry, the Supervised Release File, and the Wanted Persons System. In addition, authorized users will be able to view offender profile information sourced from the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (LEADS). Also, SmartJustice will integrate offender information housed in county probation systems, county law enforcement systems, and regional information sharing systems.
- Q.** How will authorized law enforcement and public safety users be able to access the data in California SmartJustice?
- A.** Authorized law enforcement and public safety users will be able to search the data in California SmartJustice online through the secure web portal. In addition, authorized users will be able to access the SmartJustice data through their existing local and/or regional systems (e.g., COPLINK, LInX, ARIES, and ARJIS) and through the DOJ Wide Area Network.

CALIFORNIA **SMARTJUSTICE**



QUESTIONS FROM OUR PARTNERS

- Q.** What devices can be used to access California SmartJustice?
- A.** Authorized users can access California SmartJustice through any network connected device (e.g., PC, laptop, tablet, or smartphone) that is secured in accordance with the FBI CJIS Security Policy and the CLETS Policies, Practices, and Procedures. New devices must be approved through the standard CLETS approval process.
- Q.** Will the DOJ network be used for connectivity into each county and agency?
- A.** Counties may connect to California SmartJustice through the DOJ network (also referred to as the DOJ backbone) or through a Secure Internet connection.
- Q.** Will there be a limit to the number user licenses assigned to an agency?
- A.** No end user licenses are required for California SmartJustice.
- Q.** Will an agency be required to contribute data in order to participate?
- A.** In order to be an integration partner with California SmartJustice, a county must contribute data.

Attachment #4											
AB 109 DATA TRACKING PROJECT - Last Revised March 8, 2012											
					Who collects the data?					When?	
					Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe	
A.	New §1170(h)(5) PC Disposition										
1. General Information											
	a.	Cases sentenced under §1170(h)(5) PC			✓					Intake	
	b.	Inmates released pre-trial pursuant to §1203.018 PC						✓		Intake	
	c.	Type of pre-trial release						✓		Intake	
2. Sentence											
	a.	Cases sentenced to jail only [§1170(h)(5)(A)PC]			✓					Intake	
	b.	Cases sentenced to jail with mandatory supervision tail [§1170(h)(5)(B)PC]			✓					Intake	
	c.	Length of jail sentence imposed			✓					Intake	
	d.	Length of mandatory supervision imposed			✓					Intake	
	e.	Credit for Time Served at sentencing			✓					Intake	
	f.	No alternative sentencing ordered			✓					Intake	
3. Demographic Information											
	a.	Gender					✓			Intake	
	b.	Date of birth					✓			Intake	
	c.	Race/Ethnicity					✓			Intake	
	d.	ICE hold						✓		Intake	
4. Characteristics											
	a.	Risk/needs assessment score					✓			Intake	
	b.	Supervision level					✓			Intake/Exit	
	c.	Housing situation - homeless at booking Y/N						✓		Intake	
	d.	Veteran status						✓		Intake	
5. Release from Jail											
	a.	Length of time in jail post sentence						✓		Release	
	b.	Inmates released early, per court order for overcrowding						✓		Release	
	c.	Inmates transferred into Electronic Monitoring (EM) only program						✓		Release	
	d.	Length of time in EM program						✓		Release	
	e.	Inmates transferred into EM plus other community program (e.g. Probation Report and Resource Center [PRRC])						✓		Release	
6. Connection to Services in Jail											
	a.	Inmates participating in programs in jail						✓		Release	

A.	New §1170(h)(5) PC Disposition/6. Connection to Services in Jail, continued		Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe
	b.	Programs used - Sheriff's Treatment Program (STP), educational				✓		Release
	c.	Waitlisted for program				✓		Release
	d.	Number of days between application for program and enrollment				✓		Release
	e.	Inmates not eligible for program(s)				✓		Release
7. Connection to Services - Split Sentences								
	a.	Clean and Sober Housing			✓			Exit
	b.	PRRC			✓			Exit
	c.	Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM)			✓			Exit
	d.	Detox			✓			Exit
	e.	Other Treatment or Services (<i>Services see page 3</i>)			✓			Exit
	f.	Contacts			✓			Exit
8. Violations of Split Sentence Supervision								
	a.	GPS Violation			✓			Quarterly
	b.	Violations			✓			Quarterly
	c.	Type of violation: e.g. alcohol/drug related, failure to report, etc.			✓			Quarterly
	d.	Length of jail time for revocation			✓			Quarterly
9. Completion for Split Sentences								
	a.	Offenders completing supervision - "successful"			✓			Exit
	b.	Offenders completing supervision - "unsuccessful"			✓			Exit
	c.	No fault closing			✓			Exit
10. Recidivism								
	a.	New convictions post release from jail at 12, 24, and 36 months	✓					Follow-up
	b.	New bookings post release from jail at 12, 24, and 36 months				✓		Follow-up

			Who collects the data?					When?
			Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe
B.	Released from State Prison to PRCS							
	1. General Information							
	a.	Offenders released to the County			✓			Intake
	b.	Offenders transferred in from another county			✓			Intake
	2. Demographic Information							
	a.	Gender			✓			Intake
	b.	Date of birth			✓			Intake
	c.	Race/Ethnicity			✓			Intake
	3. Characteristics - tracked at release, at regular intervals during PRCS and at discharge							
	a.	Risk/needs assessment score			✓			Intake
	b.	Supervision level			✓			Intake/Exit
	c.	Housing situation - transient, housed, or residence - 60 to 90 days			✓			Exit
	d.	Housing situation - transient, housed, or residence - time of exit			✓			Exit
	e.	Special needs diagnosis (developmental/cognitive disability) - yes/no			✓			Intake
	f.	Physical disability diagnosis - yes/no			✓			Intake
	g.	EOP (enhanced outpatient)			✓			Intake
	h.	CCCMS (correctional clinical case mgmt system)			✓			Intake
	i.	Keyhea			✓			Intake
	j.	Registered sex offender			✓			Intake
	k.	Gang affiliation/issues (Yes/No)			✓			Intake
	l.	Employment status at exit			✓			Exit
	4. Supervision and Services							
	a.	Clean and Sober Housing			✓			Exit
	b.	Day Report Center (DRC)			✓			Exit
	c.	Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM)			✓			Exit
	d.	Detox			✓			Exit
	e.	Sex Offender Treatment			✓			Exit
	f.	Contacts			✓			Exit
	g.	Other Treatment or Services			✓			Exit
	5. Mental Health Services							
	a.	Diagnosis		✓				Exit
	b.	Assessment		✓				Exit
	c.	Evaluation & Plan Development		✓				Exit
	d.	Crisis Intervention		✓				Exit

B.	<i>Released from State Prison to PRCS/5. Mental Health Services, continued</i>		Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe
	e. Case Management, Brokerage			✓				Exit
	f. Collateral			✓				Exit
	g. Group Collateral			✓				Exit
	h. Family Therapy			✓				Exit
	i. Individual Therapy			✓				Exit
	j. Individual Rehabilitation			✓				Exit
	k. Group Therapy			✓				Exit
	l. Group Rehabilitation			✓				Exit
	m. Family Rehabilitation			✓				Exit
	n. Med Visit MD - Complex			✓				Exit
	o. Med Visit MD - Brief			✓				Exit
	p. Medication Administration			✓				Exit
	q. Medication Support			✓				Exit
	r. Adult Crisis Residential			✓				Exit
	s. Inpatient Services			✓				Exit
6. Medical/Mental Health Services Provided by PHD								
	SERVICES PENDING						✓	Exit
7. Terms of PRCS								
	a. Electronic monitoring imposed				✓			Intake
8. Violation of PRCS - each instance								
	a. Length of time between release to PRCS and first violation				✓			Quarterly
	b. GPS violations				✓			Quarterly
	c. Type of Violation				✓			Quarterly
	d. Sanction imposed				✓			Quarterly
	e. Flash incarcerations imposed				✓			Quarterly
	f. Length of flash incarceration				✓			Quarterly
	g. Revocations				✓			Quarterly
	h. Length of jail time for revocations				✓			Quarterly
	j. New criminal convictions				✓			Quarterly
	k. Offenders who failed to report upon release requiring a warrant				✓			Quarterly
9. Completion of PRCS								
	a. Offenders discharged early				✓			Exit
	b. Offenders completing full term of supervision				✓			Exit
	c. Offenders terminated due to a new felony conviction				✓			Exit
	d. Offenders terminated due to a new misdemeanor conviction				✓			Exit

