Statewide Advisory Group Meeting

May 15, 2001

Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) Director Kathryn Jett opened the brief meeting of the Proposition 36 Statewide Advisory Group. The meeting was held in San Diego as part of the "Proposition 36 – Making It Work!" Technical Assistance Conference. Comments made by Advisory Group members were complimentary and supportive of the value of the conference.

Director Jett presented an update on the Governor's May Revision to the proposed state budget. She announced that all programs were proposed to receive an across-the-board cut. ADP is slated for a $34 million reduction. However, no cuts are proposed for the Proposition 36 program.

The Group discussed proposed Medi-Cal reductions, especially in relation to treatment possibilities.

PROPOSITION 36 IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

ADP Deputy Director Del Sayles-Owen presented an update on implementation, which included:

1. Emergency regulations were approved and distributed on April 25. ADP is operating under emergency authority. Opportunity for public testimony prior to final approval of the regulations will be announced.

2. Preliminary allocations for 2001-02 Proposition 36 funds have been sent to the counties and are available on the ADP website.

3. The public university has not been selected to do the longitudinal evaluation. It should be announced soon.

4. County Plans:
   - ADP has issued a template for the narrative portion.
   - A series of automated forms has been developed for fiscal and data capture.
   - Plans are due June 1, 2001. ADP then has fifteen working days to turn around complete plans.
   - ADP will be looking particularly at whether treatment needs are clearly addressed.

5. ADP is implementing a communications strategy for Proposition 36 implementation that is web-based as often as possible. All County Lead Agency (ACLA) Letters are transmitted to the counties electronically and then posted on the ADP website. There is now a Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) e-mail address which can be accessed through the ADP website (www.adp.ca.gov)

6. Licensing:
   - 301 applications for licensing/certification for new programs have been received since November. These are running about 4 to 1 certification to licensing.
   - 54 should be reviewed and through the system by July 1, 2001.
   - Seven counties have no submitted certification packets. This information will be provided to County Alcohol and Drug Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC) next week.

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE STATEWIDE ADVISORY GROUP

The Group briefly discussed its future role as well as the last two scheduled meetings. The Group agreed to cancel the June meeting which had been scheduled for June 13, and to hold a two-day meeting the following month. The July meeting will focus on strategic visioning and direction. It is scheduled for July 11 and 12 with the location to be determined.

CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The Cross-Jurisdictional Subcommittee presented a report from their joint meeting held with the Judicial Council's Models/Operations/Treatment Team on May 14. The report related the proposal that the groups agreed to regarding who pays for treatment when it is ordered out of the county of adjudication. It takes into account that the current transfer of probation/ supervision is problematic and may take up to 6 months to complete. The interim proposal presented was as follows:

- Treatment would take place in the county of residence and supervision would occur through the county of adjudication. The county of residence would pay for treatment – this should be acceptable since one of the factors of the allocation formula is county population. There is currently no structure

to transfer funds between counties under Proposition 36; and thus the county of residence would be accountable for the cost of treatment.

- The county of residence would do the assessment for treatment and supervision, and would communicate with the court of the county of adjudication.

- Treatment and supervision would not be in the same place. The county of residence would be responsible for assessment and level of treatment. The court of the county of adjudication would retain responsibility and authority for supervision.

ADP staff was asked to distribute the minutes from the Subcommittee to all of the Statewide Group members and to solicit input.