

**Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA)  
STATEWIDE ADVISORY GROUP MEETING SUMMARY  
October 29, 2003**

**Welcome**

Kathryn Jett, Director, Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) welcomed the Statewide Advisory Group and introduced Sherri Gauger, the new Deputy Director, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs.

Director Jett shared that the transition team for the Governor-Elect will meet with ADP on October 30, 2003. She plans to brief the transition team on Proposition 36, further details will not be available until after November 17, 2003. Director Jett noted that Proposition 36 has come a long way since the first year where rules were set and the framework developed.

**UCLA Evaluation – Law Enforcement Issues**

Les Johnson, Assistant Director, ADP, shared information from the Criminal Justice Workshop held at the SACPA County Lead Agency Implementation Meeting (CLAIM). The panel included Judges, the District Attorney's Office, Probation, the Sheriff's Department, and Paroles. Johnson gave details on the overall comments made by the panel members:

- Consider measuring success, not failures;
- What probation measures is based on three factors: Safety, Accountability and Treatment;
- A primary concern is public safety; and
- Communication and sharing is very important with more involvement of line law enforcement officers being of added value.

**Evaluation Update**

Larry Carr, Ph.D, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Applied Research and Analysis, provided members with an update on the UCLA Evaluation as it relates to law enforcement issues and

questions. Carr noted that time is needed to allow the participants to move through the system. Conversely, about 16 months are needed to assimilate information from the various state administrative databases. Specifically, criminal justice focus areas of the evaluation design include:

- ✓ Revocation
- ✓ Officially reported crimes
- ✓ Self-reported crimes
- ✓ Overall crime trends

The first report to be issued by UCLA addressing these items will be released January 2005. UCLA will use the 2004 data. Carr stated that although interim reports can be generated, the more time given to UCLA to complete the study, the more accurate the overall picture will be. Doug Longshore, UCLA, commented that Focus Counties are sending incomplete data and there is a need for them to turn in the missing data more quickly.

Officially reported crimes can be retrieved from the Department of Justice (DOJ) and be provided earlier than the 2005 date, as can revocation and overall crime trends. Self-reported crime is done by offender survey, and that will not be implemented until 2004. Carr also noted an additional cost impact associated with interim reports. There is a cost associated with every database inquiry that is requested; and that prudence must be exercised when requesting information.

**Member's questions and comments included:**

- There is a need to discuss data sooner rather than later. Members agreed that whatever data is available it should be used. It was recognized that data from the DOJ may not be timely.
- Some members suggested recidivism data from individual counties could be used to produce a snapshot. It was also observed that locals prefer and trust their own data. However, some members believe that ADP's release of data would be more effective and widespread.
- Members agreed that use of the evaluation's ten focus counties to tell how many have completed Proposition 36 or how many have completed probation might also be beneficial. Judge Luna noted that she has data which shows that 72 percent of Los Angeles County's participants have not re-offended.
- Judge Manley explained how Santa Clara County has already compiled data that included number of participants who have completed the program, noting that it is possible to track the client for a year and determine the number of new arrests.

- Sacramento County shared that the county completed a pre-Proposition 36 comparison of like-crimes; looking at graduates and all aspects of their treatment (graduates vs. drop-out rates).
- There was concern expressed that it is difficult to measure the Proposition 36 impact on statewide crime trends as there are too many variables that effect crime rates. Other factors may include unemployment, funding, and changes in law enforcement staffing.
- Members also noted the importance of addressing public safety and crime data associated with drug use.

Law enforcement needs to be assured that the evaluation will cover the impact of Proposition 36 on crime. Director Jett concluded that it is critical to continue to dialogue with law enforcement on the evaluation design at both the state and local levels.

### **SACPA ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY**

Del Sayles-Owen, Deputy Director, ADP, Office of Criminal Justice Collaboration, shared that work on compiling the data necessary to analyze allocation methodologies has begun. The next Fiscal Workgroup meeting is scheduled for November 20, 2003, and they will discuss alternative allocation formulas. The issue of counties holding reserves will also be discussed with the workgroup. There will be a presentation from the Fiscal Workgroup at the next Statewide Advisory Group's meeting scheduled for December 12, 2003, on the outcome of the Fiscal Workgroup meeting.

It was noted that changes to the allocation would require a regulation change that would have to be done immediately in order to effect the Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 allocation. An option discussed was to issue a "proposed" formula to the counties with a preliminary allocation for planning purposes only.

The major concern expressed by members is that at the end of FY 2005-06 clients could be pulled from treatment without the opportunity to complete their treatment. They conveyed an interest in exploring strategies to address service continuity.

### **STRATEGIES FOR CONTINUED PROPOSITION 36 FUNDING**

Members discussed the future of the program when the funding sunsets. They expressed a need to have data on the impacts of the program to inform decision makers. Also noted was the need to identify any statutory changes that would improve the effectiveness of the program should the funding be reauthorized. The fact that any changes that do not further the purpose of the Act be done by a vote of the people was raised.

Director Jett stated that the Statewide Advisory Group could continue to have discussions on how we can improve Proposition 36. She also commented that this is an Association-based committee; therefore the Associations should consult with their respective Associations and report back to the Statewide Advisory Group at the next meeting. Director Jett also commented on the importance that all the partners: treatment, the Public Defenders, District Attorneys, Sheriff's etc. need to be involved in this effort. She committed that ADP will have discussions for how to improve technical assistance.

### **Next Steps for the Statewide Advisory Group**

Members requested the following items be the focus of the agenda for the December 12, 2003 meeting:

1. Allocations Methodology
2. Report back by Association by on continued funding
3. Parolee Subcommittee Update

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:35 pm.