B.	<i>Released from State Prison to PRCS/9. Completion of PRCS, continued</i>			Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe
	e.	Offenders terminated unsuccessfully due to a technical violation				✓			Exit
	f.	Offenders transferred out to another county				✓			Exit
10. Recidivism									
	a.	Convictions during supervision and 12 months after exit		✓					Follow-up

				Who collects the data?					When?
				Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe
C.	Violation of State Parole								
	1. General Information								
	a.	Offenders booked on parole violation					✓		Release
	b.	Date of booking on parole violation					✓		Release
	c.	Date of additional law offense booking					✓		Release
	d.	If Yes on (c) date of sentencing on new law viol.					✓		Release
	e.	Date of release					✓		Release
	f.	Rehouse on GPS (Y/N)					✓		Release
	g.	If Yes on (f) date of rehouse					✓		Release
	2. Demographic Information								
	a.	Gender					✓		Release
	b.	Date of birth					✓		Release
	c.	Race/Ethnicity					✓		Release
	d.	ICE hold					✓		Release
	3. Sentence								
	a.	Flash incarcerations imposed (by offender)					✓		Release
	b.	Length of flash incarceration					✓		Release
				Who collects the data?					When?
				Court	ADMHS	Prob	SBSO	Public Health	Timeframe
D.	§1203.018 PC (pre trial release on Electronic Monitoring [EM] Program)								
	1. Jail Utilization								
	a.	Inmates transferred to EM program in-lieu of bail					✓		Release
	b.	Length of time on EM program in-lieu of bail					✓		Release
	c.	New bookings while on EM					✓		Release

Criminal Justice Evidence Based Practices Quality Assurance Committee

Mission Statement

The mission of the Santa Barbara County Criminal Justice Quality Assurance Team is to promote the effective use of culturally-competent Evidence-Based Practices throughout the Santa Barbara County Criminal Justice System.

Guiding Principles and Objectives

- Identifying and maintaining an inventory of available programs
- Assessing and ensuring fidelity in the use of evidence-based models
- Supporting skill-building, and creating opportunities for joint trainings
- Utilizing shared language and agreed upon data elements
- Identifying gaps in service and improving access to appropriate services
- Promoting improved outcomes through ongoing collaborative quality assurance efforts.

Quality Assurance Committee:

Sylvia Barnard - Good Samaritan Shelter

Merith Cosden - University of California, Santa Barbara

Michael Craft - Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services

Maria Antonia Durbiano - Santa Barbara Sheriff's Office (SBSO)

Dean Farrah - Santa Barbara County Probation Department (Probation)

Donna Flores - Good Samaritan Shelter

Katie Henson - Probation

Tom Jenkins - SBSO (retired)

Tim McWilliams - SBSO

Mark Mahurin - SBSO (retired)

Marcel Meier - Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse (CADA)

Tona Wakefield - CADA

Katie Ward - Community Solutions, Inc.

REALIGNMENT POPULATION

PRCS PROJECTIONS

Month	Entered	Exited	Total
Aug-13	13	17	315
Sept-13	17	13	319
Oct-13	19	16	321
Nov-13	18	18	321
Dec-13	12	22	313
Jan-14	18	14	317
Feb-14	13	15	315
Mar-14	14	15	314
Apr-14	13	15	312
May-14	13	15	310
Jun-14	13	15	308
Jul-14	13	15	306
Aug-14	14	15	305
Sep-14	14	15	304
Oct-14	13	15	302
Nov-14	14	15	301
Dec-14	13	15	299
Jan-15	14	16	297
Feb-15	13	18	292
Mar-15	14	18	288
Apr-15	13	20	281
May-15	13	22	272
Jun-15	14	24	262
<i>Last updated 2-1-14</i>			

PSS PROJECTIONS

Month	Entered	Exited	Total
Aug-13	10	5	194
Sept-13	12	3	201
Oct-13	10	3	208
Nov-13	10	6	211
Dec-13	10	5	218
Jan-14	10	10	218
Feb-14	12	4	226
Mar-14	12	4	234
Apr-14	12	4	242
May-14	12	4	250
Jun-14	12	4	258
Jul-14	12	4	266
Aug-14	12	4	274
Sep-14	12	4	282
Oct-14	12	4	290
Nov-14	12	4	298
Dec-14	12	4	306
Jan-15	12	4	314
Feb-15	12	4	322
Mar-15	12	4	330
Apr-15	12	4	338
May-15	12	4	346
Jun-15	12	4	354
<i>Last updated 2-1-14</i>			



MEMO TO: All Chiefs


FROM: CPOC Research Committee (S. James)

DATE: 1/14/2014

SUBJECT: CDCR PRCS Release Estimates

In the communication memo on 12/18/13, we highlighted the Fall PRCS projections by CDCR here: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/Projections/F13pub.pdf. This document goes into more detail as to the statewide numbers, as well as offering some county level estimates for the coming year based on statewide CDCR estimates

In the populations document, CDCR states "The number of projected discharges to PRCS for fiscal year 2013-14 is 2.0 percent lower than projected in Spring 2013 and 11.2 percent higher than projected in Spring 2013 for fiscal year 2014-15." This means statewide PRCS releases will not be declining as quickly as CDCR had initially anticipated in FY 14-15. From our talks with CDCR, this is because they are getting more admissions eligible for PRCS than previously



anticipated in the spring. Instead of a decline as predicted before, the number of releases will remain fairly steady through FY 14-15. (See Figure 1). Figure 1 also shows the number of PRCS offenders completing their PRCS supervision. Since October 2012, the number of PRCS

completions has been greater than the number being released to supervision on a monthly basis, which has coincided with a decline in the PRCS population. The total PRCS offenders on supervision in counties will continue to decline, but at a slower rate than originally anticipated.

The only data on PRCS projection provided by CDCR is a statewide monthly PRCS release table through June 2015, . We have been informed CDCR will no longer be providing estimates at the county level for PRCS releases. To help in your local planning, attached is a county-by-county spreadsheet, with month-by-month estimates of January 2014 to June 2015 PRCS releases based on the monthly statewide releases and your county's FY 12-13 portion of PRCS releases, rounded to the nearest whole number.

CPOC, through the Research Committee, will work on developing other population planning resources for supervision populations in the coming months.

Please let us know if you have questions.

