

**Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA)
STATEWIDE ADVISORY GROUP MEETING SUMMARY
December 13, 2002**

Welcome and Director's Update

On behalf of Kathryn P. Jett, Director, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP), Les Johnson, Deputy Director, welcomed the Statewide Advisory Group attendees. Les Johnson updated attendees on recent developments affecting the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA), including:

Mid-Year Budget Reduction Proposals

- Last week the Governor announced his mid-year spending reductions and highlighted the fact that California's budget situation remains very challenged.
- More than \$10 billion in budget cuts are being proposed in an effort to close a two-year budget shortfall that could exceed \$21.1 billion.
- Budget cuts for ADP totals \$1.5 million dollars.

SACPA Annual Report

- The Proposition 36 First Annual Report is complete, and as mandated, has been provided to the California Legislature.
- Copies of the Executive Summary are distributed as part of the meeting materials and the entire report is online at www.adp.ca.gov.

Co-occurring Substance Abuse and Mental Disorders Report

- Federal Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy G. Thompson submitted to Congress a report on co-occurring substance abuse and mental disorders on December 2, 2002.

Recent Conferences and Meetings

- On November 18 - 19th, 2002, at the Sacramento Radisson Inn, the Department sponsored the Youth Vista Conference.
- On November 19 - 20th, 2002, at the Sacramento Convention Center, the Department sponsored the Substance Abuse Research Consortium.
- On November 2 - 6, 2002, the Department sponsored the California Prevention Summit & Prevention Research Conference.

- On October 24 and 25, 2002, Los Angeles, the Department participated in the 9th Annual Conference On Behavior, Clinical Neuroscience, Substance Abuse And Culture.

Check-In and Program Updates

Program updates from the Advisory Group were provided. Key points and comments included:

Funding and Capacity

- Counties, particularly small and medium sized, are concerned with preserving the existing allocation amounts received to ensure services can be delivered. Although there are reports of alcohol and other drug (AOD) treatment capacity increases since passage of Proposition 36, there is a great deal of interest in how the capacity is utilized, and where this capacity exists.
- Some counties are experiencing capacity shortages and are using waiting lists until treatment appropriate for the client's assessed needs becomes available, as a means of dealing with the shortage. An additional stress on AOD treatment systems is the displacement of the voluntary treatment population due to the influx of the SACPA and other mandated client populations. Some counties are reporting erosion of AOD treatment capacity.
- There is concern that the data in the annual report for SACPA shows that while 32 percent of SACPA clients' drug of choice is heroin, only eleven percent of clients are placed in methadone treatment programs.
- It is critical to continue efforts aimed at maximizing funding options across the various resources to place and retain clients in treatment for as long as treatment is needed. Outreach to private organizations and faith-based initiatives to support AOD treatment is one way to address the funding and capacity issues.
- The need to provide training and technical assistance to Judges, counties, and providers to meet the many challenges continues to be unmet.

Workforce Issues

- The criminal justice systems, counties, and providers continue to experience workforce shortages, particularly in light of the high numbers of people reaching retirement age.

- This continues to challenge people in occupations where caseloads continue to grow.

Collaborative Efforts

- Working out cross-jurisdictional issues in advance with other counties when making transferring clients has been very helpful and continued work on facilitating transfers is needed.
- The Native American Indian community progress and inroads to the SACPA system are slow. Native American clinics are getting certified, however there are no clients referred yet. This is a concern and they would like to see referral agencies consider treatment placement based on culture and refer clients for culturally relevant services.

Public Perception and Trends

- In the last election, efforts to pass other initiatives relative to drug offenses were made. Two of five ballot items were modeled after Proposition 36, however they did not pass. People will be looking at California's successes and failures in using treatment instead of incarceration for drug offenders.
- It was noted that what California has done so far is remarkable. While Proposition 36 is saving money, providers have challenged us to look at licensing issues, counseling and best practices in serving this population.

Parolee Subcommittee Update

The last meeting of the Parolee Subcommittee Meeting was held on October 25, 2002 at the Board of Prison Terms. The Agenda Action Items included:

1. An Update on the Parolee Process Redesign
 - The All County Lead Agency Letter 02-14, which described the process redesign implementation in detail, was distributed.
 - An update on the progress of the redesign implementation was provided.

The written protocol, with revised forms is complete and all impacted parole staff received training.

2. Substance Abuse Services Coordinating Agency (SASCA) Interface
 - The goal is to develop and implement a referral process from SASCA to Proposition 36 county services to ensure service continuity when a

Proposition 36 parolee exhausts SASCA services but the need for services continues.

- A small focus group comprised of ADP, Office of Substance Abuse Programs (OSAP), and SASCA providers will examine the various service need scenarios and design a referral protocol accordingly.
- Once drafted, the protocol will be presented to the full subcommittee for review and comment.

3. Mental Health Screening and Referral Information Update

- The goal is to implement for local use a Mental Health Information and Screening Tool to ensure that parolees in need of such services are referred via their Parole Officer to such services. Members agreed to form a small workgroup to modify the forms, and then present the revised tool to a small focus group for comment. Once final, the tool will be presented to the full Subcommittee for review and comment.

4. The Next Meeting of the Subcommittee will be held in February, concurrent with the Making It Work Conference, in San Diego.

Evaluation Update

Larry Carr, Ph.D., with the Office of Applied Research and Analysis provided an update to the Statewide Advisory Group members on the long term evaluation and the recent activities and accomplishments of the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG).

- The EAG has increased the frequency of meetings to monthly. The next meeting of the EAG is scheduled for December 18, 2002 and there is an opportunity for interested Statewide Advisory Group members to participate.

