**Proposition 47 Jail Inreach Local Advisory Committee Notes**

October 18, 2023

<https://zoom.us/j/97397696529?pwd=eUU2eENRYmxBS2R1Y0VGTWpNZmI0dz09>

LAC Members:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [ ] Alison Lobb | [x] Mary-Frances Walsh | [x]  Orlando O’Shea |
| [x] David Evans | [ ] Matthew Henning | [ ]  Sean Kelson |
| [ ] Desiree Ohlstrom | [ ] Melissa Struzzo | [x]  Shannon Petersen |
| [x] ~~James Alexander~~*Michael Gause* | [x] Michael Merchen | [x]  Sharmalee Rajakumaran |
| [ ] Jessica Raak | [x] Monica Savon | [ ] Judge Shelly Averill |
| [x] Lynne Slater | [ ]  Nour Maxwell | [x] Sid McColley |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Key discussion points | Next Steps |
| Introductions | * Agenda Overview
* Introductions with Agency & Interests
* Strong interest in preventing recidivism & enabling people to live independent lives by providing needed treatment and support.
* Many panel members have lived experiences with friends/family members/self.
* Missing some folks: HSD, WCCS, Well Path, D.A.’s Office, Courts will hopefully join next time.
 |  |
| Project overview | * SLIDE SHOW
* We have done a lot of this work already, per requirements.
* We are a Stepping Up County (National initiative started about 10 years ago.)
* Have been meeting every 2 months.
* All about getting people with mental illness out of the criminal justice system/out of jail.
* Prop 47 requirements (see slide.)
* 2018 workshop with consultant and many stakeholders – objectives on slide.
 | * Share slides on website
 |
| SIM Overview and Map | * Six Intercepts on slide - points at which individuals intercept with the criminal justice system, and where interventions could make a difference.
* Map from 2018 Workshop on slide – much has already changed.
* Looking at options for bringing people into support systems instead of the jail/criminal justice system.
* Identified Gaps & set priorities – see slide.
* Initiatives since 2018 have been filling some gaps – see slide.
* Sid & David working on application for DSH funding for housing.
* JMHCP funding, now continuing with Measure O funding, Case Management for pre-trial release.
* Desiree Ohlstrom from Enhanced Care Management unable to join us today but will be involved in these discussions going forward.
* Not comprehensive – we still have a lot of gaps to fill. This Advisory Committee will help on the Prop 47 piece.
 |  |
| BSCC Grant Requirements | * Thank you to everyone for bringing your expertise.
* See all grant requirements on slide.
* David has been doing a lot of work on setting up data collection and reporting.
* Grant is three-year, hope to find a way to continue funding successful programs.
* Jail In-Reach Program Design – see slide.
* Not just for people with mental illness, also for people with substance use disorder.
* Aimed at people who are not being reached by existing programs – we have a number of very good programs in place – some people don’t want to engage in any of these existing programs.
* People have good reasons for being reluctant to engage, so this program will have work to do to build trust, focusing on THEIR goals and objectives and building relationships.
* Building relationships takes time.
* Program goals & objectives – see slide.
 |  |
| Current status | * Current Status, see slide – Interfaith Shelter Network will be a very valuable partner. Well Path, JMHCP staff, and FACT/Diversion evaluator will provide referrals. RDA Consulting will support planning and reporting.
 |  |
| Local Evaluation Plan | * Local Evaluation Plan (required) – see slide – we wrote it in March, subject to revision. Available on website: [<https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Sonoma-County-Local-Evaluation-Plan.pdf>](https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Sonoma-County-Local-Evaluation-Plan.pdf)
 |  |
| PanelDiscussion | * Lynne S: What messaging has been given to the Bench Officers? Larger training to all the officers?
* Sid: Great Idea – how do we get that started?
* Lynne: Email Judge Averill
* Orlando: Clarifying Q: Ideally, staff would be going into the jail to meet with individuals; would they be going to any Court proceedings with them?
* Sid: Great idea – we haven’t planned that yet, but if we have the bandwidth, it’s worth discussion. Let’s bookmark it for now with a plan to revisit.
* Monica: We are just looking at the beginning of this program – Let’s see how the connection goes and be led by the needs and state of mind of the individual. Some may want to be accompanied to court proceedings, but we don’t want to necessarily be associated with the court or to be seen as antagonistic to certain procedures.
* Orlando: When I was working in the jail, we would go into the Court with a plan, and often the Judge would be really happy about the plan.
* David: This is more an extensive, prolonged, discharge plan: brokerage, linkage, connection to resources. We build the relationship towards eventually/hopefully individual being willing to engage in treatment.
* David to Lynne: Regardless of the program, what language can we use to communicate that this individual (saying no) will be referred to the new Jail In-Reach Program?
* Lynne: I’m hoping that we can get connection early – one or two months is too long.
* David – Let’s get the referral as soon as someone refuses treatment.
* Lynne: When someone is in court on someone’s behalf, we can get them in early (avoid you sitting there until 11:30 every morning.)
* Mary-Frances: I’ll make sure to make family members aware of these programs, which will give hope.
 | * Contact Judge Averill to discuss how best to communicate this program to Court Officers.
* Save idea of Jail In-Reach Workers accompanying individuals to Court for future discussions.
* Work out referral procedures, including communication with courts.
 |
| Community Q&A  | Q: Brian K: I appreciate the care and attention to this need. My experience is that two people can experience the same event in very different ways. Important to bridge the gap between people who have had bad experiences and the people trying to provide care. I want this to work for everybody. Sid: Is there a particular way that you’d be involved in this project?Brian K: I’d like to spend time defining my role.Sid: Let’s have a conversation about it. That lived experience perspective is key when we are creating a project like this. Thank you.Meghan M: So excited about this project. Will be in touch to clarify referral procedures.Sid: I do want the Advisory Committee to be flexible to adapt to the needs: how will it work best, what will it look like.  A lot of Counties piggyback the Advisory Committee meeting onto the Stepping Up meeting. Meetings will be posted well in advance on our website (SCBH)Lynne: Timeline for launch?Monica: Our Program Manager, Kelly McAnelly, is in place. We have some staffing ready to go – Kelly?Kelly: Yes, some in approval process, some already approved. Next step is referrals.Lynne: I can start working on referrals, coming in through IMDT meeting?David: Yes, we can start stockpiling names of good candidates.Lynne: Will we need the Universal ROI signed?David: This will be nuanced – we can bring them up on IMDT only with signed ROI, but referrals can come through me without.Sid: Kelly already sent over a draft referral form, we’ll look at it this afternoon, David.Orlando: Maybe before there’s direct client contact, it’s really important to make sure that the cultural competency is in place. We need to be sure not to re-traumatize people of color, LGBTQIA+, etc. | * Sid and Brian discuss Brian’s role moving forward.
* Sid, David, and Kelly finalize referral form.
* Sort out ROI questions.
* Get referrals going ASAP.
* Establish clear guidelines for cultural competency prior to inmate contact.
 |
| Next Meeting | January 17, 2024,12:30 pm\*Details and Zoom link will be on Sonoma County BH website\* |  |