Kevin

CPOC Analyst

koconnell@cpoc.org



	% of FY							6 month												14-15 Total	
	12-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Release Total	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	PRCS Release
State PRCS Releases		1,409	1,435	1,543	1,473	1,490	1,503	8,853	1,516	1,550	1,561	1,529	1,544	1,517	1,604	1,474	1,574	1,471	1,514	1,541	18,395
Alameda	2.05%	29	29	32	30	30	31	181	31	32	32	31	32	31	33	30	32	30	31	32	377
Alpine	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Butte	1.23%	17	18	19	18	18	19	109	19	19	19	19	19	19	20	18	19	18	19	19	227
Calaveras	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Colusa	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	1.23%	17	18	19	18	18	19	109	19	19	19	19	19	19	20	18	19	18	19	19	227
Del Norte	0.13%	2	2	2	2	2	2	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	24
El Dorado	0.26%	4	4	4	4	4	4	23	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	48
Fresno	4.03%	57	58	62	59	60	61	357	61	62	63	62	62	61	65	59	63	59	61	62	741
Glenn	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Humboldt	0.49%	7	7	8	7	7	7	43	7	8	8	7	8	7	8	7	8	7	7	8	90
Imperial	0.52%	7	7	8	8	8	8	46	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	96
Inyo	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kern	4.32%	61	62	67	64	64	65	383	66	67	67	66	67	66	69	64	68	64	65	67	795
Kings	1.07%	15	15	17	16	16	16	95	16	17	17	16	17	16	17	16	17	16	16	17	197
Lake	0.26%	4	4	4	4	4	4	23	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	48
Lassen	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Los Angeles	29.11%	410	418	449	429	434	438	2,577	441	451	454	445	449	442	467	429	458	428	441	449	5,355
Madera	0.42%	6	6	7	6	6	6	37	6	7	7	6	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	7	78
Marin	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Mariposa	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Mendocino	0.29%	4	4	5	4	4	4	26	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	54
Merced	0.68%	10	10	11	10	10	10	60	10	11	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10	10	11	126
Modoc	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mono	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monterey	1.20%	17	17	19	18	18	18	106	18	19	19	18	19	18	19	18	19	18	18	19	221
Napa	0.19%	3	3	3	3	3	3	17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	36
Nevada	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Orange	4.61%	65	66	71	68	69	69	408	70	72	72	71	71	70	74	68	73	68	70	71	849
Placer	0.62%	9	9	10	9	9	9	55	9	10	10	9	10	9	10	9	10	9	9	10	114
Plumas	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside	7.93%	112	114	122	117	118	119	702	120	123	124	121	122	120	127	117	125	117	120	122	1,458
Sacramento	3.77%	53	54	58	56	56	57	334	57	58	59	58	58	57	60	56	59	55	57	58	693
San Benito	0.13%	2	2	2	2	2	2	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	24
San Bernardino	10.66%	150	153	164	157	159	160	943	162	165	166	163	165	162	171	157	168	157	161	164	1,960
San Diego	6.73%	95	97	104	99	100	101	595	102	104	105	103	104	102	108	99	106	99	102	104	1,237
San Francisco	0.84%	12	12	13	12	13	13	75	13	13	13	13	13	13	14	12	13	12	13	13	155
San Joaquin	2.14%	30	31	33	32	32	32	190	33	33	33	33	33	33	34	32	34	32	32	33	394
San Luis Obispo	0.52%	7	7	8	8	8	8	46	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	96
San Mateo	0.65%	9	9	10	10	10	10	58	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120
Santa Barbara	0.88%	12	13	14	13	13	13	78	13	14	14	13	14	13	14	13	14	13	13	14	161

PRCS estimates listed above are based on past FY portion of all PRCS releases, and roudned to the nearest whole number. This document is based on population projections. not actual releases.

PRCS Release Estimates

Contact Koconnell@cpoc.org with questions
<http://www.cpoc.org/assets/Realignment/dashboard.swf>

Santa Clara	2.63%	37	38	41	39	39	40	233	40	41	41	40	41	40	42	39	41	39	40	41	484
Santa Cruz	0.26%	4	4	4	4	4	4	23	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	48
Shasta	1.07%	15	15	17	16	16	16	95	16	17	17	16	17	16	17	16	17	16	16	17	197
Sierra	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	0.13%	2	2	2	2	2	2	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	24
Solano	1.01%	14	14	16	15	15	15	89	15	16	16	15	16	15	16	15	16	15	15	16	185
Sonoma	0.68%	10	10	11	10	10	10	60	10	11	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10	10	11	126
Stanislaus	2.66%	38	38	41	39	40	40	236	40	41	42	41	41	40	43	39	42	39	40	41	490
Sutter	0.23%	3	3	4	3	3	3	20	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	42
Tehama	0.32%	5	5	5	5	5	5	29	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	60
Trinity	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Tulare	1.46%	21	21	23	22	22	22	129	22	23	23	22	23	22	23	22	23	22	22	23	269
Tuolumne	0.06%	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Ventura	1.17%	16	17	18	17	17	18	104	18	18	18	18	18	18	19	17	18	17	18	18	215
Yolo	0.42%	6	6	7	6	6	6	37	6	7	7	6	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	7	78
Yuba	0.39%	5	6	6	6	6	6	35	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	72

PRCS estimates listed above are based on past FY portion of all PRCS releases, and roudned to the nearest whole number. This document is based on population projections. not actual releases.

COMPAS: Correctional Offender Management and Profiling Alternative Sanctions

In January 2010, the Adult Division of the Santa Barbara County Probation Department implemented Northpointe COMPAS, a 4th Generation Risk and Needs Assessment to meet the challenge of providing appropriate level of service, effective Evidence Based interventions, and public accountability in the management of the community supervision population in Santa Barbara County.

As part of an over-arching Departmental plan to expand and enhance evidence-based supervision, the assessment of offenders in a reliable and valid manner is a prerequisite for effective supervision and treatment. The need for timely, relevant measures of offender risk and needs is essential for the triage of offenders and utilization of resources.

COMPAS is a computerized database and analysis system for criminal justice practitioners to make decisions regarding the placement, supervision and case-management of offenders in community and secure settings.

COMPAS was validated to the local Santa Barbara County population on November 1, 2010.

A responsive and adaptive assessment system;

- The COMPAS approach of separating risk and needs aligns with current best practices in risk assessment (Baird, 2009; Gottfredson & Moriarty, 2006).
- Individualized Case Planning Component
- Inclusion of specialized Assessments, such as the Texas Christian University (TCD) Drug screen tool & the Case Supervision Review
- 26 Risk and Need Scales in full assessment
- Targeted Assessments- Re-entry, Community Corrections, Juvenile

COMPAS is used by over 275 correctional agencies across the country, including;

- San Diego Co. Probation
- San Bernardino Co. Probation
- San Francisco Co. Probation
- New York State Probation
- CDCR
- Michigan Department of Corrections

Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) and Post Sentence Supervision (PSS) Caseload Guidelines

All PRCS and PSS offenders are supervised using the re-entry standards regardless of their risk level. Any exceptions to this must be staffed with a supervisor and any approved deviations must be clearly documented in the chronos. Once the 90 day re-entry phase is complete, the offender should be supervised utilizing the standards associated with their risk level as determined by the ROVAR/ION. Although the offender may be going to a lower level of supervision the officer does not need to complete a Case Supervision Review (CSR) at that point. A CSR is not needed until the offender has been supervised for a minimum of six months or as a result of a violation.

In order to ensure a focus on field work conducted during non-business hours, each officer is to work at least one weekend shift per quarter (includes Friday nights) and at least one evening/early morning per week.

Re-Entry Standards for PRCS–

- PRCS cases will be prescreened for Probation Report and Resource Center (PRRC) services, GPS or other specialty programming 30 days prior to release from California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.
- An initial office visit will be required within two (2) working days of their release.
- An unannounced home visit will be conducted within one week of their release.
- COMPAS risk and need assessments and a case plan will be completed within the first 21 days of supervision. Referrals will be initiated based on the needs identified in the assessment and case plan.
- During the first 90 days of supervision, in addition to office visits, administrative or Response Team contacts, at minimum, weekly field supervision contact will be conducted with an emphasis on non-business hours.
- Offenders with substance abuse issues will be tested a minimum of four (4) times a month, with an emphasis on random, call in testing. Tests conducted by treatment providers can be considered in the total if the tests are documented in IMPACT.
- Additional priority tasks will be identified based on the offender's criminal history. For example, sex offender registrants will be prioritized for the use of "Field Search" to determine any inappropriate use of computers or electronic devices (See attached Caseload Guidelines for other priorities based on criminal history.)
- Upon completion of the initial 90 day re-entry period, the offender's supervision standards will be reassessed based on their progress and the results of the risk/needs assessment. High risk offenders will be maintained on the most intensive supervision level. Medium and low risk offenders will be transitioned to a lower level of supervision as dictated by the nature of the offense and specialized legal or programming requirements and their risk score.

Re-Entry Standards for PSS–

- PSS cases will be prescreened for Alternative Sentencing options such as GPS, PRRC Re-Entry services, or other specialty programming.
- COMPAS risk and need assessments will be conducted prior to release and in some instances the case plan will also be completed pre-release. Any offenders whose case plan is not completed pre-release will have one completed within the first 21 days of supervision. Referrals will be initiated based on the needs identified in the assessment and case plan.
- An initial office visit will be required within two (2) working days of release.
- An unannounced home visit will be conducted within one week of their return to the community.