New members welcomed to the EAG are John Lovell representing the California Narcotic Officers Association (CNOA) and Scott Thorpe from the Attorney General's Office. The schedule of meetings and minutes of the meetings will be posted on the EAG's Internet website.

The membership of the EAG has organized itself into subgroups by field of expertise for the purpose of mapping the evaluation research questions to data sources.

The stakeholder survey is about 74 percent complete. The survey is an annual assessment tool used to determine what is working, what needs to be improved, and what has been learned from experience to date. The 2002 research report is expected to be delivered to the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs by December 31, 2002.

Statewide Advisory Group members expressed a number of concerns and comments regarding the evaluation, including:

- The importance of getting feed back from focus groups.
- Assuring that treatment providers are appropriately represented in surveys and related evaluation activities.
- Concern that the research questions do not identify or quantify the benefits of treatment versus incarceration. For example, measuring the cost savings or cost avoidance in terms of jail and prison days avoided.
- The need for research to measure the benefits of treatment for this population.
- The need to assure the evaluation audiences clearly understand the similarities and differences of comparison groups whenever such groups are used in the evaluation.
- The “thinness” of data produced to date. The data must be more robust and rich to really tell the SACPA story.
- There is a need to understand the complexity and the process of the Statewide Advisory Group and EAG roles with respect to the evaluation.

In response to the comments of the Statewide Advisory Group members, Dr. Carr agreed to share information from the focus groups.

The Statewide Advisory Group was asked to keep in mind that:

- The mechanisms and processes used in the evaluation allow for feedback at every step.
- There are clear and in-depth explanations available of who is in the comparison groups.
- Evaluation updates and documents are designed to reflect where the EAG and evaluation activities are in the process. While there is some ability to

refine as work progresses, the evaluation process cannot be put on hold or delayed.

Program and Policy Update

Del Sayles-Owen, Deputy Director, Office of Criminal Justice Collaboration, presented a summary overview of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) of 2000 Annual Report to the Legislature. The report discusses the challenges and accomplishments of the first year, as well as provide some preliminary findings for the first six months of program implementation. This includes:

Challenges & Accomplishments

The challenges and accomplishments of the first year of SACPA implementation include:

- A brief start-up period for statewide implementation.
- The initiative is operational in all 58 counties.
- Implementation received a statewide collaborative effort.
- New partnerships between universities and private foundations were established.
- SB 223 provided \$8.4 million in federal funds for drug testing.
- Long-term evaluation is underway by UCLA to evaluate program outcomes.

Preliminary Findings for the First Six Months of Program Implementation

The annual report answers some important questions about this first six month period, including:

How many SACPA offenders were referred from criminal justice to treatment admission?

- Based on the twelve largest counties, an estimated 12,000 were placed in treatment, representing approximately 60 percent of those referred.
- Various reasons exist for difference between those referred and placed. Counties plan to address barriers.

How did the service delivery system respond to the anticipated increase in the demand for services?

- Licensed or Certified Programs 42 percent Increase
- Licensed Residential Facilities 17 percent Increase
- Certified Outpatient Programs 81 percent Increase

What do SACPA clients admitted to treatment look like?

Referral Source:

- Parole 7 percent
- Probation 93 percent

Age at Admission

- Under 21: 10 percent
- 21 – 25: 10 percent
- 26 – 30: 3 percent
- 31 – 35: 18 percent
- 36 – 40: 20 percent
- 41 – 45: 16 percent
- 46 – 50: 8 percent
- 51 – 55: 3 percent
- 55+: 2 percent

Primary Drug of Choice

- Heroin 11 percent
- Alcohol 10.5 percent
- Methamphetamine 46.4 percent
- Cocaine/Crack 15.1 percent
- Marijuana 11.2 percent
- Other 2.9 percent

How much was spent for SACPA purposes?

- In the twelve largest counties, fifteen percent of the \$124.6 million available was spent during the first six months.

- Total funds available included \$38.9 million in carryover funds from the previous year.

In conclusion ADP is trying to summarize the twelve-month data by March 2003 and the report to the legislature will incorporate the UCLA data.

Concern regarding the displacement of non-SACPA clients was voiced. In some counties, Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) treatment capacity is actually being lost. Members questioned how capacity is actually utilized across the state and for whom.

There is concern that the data in the annual report for SACPA shows that while 32 percent of SACPA clients' drug of choice is heroin, only eleven percent of clients are placed in methadone treatment programs. This raised questions regarding access SACPA clients have to narcotic replacement therapy.

A concern regarding the delay in issuing the first annual report was expressed, particularly since so much widespread interest exists regarding the early experience of SACPA.

Due to time constraints, the remainder of the Program and Policy update was deferred.

University of California, San Diego Technical Assistance Plan

Melinda Hohman, Ph.D., California State University San Diego presented an update to the Statewide Advisory Group on the progress of the technical assistance plan in development by the University of California, San Diego and funded by the California Endowment. To date, Focus Groups with representation from each county have been established. Using a standardized interview protocol, focus groups were asked to respond to a set of questions relating to technical assistance needs. Examples of the questions include:

- What are the type of problems and concerns when implementing?
- What would you like to see - such as in training and resources?

As a result of the interviews, some overall trends are emerging:

- Counties are asking for direction in implementation.
- Counties are experiencing workforce problems, particularly in finding qualified staff and service providers, as well as training resources.
- Counties are encountering issues with data systems and have training and technical assistance needs relative to data management.

As work progresses, additional information on the technical assistance plan and implementation will be made available.

Next Meeting

The next meeting dates for the Statewide Advisory Group are:

March 21, 2003
May 30, 2003

July 11, 2002
October 3, 2003