



AB109 Realignment Update

Prepared for the
California Mental Health Planning Council



A Year Later

4 Counties Participated in the Forum

- Los Angeles County
- San Mateo
- Santa Clara
- Stanislaus

3 Main Agencies Involved in Realignment and Forum

- County Sheriff's Dept
- Probation Department
- Mental Health Departments



How Monies are Allocated

38% to Sheriff's – Mainly for jail operations

32% to Probation – Supervision of parolees

11% to Programs and Services (mental health, substance abuse, housing and employment)

9% to All other services

Unanticipated Outcomes

High Cost of Parole Revocations –

There is a big disconnect because the state has the authority to revoke parole but the counties bear the burden of incarcerating them and thereby taking away needed jail beds for AB109 participants.

Split Sentencing – It was unanticipated but was generally praised.

Complex Health Needs –

- Over 50% of realignment population has problems with drugs or alcohol
- Did not anticipate the high physical health care needs (many needed skilled nursing care).
- Unanticipated transportation needs Related issues such as transportation to and from appointments, or wheelchair accessible vehicles, also presented logistical challenges.
- Loss of medical insurance coverage due to the incarceration, which takes a significant amount of time and effort to reinstate.
- It would be easier to put both substance abuse and mental health funding in the hands of the county.

Collaboration with Other Agencies

Communication from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation was praised as being forthcoming, but in some instances the reliability of the information was criticized.

Overall, counties felt that the handoffs between counties and amongst county departments were more seamless than the handoffs between CDCR and the counties.

One participant suggested that the gaps that have occurred can be lessened or eliminated altogether by increasing "Initiative and understanding among organizations" in order to encourage more thoughtful and open communications.

Measuring Outcomes

California Penal Code Section 1232

Commencing no later than 18 months following the initial receipt of funding pursuant to this act and annually thereafter, the Administrative Office of the Courts, in consultation with the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Department of Finance, and the Chief Probation Officers of California, shall submit to the Governor and the Legislature a comprehensive report on the implementation of this act. The report shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following information:

- The effectiveness of the community corrections program based on the reports of performance-based outcome measures required in Section 1231.
- (b) The percentage of felony probationers whose probation was revoked for the year on which the report is being made.
- (c) The percentage of felony probationers who were convicted of crimes during their term of probation for the year on which the report is being made.
- (d) The impact of the moneys appropriated pursuant to this act to enhance public safety by reducing the percentage and number of felony probationers whose probation was revoked for the year being reported on for probation violations or new convictions, and to reduce the number of felony probationers who are sent to prison for the year on which the report is being made.
- (e) Any recommendations regarding resource allocations or additional collaboration with other state.

Measuring Outcomes cont'd

- AB 109 spelled out very clearly that counties are expected to provide copious data.
- Although the requirements for data are specified in AB 109, consequences for not supplying the required data and reports are not.
- Most of the counties were in the process of establishing a reporting system, and some already had a system in place for collecting, evaluating, and reporting data. Santa Clara, in particular, had a robust process in place through a partnership with Stanford Law School.
- LA County is reviewing the possibility of partnering with UCLA and the RAND Corp for establishing a reporting system.

Recommendations by the Council

- **Health Conditions – Physical , Mental, and Substance Use Disorder**
The Administration needs to clarify funding sources to counties so they can provide the services for this often aging and "high needs" population. The Council also cautions against an over-reliance on Medi-Cal and Low Income Health Program services, whose needs assessments were based on numbers that preceded the Post-Release Supervision.
- **Training Needs for Community Partners**
POST-Training should include educating street cops and first responders on available services for parolees. Additionally, school personnel should be trained on recognizing and referring for trauma services for children of incarcerated and post-release individuals.
- **Related Supportive Services**
Community Corrections Partnership panel should include a parolee who has successfully rehabilitated and a family member so that proposed services can be considered from informed perspectives.