- Offenders with a history of substance abuse will be tested a minimum of four (4) times a month, with an emphasis on random, call in testing. Tests conducted by treatment providers can be considered in the total if the tests are documented in IMPACT.
- Supervision standards will be based on their risk/needs assessment and are identified below.

High Risk Standards –

- Offenders with substance abuse issues will be tested a minimum of four (4) times a month, with an emphasis on random, call in testing. Tests conducted by treatment providers can be considered in the total if the tests are documented in IMPACT.
- Four (4) field contacts per month will be conducted with an emphasis on non-business hours.
- Ensure that GPS tracks are reviewed each work day by the GPS officer for those on Enhanced Electronic Supervision (EES).
- A minimum of one field search will be conducted per month.
- Additional high priority tasks as indicated for all caseloads as well as offense specific caseloads such as Domestic Violence (DV) or Sex Offender.
- An automated monthly report will be required.

Medium Risk Standards –

- Offenders with substance abuse issues will be tested a minimum of two (2) times a month, with an emphasis on random, call in testing. Tests conducted by treatment providers can be considered in the total if the tests are documented in IMPACT.
- Two (2) field contacts per month will be conducted with an emphasis on non-business hours.
- A minimum of one field search will be conducted every other month.
- Monthly program contacts to ensure the offender is attending and progressing at a satisfactory rate.
- Contact with DV victims who reside with offenders required at a minimum of every other month.
- An automated monthly report will be required.

Low Risk Standards –

- Offenders with substance abuse issues will be tested on an as needed basis.
- One (1) field contact per month will be conducted with an emphasis on non-business hours.
- Office visits will be scheduled as needed.
- An automated monthly report will be required.
- Field searches will be conducted as needed.
- Monthly program contacts to ensure the offender is attending and progressing at a satisfactory rate.
- Contact with DV victims who reside with offenders required at a minimum of every other month.



SANTA BARBARA COUNTY



SM PRRC AB 109 Programming Guide

AB 109 Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R):

R&R classes are 1.5 to 2 hour sessions, 2 x per week for 7 weeks

R&R is an evidence-based cognitive behavioral program designed to teach impulse control, problem solving techniques and systematic thinking with a move towards more empathetic behavior in a social environment.

AB 109 Employment Readiness:

Employment Readiness Class provides job preparedness training and assists offenders in their attempts to secure employment. Offenders will hone their skills in job search techniques, resume development, job application completion, interviewing, test taking, and follow up to interviews. Additionally, clients will learn the skills necessary to keep a job. Among the topics discussed are good work habits, ethics and conflict resolution.

AB 109 Drug and Alcohol Treatment Groups (Good Sam):

Classes are 1.5 to 2 hour sessions, 2 x per week for a total of 52 sessions (six month program):

Groups are facilitated by Good Samaritan staff and provide court recognized drug and alcohol treatment programming. Good Sam staff are credentialed drug and alcohol counselors who utilize a Matrix model of drug and alcohol prevention education which includes: anger management, socialization, communication and life skills as well as after care. Cohorts are Mondays and Thursdays from 1pm-3pm & Tuesdays and Thursdays from 6pm-8pm.

AB 109 Treating Addictive Disorders (TAD):

2 x per week for a total of 14 sessions

Treating Addictive Disorders presents a straightforward, multi-session coping skills training program that has been proven effective in helping individuals with addictive behaviors such as gambling, substance abuse, pornography, etc. Skills training includes: nonverbal communication, introduction to assertiveness, conversational skills, giving and receiving positive feedback, listening skills, giving and receiving constructive criticism, refusal skills, resolving relationship problems, developing social skills, managing urges, problem solving, increasing pleasant activities, anger management, managing negative thoughts, seemingly irrelevant decisions and planning for emergencies.

Parenting Wisely:

1.5 to 2 hr. intervals, 1 x per week, for 4 weeks (TBA):

This program assists clients with young children in learning the necessary skills for the healthy, well-balanced approach to raising children. This evidence-based program is proven to improve parenting skills by reducing children's disruptive problem behaviors through improved supervision and appropriate discipline of their children, enhance family communication and develop family unity. Parenting Wisely provides excellent tools for soon-to-be parents, parents who may have been away from their children, or for those parents seeking to gain further skills. Classes are available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

First Aid - Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation FA/CPR Class:

Classes scheduled monthly

PRRC offers certification in First Aid/CPR to clients interested in acquiring these invaluable skills. Clients receiving this training will receive a FA/CPR certification card at the end of the class and can list the training on a resume thus increasing their employability and earning power. Additionally, these potentially life-saving skills will assist the clients in being able to respond to emergencies. Classes are available for both standard and PRCS clientele.



SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

SB PRRC AB 109 Programming Guide



AB 109 Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R):

R&R classes are 1.5 to 2 hour sessions, 2 x weekly for 7 weeks

R&R is an evidence-based cognitive behavioral program designed to teach impulse control, problem solving techniques and systematic thinking with a move towards more empathetic behavior in a social environment.

AB 109 Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT):

MRT classes are 1.5 to 2 hour sessions, 2 x weekly for 24 weeks

MRT is a systematic, cognitive-behavioral, step-by-step treatment strategy designed to enhance self-image, promote growth of a positive, productive identity, and facilitate the development of higher stages of moral reasoning. All of these goals are ultimately demonstrated by more appropriate behavior on the part of the participant.

AB 109 Employment Readiness:

Classes are 2 hrs. in length 9a – 11a Thur, Fri, and Sat for 9 sessions.

Employment Readiness Class provides job preparedness training and assists offenders in their attempts to secure employment. Offenders will receive training in completion of resume, how to dress for an interview, applications completion, test taking tips and follow-up to interviews. Clients will also receive instruction in the development of good work habits, ethics and conflict resolution.

AB 109 WAGES\$:

WAGES\$ is scheduled bi-weekly Mon, Tues, and Wed, morning Hours: 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

WAGES\$ is designed to assist unemployed or under-employed clients. WAGES\$ is a shorter job search training program that focuses on how to answer the difficult questions regarding a client's felony conviction. Clients will learn interviewing techniques, how to dress for interviews, and the optimum locations to look for employment. Clients will also be assisted in the completion of their individual resumes.

AB 109 Drug and Alcohol (AOD) Treatment Groups:

CADA classes are 1.5 to 2 hour sessions, 2 x weekly for a total of 48 sessions

AOD treatment groups are facilitated by CADA staff and provide court recognized drug and alcohol treatment programming. CADA staff is credentialed drug and alcohol counselors focusing on a Matrix model of prevention education, anger management, life skills, socialization, and communication skills and after care.

AB 109 Treating Addictive Disorders (TAD):

Wed 5p – 7p and Sat 11p-12:30p 2 x weekly for a total of 14 sessions

Treating Addictive Disorders presents a straightforward, multi-session coping skills training program that has been proven effective in helping individuals with addictive behaviors such as gambling, substance abuse, pornography, etc. Skills training includes – nonverbal communication, introduction to assertiveness, conversational skills, giving and receiving positive feedback, listening skills, giving and receiving constructive criticism, refusal skills, resolving relationship problems, developing social skills, managing urges, problem solving, increasing pleasant activities, anger management, managing negative thoughts, seemingly irrelevant decisions and planning for emergencies.

Parenting Wisely:

1.5 to 2 hr. intervals, 1x weekly, Saturdays for 5 weeks

Clients with young children will learn the necessary skills for the healthy, well-balanced raising of children. This evidence-based program is proven to reduce problem behaviors, increase communication and develop family unity. Parenting Wisely provides excellent tools for soon-to-be parents, parents who may have been away from their children for some time or are seeking positive skills for dealing with their children. Class available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) Transitions Program:

Assistance available to probationers upon request

PRRC is currently working with Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) and the EOPS Transitions Program in assisting probationers with enrollment at SBCC. The PRRC and the Transitions program are working together to assist clients in overcoming barriers and achieving success through higher education. Class available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

Drop-in-Employment:

Available Monday thru Saturday during program hours

Clients can utilize computers for online job searches, check posted classifieds and get assistance completing and sending job applications and resumes. Assistance with completing application forms such as SSI, CDL/CA ID forms is also available. Classes are available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

Drop-in-Education:

Available Monday thru Saturday during program hours

Clients get information on obtaining their GED, high school diploma and SBCC enrollment. Participants can utilize computers for SBCC online enrollment and to view class schedules. One-on-one tutoring is also available to clients who desire additional assistance with course work, reading and writing skills, English, computer skills, etc. Clients are assessed by a certified teaching staff and a tutor assigned based on the client's needs. Class available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

First Aid Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation FA/CPR Class:

Classes scheduled monthly

PRRC offers certification in FA/CPR to probationers interested in acquiring this skill. Clients receiving this training will receive a FA/CPR certification card at the end of the class and can list the training on a resume increasing their earning power and employability. Additionally this new skill will make the lives of their families safer. Classes are available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

Self-Empowered Entrepreneurial Development (S.E.E.D.) Class:

Classes scheduled upon request

SEED was developed to close a gap in employment that exists for probationers who are having difficulty locating employment due to the seriousness of their offense. The class is for clients who have a legitimate idea for a business that they wish to pursue but are unsure how to proceed. Clients will learn to develop a realistic vision of their product or endeavor and develop a workable business plan. Classes are available for both standard and PRCS clientele.

ServSafe Food Handlers Certification Card:

Sessions scheduled upon request

All persons handling food are required by the State of California to possess a Food Handlers Certification Card. To aid probationers in getting work in the food service and hospitality industry, a Food Handlers Certification card can be Provided, following testing at the PRRC. Classes are available for both standard probationers and PRCS clientele.

Santa Barbara County Probation Department
April 15, 2013 Enrollment Report

	Santa Barbara	Santa Maria	Lompoc
SATC	33	65	0
Re-Entry Drug Court		26	
DDX	0	32	0
MHTC	33	32	2
Prop. 36	357	316	254
CSDC	14		
VTC*	40 cases 31 people	73 cases 48 people (29 are BJA grant)	

*(Veterans Treatment Court [VTC] enrollment data secured from the Santa Barbara County Superior Court/Collaborative Courts reports;
BJA VTC grant participation numbers obtained from Probation staff):

Santa Barbara	Apr 2013	May 2013	June 2013	July 2013	Aug 2013	Sept 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
SATC	24	25	29	29	31	30	30	28	26	30	29	35	33
DDX	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	0
MHTC	7	7	8	8	9	9	9	10	9	10	11	41	33
Prop. 36	287	289	286	299	302	305	313	321	317	333	345	347	357
CSDC	36	39	37	37	43	44	46	29	20	20	19	15	14
VTC*	10	11	16	15	14	18	21	23	30 cases	32 cases	37 cases	43 cases	40 cases

Santa Maria	Apr 2013	May 2013	June 2013	July 2013	Aug 2013	Sept 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
SATC	67	65	74	79	81	81	72	74	73	67	68	67	65
RDC	35	29	32	36	37	38	25	27	28	28	26	25	26
DDX	30	27	26	26	27	29	29	31	33	33	35	32	32
MHTC	46	41	42	44	47	42	36	32	34	30	34	33	32
Prop. 36	327	316	322	317	309	301	290	293	295	292	303	308	316
VTC*	59	58	57	59	63	70	66	53	56 cases	60 cases	61 cases	66 cases	73 cases

Lompoc	Apr 2013	May 2013	June 2013	July 2013	Aug 2013	Sept 2013	Oct 2013	Nov 2013	Dec 2013	Jan 2014	Feb 2014	Mar 2014	Apr 2014
SATC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DDX	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
MHTC	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Prop. 36	214	225	231	232	243	239	251	249	247	247	251	248	254

Santa Maria SATC Process Evaluation

Summary

Introduction

Process evaluations look at program implementation and address what programs are doing in relation to best practices. Data from prior studies provide support for the positive impact of drug courts when they implement facets of the 10 key components. Specifically:

Key Component 1. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to law enforcement being involved as part of the drug court team; judge, attorneys, treatment program coordinator, probation, treatment representatives, and law enforcement attending staffing; judge, attorneys, treatment representatives, probation, coordinator, and law enforcement attending court sessions; and treatment representatives keeping in contact regularly with the court.

Key Component 2. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to the drug court allowing participants to enter on non-drug related charges.

Key Component 3. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to a lapse of 50 days or less between arrest and drug court program entry, and a drug court program caseload of 125 participants or less.

Key Component 4. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to working with two or fewer treatment programs; mandating participants to attend a particular number of individual treatment sessions; offering gender-specific services, mental health treatment, parenting classes, or family/domestic relations counseling; and a minimum program length of 12 months or longer.

Key Component 5. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to drug court programs that received their drug test results back in two or fewer days.

Key Component 6. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to drug court team members being given written guidelines for administering sanctions. In addition, drug courts that did *not* allow someone other than the judge to impose sanctions on a participant outside of the court sessions saw significant reductions in participant recidivism.

Key Component 7. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to biweekly court hearings for participants in Phase 1; the judge spending 3 or more minutes on average with each participant; and the judge's term being indefinite.

Key Component 8. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to reviewing data, reviewing program statistics, and using the results of program evaluations to modify program operations.

Key Component 9. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to requiring new drug court employees to participate in formalized training.

Key component 10. Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support, but research on this has not yet demonstrated outcomes.

Our process evaluation of the SATC in South County Santa Barbara was conducted using both interviews/surveys of staff and observations by external evaluators. That is, we:

- a. Observed staffing and courtroom procedures;
- b. Conducted self-report survey and open-ended interview questions of team members.

Our findings are detailed in the report but summarized below.

Results

Key Component #1: Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.

Support for this component was obtained both from observations of the staffing process and from reports of team members themselves. There is particular support for the impact of this component on program effectiveness in the literature. Observations made during the staffing reflected that team members discussed treatment progress as well as drug test results and compliance with program requirements. Participation by both treatment team members and criminal justice representatives were noted, and respect for each other's ideas observed. These observations were corroborated by Interviews with the team members themselves. Team members reported that the Judge valued the treatment providers' recommendations, that there was good communication between staff representing the criminal justice system and treatment providers, and decisions about participants were made collaboratively. Team members reported that among the most effective parts of the program were the team collaboration and working relationships of team members.

Key Component #2: Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' rehabilitation needs.

Team cohesion and respect for each other's viewpoints was evident in the staffing observation. This was the case for defense and prosecution, as well as for treatment and court personnel. This observation was supported by responses to the team survey that the prosecution and defense set aside their adversarial goals during the court process. Team members reported that the defense attorney and public defender maintained their traditional responsibilities but also engaged in non-traditional non-adversarial roles as part of the SATC. Research has focused on the importance of allowing clients with non-drug related charges to enter treatment. The eligibility requirements in this program include a wide range of non-violent charges. The non-adversarial process permeated all aspects of the program.

Key Component #3: Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.

During the interviews, team members reported that the District Attorney was responsible for assuring that participants met the eligibility criteria for the program, while in the surveys there was strong support for the defense and prosecution working together to determine who was eligible. In the surveys, all team members indicated that there were clear eligibility criteria for program entry while a majority, but not all, indicated that there were clear criteria about suitability as well. Although the collaborative efforts to determine eligibility by prosecution and defense would suggest facilitation of the process by which participants were able to enter the program, the promptness of identification and placement was not directly evaluated in this study.

Key Component #4: Drug courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.

The SATC was designed to utilize one primary treatment program, with two others utilized to provide specialized services for parenting women and for those with a dual-diagnosis. All were required to follow similar treatment protocols for substance abuse treatment in addition to specialized interventions, and the programs themselves

lasted 18 months. While the team was observed talking about treatment for many clients, less focus was placed on work and educational possibilities during the sessions coded. Some concerns were raised by stakeholders about the extent to which gender and culture-sensitive services were provided.

Key Component #5: Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.

The therapeutic use of frequent drug and alcohol testing was noted through observation of staffing and courtroom processing as well as through interviews and surveys with the staff. Positive and negative drug tests were discussed in the staffing; in court, the Judge reported on these findings to the clients and assigned sanctions and incentives accordingly. Interviews with team members indicated that both treatment staff and probation officers engaged in drug testing. Although specific time for receiving drug tests, which is associated with drug court effectiveness, was not addressed, team members reported that results were provided quickly and identified the intensity of drug testing as one of the effective practices of the SATC.

Key Component #6: A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance.

Stakeholders reported that rewards and sanctions were used in a graded and appropriate manner with participants. The team was observed discussing rewards and sanctions as part of the staffing, and the Judge was observed to provide both to participants as part of the court process. Judicial implementation of rewards and sanctions with participants has been identified as an effective practice. Written guidelines for administering rewards and sanctions have also been identified as an effective practice. This did not exist at the time of the observations, but was in the process of development and has since been finalized.

Key Component #7: Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential.

Observations in the court reflected a high level of activity between the participants and the Judge. He made eye contact and spoke directly to defendants; he asked questions, provided information, and assigned defendants with sanctions and rewards in response to their behaviors. In interviews, program staff described the Judge as having important relationships with clients in which he served as both a paternal figure, establishing rules, and a maternal figure, providing support. This is an important component as it is strongly related to drug court effectiveness.

Key Component #8: Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness.

Stakeholder surveys indicated that some team members were not aware of how evaluation activities were used to impact program decisions. While some members of the team had access to the yearly evaluation reports prepared for the program, others were not. This is important given data that shows that drug court programs that utilized evaluation data to improve program activities are more effective. Evaluation reports on outcomes are prepared at the end of each year and presented at a meeting of the Policy Council but not all team members attend those meetings.

Key Component #9: Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.

The stakeholders reported participation in drug court trainings. They also indicated that the court coordinator had an important role in keeping the team up to date on best practices, trainings, and grant opportunities. Finally, several team members indicated that the treatment staff were required to attend trainings on gender-specific and culture-specific interventions, although there was some disagreement among team members as to whether or not this was sufficient to meet clients' needs.

Key Component #10: Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court effectiveness.

Community involvement was addressed in the stakeholder interviews and surveys. While some of the team members agreed that community involvement was strong, others were not as sure of this. Although studies have not associated community support and media attention with reductions in recidivism, there are other advantages to community support, including fiscal support. There was sentiment among respondents of a need to obtain more community support and more media attention on the effectiveness of the program.

FUTURE SUGGESTIONS AND DIRECTIONS

- 1) The collaborative process is strong in the Santa Maria drug court and is associated with respectful and positive relationships among the key stakeholders. At least one change in key staff (the Judge) occurred shortly after the observations were conducted, however. There is a need to assure maintenance of group cohesion and collaboration beyond this change and as other staff changes occur in the future.
- 2) Team members indicated that they were not that familiar with the specific interventions clients received. More information about specific treatment protocols for clients should be addressed at team meetings.
- 3) There were differences in staff perceptions regarding how well the program specifically addressed client diversity, with some staff members believing that more could be done in terms of providing interventions that were sensitive to clients' gender and cultural diversity. The team might benefit on additional trainings on what it means to provide gender specific and culturally sensitive interventions.
- 4) Although evaluation reports on program outcomes are developed each year, they have not been shared with the treatment team per se, and have not been used by the team to make program decisions. Reports can be shared with the team in the future, and methods of utilizing the information to improve program performance discussed.
- 5) A list of sanctions and rewards was not available at the time of the observation. Although it was finalized shortly thereafter, determining the utility of this list in the drug court is an important next step for the program.
- 6) Finally, many of the program staff felt that the program would benefit from further community support. Continuing to increase community awareness of the effectiveness of the courts could benefit the programs by increasing community support and use of this resource.

Santa Barbara SATC Process Evaluation

Summary

Introduction

Process evaluations look at program implementation and address what programs are doing in relation to best practices. Data from prior studies provide support for the positive impact of drug courts when they implement facets of the 10 key components. Specifically:

Key Component 1. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to law enforcement being involved as part of the drug court team; judge, attorneys, treatment program coordinator, probation, treatment representatives, and law enforcement attending staffing; judge, attorneys, treatment representatives, probation, coordinator, and law enforcement attending court sessions; and treatment representatives keeping in contact regularly with the court.

Key Component 2. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to the drug court allowing participants to enter on non-drug related charges.

Key Component 3. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to a lapse of 50 days or less between arrest and drug court program entry, and a drug court program caseload of 125 participants or less.

Key Component 4. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to working with two or fewer treatment programs; mandating participants to attend a particular number of individual treatment sessions; offering gender-specific services, mental health treatment, parenting classes, or family/domestic relations counseling; and a minimum program length of 12 months or longer.

Key Component 5. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to drug court programs that received their drug test results back in two or fewer days.

Key Component 6. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to drug court team members being given written guidelines for administering sanctions. In addition, drug courts that did *not* allow someone other than the judge to impose sanctions on a participant outside of the court sessions saw significant reductions in participant recidivism.

Key Component 7. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to biweekly court hearings for participants in Phase 1; the judge spending 3 or more minutes on average with each participant; and the judge's term being indefinite.

Key Component 8. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to reviewing data, reviewing program statistics, and using the results of program evaluations to modify program operations.

Key Component 9. Significant reductions in recidivism were related to requiring new drug court employees to participate in formalized training.

Key component 10. Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support, but research on this has not yet demonstrated outcomes.

Our process evaluation of the SATC in South County Santa Barbara was conducted using both interviews/surveys of staff and observations by external evaluators. That is, we:

- a. Observed staffing and courtroom procedures;
- b. Conducted self-report survey and open-ended interview questions of team members.

Our findings are detailed in the report but summarized below.

Results

Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.

A collaborative spirit was reported by stakeholders, supported by observations from the evaluators. Stakeholders described a strong group process, led by the Judge, in which all voices were heard before decisions were made. Program progress, drug use, and other aspects of clients' successes and failures were discussed in the team. The collaborative process, including mutual respect, communication, and working toward a common goal, was considered one of the most effective aspects of the SATC.

Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' rehabilitation needs. Most stakeholders believed that the defense and prosecution worked well together. It was noted that they still maintained their role perspectives as protectors of public safety (prosecution) and providers of client support (defenders). Nevertheless, other team members reported that both the prosecutor and defender adapted their roles to also be effective and cooperative team members. Team cohesion and respect for each other's viewpoints was evident in the staffing observation. The only area in which some concern was noted was in determining client eligibility, with some question as to whether both the prosecutor and defense attorney were on the same page in terms of client qualifications and referrals.

Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program. The manner in which clients are referred to the SATC has improved over the past year, but still remains an area of concern. For years the number of clients referred to the SATC was very low. That number has increased this year, which is attributed both to the defense attorney encouraging clients to enter treatment, and the prosecutor finding more clients who are eligible. While stakeholders report that probation does the eligibility research, the defense attorney encourages clients, and the prosecutor checks eligibility and suitability as a gatekeeper, it appears that there is a need for more standardization of this process so that all qualified clients can receive treatment while protecting the public safety.

Drug courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services. Stakeholders positively described the quality of existing services but were concerned about the lack of affordable services. This problem has been caused, in part, by changes in the number of clients served by the program over time. While initially robust, the program became smaller and county resources for it were commensurately reduced. Thus, while there has been an increase in recent enrollment, it appears that there are currently an insufficient number of fully funded slots for all participants. Stakeholders noted the need for a greater variety of services, including residential treatment for those who did not want to participate in a religious/spiritual program, culture- and gender-specific interventions, and interventions for those with co-occurring mental illnesses.

Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing. Discussion of drug test results was a key part of staffing. Stakeholders reported that testing was done frequently by probation and treatment providers, and outcomes were reported regularly and quickly. The Judge assigned sanctions and rewards to clients based, in part, on this testing.

A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance. Stakeholders reported that rewards and sanctions were used in a graded and appropriate manner with clients. Clients' behaviors were described in detail during the staffing. Decisions on how to respond to clients were made by the team, with dispersal of rewards and sanctions part of each discussion. The Judge provided both sanctions and rewards to clients as part of the court process. The other stakeholders reported that clients valued their time with the Judge and took her responses to them seriously.

Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential. While the Judge heard all voices in the staffing, it was the Judge's voice that clients heard. The Judge had direct contact and communication with each client during their hearing. Clients looked to the Judge for praise, other rewards and sanctions. The importance of these judicial interactions with clients were noted by stakeholders and observed during the courtroom sessions.

Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness. The team indicated that they did not use data to inform program practices. It appeared that few of the team members had access to the yearly SATC outcome evaluation report presented to the Policy Council.

Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations. There was little discussion of training among stakeholders. Although some participants indicated that they had received culture-sensitivity training, others reported that they needed to do more to provide cultural sensitive treatment and wished other team members had greater understanding of clients' underlying concerns and needs.

Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court effectiveness. Most stakeholders believed that more needed to be done to obtain community support for the SATC. Stakeholders indicated a need for more positive publicity and a greater network of community resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Although the team functions well when discussing individual cases, the staffing process may benefit from having a more structured time dedicated to it. Consolidating the SATC calendar to one day, and allowing the SATC calendar to proceed uninterrupted, would focus attention from the group members, and from the community, on its importance to the community.
- 2) The program does not appear to have a dedicated coordinator. A coordinator could maintain a closer look at the team and its needs in order to provide training and other resources as concerns arise. The program would benefit from having someone whose responsibility it is to coordinate team efforts, obtain resources as needed, and communicate those efforts to stakeholders outside of the team. This would be easier to effect if there were a dedicated time for staffing.

- 3) As the number of clients in the SATC dropped during the past 10 years, there was a commensurate reduction in county resources, particularly a reduction in paid treatment slots. As the numbers increase, there should be a concomitant increase in resources to meet their growing needs.
- 4) Various stakeholders raised concern about the application of eligibility and suitability criteria to potential clients. There are several areas where this can be addressed: identification of eligible clients, accurate and fair screening for eligibility and suitability, and encouragement of those who qualify to participate. Although the increase in client numbers indicates that this is improving, stakeholders continue to note the need to standardize these procedures.
- 5) Stakeholders indicated that other than providing services in Spanish there were few program modifications related to meeting the needs of diverse clients. The team could benefit from additional resources to provide culturally-sensitive interventions to the diverse clients it serves.
- 6) Although most of the stakeholders were unaware of it, an annual evaluation report is prepared on outcomes of the SATC. It will be important to share the information gathered on the program and its effectiveness with the team so that they can use this information to improve the program.

Attachment #13 AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
14	20	319

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
18	6	191

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	110	27	137
*PRCS	20	1	21
*Parole	11	1	12

*Technical Violations Only

Planned Total Bed Day: 4410/Month (145 ADA)

Custody	4443	101%
Alternative	891	20%
Total	5334	121%

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	8	3	3
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	8	3	3

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	7	5	
PSS	18	18	

of individuals with signed waivers

This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.
5	2	3

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

8% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14 Budget</i>	<i>Expenditures as of 7/31</i>	<i>% of Funds Expended</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>			
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 199,035	8.0%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	20,964	2.4%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	178,296	6.6%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	77,519	6.9%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	30,840	1.5%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	-	0.0%
Evaluation	125,811	6,219	4.9%
Administration	365,963	19,579	5.3%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 532,452	5.3%

July 2013

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
13	17	315

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
10	5	194

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	99	28	127
*PRCS	22	1	23
*Parole	5	0	5

*Technical Violations Only

Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)

Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days
Custody	3898	88%
Alternative	901	20%
Total	4799	109%

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	7	8	5
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	7	8	5

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	6	7	
PSS	10	18	

of individuals with signed waivers

This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.
0	5	3

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

17% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14 Budget</i>	<i>Expenditures as of 8/31</i>	<i>% of Funds Expended</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>			
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 353,771	14.2%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	68,341	7.8%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	367,602	13.5%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	124,751	11.1%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	69,353	3.4%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	22,791	7.1%
Evaluation	125,811	12,659	10.1%
Administration	365,963	38,608	10.5%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 1,057,876	10.5%

August 2013

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
16	15	316

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
12	3	201

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	91	28	119
*PRCS	14	2	16
*Parole	5	1	6
*Technical Violations Only			141

Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)

Bed Days	% Planned Bed Days
Custody	3322 86%
Alternative	902 23%
Total	4224 109%

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	6	7	5
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	6	7	5

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	8	6	
PSS	12	10	
# of individuals with signed waivers			
This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.	
4	0	3	

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

25% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 9/30</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 566,992	22.7%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	126,521	14.4%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	669,504	24.7%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	199,876	17.7%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	204,238	9.9%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	46,744	14.6%
Evaluation	125,811	34,016	27.0%
Administration	365,963	69,716	19.0%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 1,917,607	19.0%

September 2013

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
19	16	319

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
10	3	208

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	99	27	126
*PRCS	13	1	14
*Parole	4	0	4
*Technical Violations Only			144

Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)

Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days
Custody	3590	81%
Alternative	861	20%
Total	4451	101%

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	7	6	6
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	7	6	6

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	12	8	
PSS	10	12	

of individuals with signed waivers

This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.
7	4	4

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

33% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 10/31</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 740,111	29.6%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	185,900	21.2%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	889,120	32.8%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	307,416	27.3%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	356,450	17.3%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	70,912	22.2%
Evaluation	125,811	42,664	33.9%
Administration	365,963	97,895	26.7%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 2,690,468	26.7%

October 2013

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
17	18	318

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
10	4	212

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	98	31	129
*PRCS	14	0	14
*Parole	6		6
*Technical Violations Only			149
Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)			
Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days	
Custody	3524	80%	
Alternative	941	21%	
Total	4465	101%	

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	3	7	5
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	3	7	5

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	4	12	
PSS	10	10	
# of individuals with signed waivers			
This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.	
2	7	5	

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

42% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 11/30</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 921,091	36.9%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	242,783	27.6%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	1,095,215	40.4%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	417,719	37.1%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	404,917	19.7%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	80,036	25.0%
Evaluation	125,811	53,294	42.4%
Administration	365,963	121,316	33.1%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 3,336,371	33.1%

November 2013

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
13	21	311

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
8	3	219

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	98	31	129
*PRCS	18	0	18
*Parole	4	0	4
*Technical Violations Only			151
Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)			
Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days	
Custody	3741	85%	
Alternative	953	22%	
Total	4465	101%	

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	2	3	5
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	2	3	5

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	2	4	
PSS	10	10	
# of individuals with signed waivers			
This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.	
6	2	5	

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

50% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 12/31</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$2,498,390	\$1,088,278	43.6%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	306,740	34.9%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	\$1,272,430	46.9%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	482,524	42.8%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	507,860	24.7%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	116,776	36.5%
Evaluation	125,811	63,481	50.5%
Administration	365,963	144,738	39.5%
Total:	\$10,085,787	\$3,982,827	39.5%

December 2013

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
18	15	314

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
11	9	218

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	89	33	122
*PRCS	18	0	18
*Parole	3	0	3
*Technical Violations Only			143
Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)			
Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days	
Custody	3444	78%	
Alternative	1037	24%	
Total	4481	102%	

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	8	2	6
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	8	2	6

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	3	2	
PSS	11	10	
# of individuals with signed waivers			
This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.	
4	6	5	

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

58% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 1/31</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 1,281,674	51.3%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	366,489	41.7%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	1,434,048	52.9%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	535,741	47.5%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	650,318	31.6%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	136,800	42.8%
Evaluation	125,811	67,844	53.9%
Administration	365,963	168,526	46.0%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 4,641,440	46.0%

January 2014

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
6	13	306

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
14	3	229

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	94	34	128
*PRCS	15	0	15
*Parole	6	2	8
*Technical Violations Only			151
Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)			
Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days	
Custody	3216	73%	
Alternative	989	22%	
Total	4205	95%	

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	8	8	7
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	8	8	7

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	9	3	
PSS	14	11	
# of individuals with signed waivers			
This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.	
4	4	5	

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

67% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 2/28</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 1,486,254	59.5%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	446,080	50.8%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	1,633,945	60.2%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	677,493	60.1%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	750,232	36.5%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	164,606	51.4%
Evaluation	125,811	87,241	69.3%
Administration	365,963	197,802	54.0%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 5,443,653	54.0%

February 2014

AB 109 Operational Impact Report

PROBATION

of individuals in
Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

Entered	Exited	Net
9	9	306

of individuals in
Post Sentence Supervision (NX3)

Entered	Exited	Net
10	8	229

SHERIFF

Incarcerated AB109 Inmates

	Custody	Alternative	Total
Sentenced	96	35	131
*PRCS	19	0	19
*Parole	7	0	7
*Technical Violations Only			157
Planned Total Bed Day: 3864/Month (127 ADA)			
Bed Days		% Planned Bed Days	
Custody	3771	86%	
Alternative	1095	25%	
Total	4866	110%	

COURTS

of Revocation Hearings conducted

	This Month	Last Month	6 mo. Avg.
Public Defender	3	8	6
Conflict Defense			
District Attorney	3	8	6

of NX3 sentences

	This Month	Last Month	
Custody only	11	9	
PSS	11	14	
# of individuals with signed waivers			
This Month	Last Month	Monthly Avg./ 6 mo.	
2	4	5	

FINANCIAL STATUS FY13-14

75% of Fiscal Year Elapsed

	<i>FY 2013-14</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>% of Funds</i>
<i>AB 109 Component</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>as of 3/31</i>	<i>Expended</i>
Jail Custody	\$ 2,498,390	\$ 1,670,406	66.9%
Detention Alternatives	878,754	533,492	60.7%
Community Supervision	2,713,135	1,932,889	71.2%
Collaborative Efforts	1,127,353	751,603	66.7%
MH, AOD, Tx	2,056,381	851,973	41.4%
Housing, Sober Living, Detox	320,000	186,039	58.1%
Evaluation	125,811	91,906	73.1%
Administration	365,963	226,714	61.9%
Total:	\$ 10,085,787	\$ 6,245,022	61.9%

March 2014

PUBLIC SAFETY REALIGNMENT IN SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY October 2011 – March 2013

Assembly Bill 109 (AB109)

The California state public safety realignment act (Assembly Bill 109; AB109) aims to more efficiently serve criminal offenders in local county probation department and sheriff offices who: (1) would have previously been housed in prison and supervised by state parole, and (2) are being released from state prison for the commission of similar types of crimes. The goal is for counties to more effectively serve eligible offenders at the local level, reduce rates of recidivism in this population, and reduce prison overcrowding. The two types of populations served under AB109 are:

Penal Code Section 1170(h). Specified felony crimes are now punishable by local corrections agencies; qualifying felonies will be served locally. This includes serving full sentences at a local jail, a split sentence through a local jail, mandatory supervision at the county level, or another county-level sentencing option. These offenders have been deemed to be non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenders (NX3) and have not committed past or present disqualifying offenses. “These NX3 offenders can be subject to a period of mandatory supervision by probation, or Post Sentence Supervision (PSS), as ordered by the Superior Court.”¹ These offenders are also often referred to as “1170(h) offenders,” and are one of the two populations served by AB109.

Establishment of local Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) agencies. PRCS agencies provide local (versus state) supervision to “parolees whose committing offense is a non-violent, non-serious felony and who are not deemed to be high risk sex offenders.”¹ Eligible offenses for participation in PRCS have been predetermined, and PRCS supervision shall not exceed 3 years. Thus, offenders who have served a prison term for an eligible offense are supervised at the local level instead of the state level upon their release from prison. This is the second of the two populations served by AB109.

The provisions of the AB109 legislation do not allow for reduced sentences for offenders or early release of offenders from prison. In addition, in the PRCS and PSS programs, enhanced supervision and referrals to community rehabilitation programs are made to help facilitate successful re-entry into the community.

Summary of Preliminary Outcomes – Overall AB109 Population

- Overall, the population of offenders in both PRCS (n=495) and 1170(h) (n=345) are predominantly male, Latino or White, and between ages 23-33 years at entry to their respective AB109 program.
- Information obtained on the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) survey at entry to county probation programs under AB109 suggests that the majority of both 1170(h) and PRCS participants scored in the *high risk* range for both recidivism and violence risk, thereby indicating that such offenders require a high level of supervision.
- It will take several years of data collection to capture the complete picture of the impact of AB109 on public safety.
- Examples of future analyses include:
 - Association between mental health needs, gang affiliation, and sex offender status and intake and exit status.
 - After controlling for risk level(s), association between various interventions and exit status as well as one-year recidivism status.

- Examination of specific probation practices, such as GPS, in more detail.

Summary of Preliminary Outcomes – PRCS

Demographics

- As of this report, 495 offenders have been referred to PRCS in Santa Barbara County upon release from prison.
- Of the 92 PRCS participants who were exited from supervision locally (i.e., excluding transfers and deportees), the number who achieved successful early termination (n=60; 65%) outnumbered those who were exited due to expiration (n=11) or deemed unsuccessful because of a new felony (n=21).
 - This appears to indicate that the PRCS program has been mostly successful, in that the offenders in the program are generally complying with the terms of their release and are not receiving new felony convictions while in PRCS
- Exited female participants (n=13) were particularly successful in PRCS, with the vast majority earning successful early termination (n=12; 92%) rather than being unsuccessful due to a new felony (n=1; 8%).
 - The low number of female offenders in PRCS in Santa Barbara County is consistent with national trends of lower numbers of female offenders overall.
- Male participants (n=79) were also more likely to earn successful early termination (n=48; 61%) than to be unsuccessful due to a new felony (n=20; 25%).

COMPAS Risk Levels

- Low risk COMPAS scores were linked with high rates of Successful Early Termination from PRCS.
 - All participants (100%) who had a low COMPAS violence risk level earned successful early termination from PRCS.
 - 91% of those who had a low COMPAS recidivism risk level achieved successful early termination, compared to 83% of those who were medium risk and 58% of those who were high risk.

Treatment and Mental Health

- Of the 495 total offenders that entered the PRCS program from October 2011 through March 2013, a minority of offenders utilized a range of treatments and services while in PRCS.
- The PRCS treatment services with the highest percentage of successful participants were Drop-In Education (n=43; 100%) and Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R; n=23, 64%).
- Most (71%) PRCS offenders who received targeted case management successfully completed an Early Termination of PRCS.
- Programs with the least percentage of offender successful completion of treatment included Batterer's Intervention Program (BIP), Clean & Sober Living, Detox, Drug & Alcohol Treatment, and Mental Health Treatment.
- The number of exited offenders with at least one psychiatric diagnosis (n=30) or who received Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Services (ADMHS; n=17) was relatively low.

Violations and Recidivism

- For all offenders in the PRCS program from October 2011 through March 2013 (n=495), almost half (45%) received violations (not including new crime convictions), with a majority receiving either one or two violations (59%).
- Of the 92 clients who exited the PRCS program with successful, unsuccessful, or expired PRCS statuses, a total of 21 offenders (23%) received new charge convictions.
 - Offenders convicted of new crimes were released from prison for an average of almost six months before their next conviction.

1170(h) Crimes and Sentences

- To date, there have been 345 separate 1170(h) entrances into the program.
 - Of all sentenced offenses for 1170(h) clients, the type of charge with the greatest number of different charges was drug possession (n=15). The type of charge with the least number of different charges was drug distribution (n=3).
 - A number of other non-drug related charges were also present, including some crimes against others and sex offender crimes
- Less than half of offenders (n=128; 41%) received a split sentence, while the other 59% received sentences of a charge(s) of jail only.
- Of the 603 total sentences received across 311 offenders, the average sentence length was 20.9 months.
 - Many offenders received more than one sentence.
 - The majority of offenders received one or two sentences.
- The 1170(h) program was designed to take several years to complete the program; further outcomes will not be available on the 1170(h) offenders until additional time has passed.