## Proposition 47 Jail In-reach Local Advisory Committee Agenda

## April 17, 2024

## https://zoom.us/j/99230924474?pwd=Y1RpMy9Ma2xQNkpvemYvK2w4Y04zUT09

## LAC Members:

🛛 Alison Lobb	🛛 Matthew Henning	🛛 Sean Kelson
🛛 David Evans	🛛 Will Gayowski	🛛 Shannon Petersen
Desiree Ohlstrom	🗆 Michael Gause	🛛 Sharmalee Rjakumaran
🛛 Elizabeth Goldman	🗆 Michael Merchen	Judge Shelly Averill
⊠Lisa Elliott	🗵 Monica Savon	⊠ Sid McColley
🛛 Lynne Slater	🗆 Nour Maxwell	□Chad McMasters
🛛 Mary-Frances Walsh	🗆 Judge Karlene Navarro	

Торіс	Key discussion points	Next Steps
Introductions	Committee members introduce themselves.	
Review of Agenda	Sid McColley gives overview of agenda and asks for any additions.	
Overview of Prop 47 Jail In-Reach Program & Purpose of LAC	Sid gives an overview of the program.	
Implementation Update: <ul> <li>Successes</li> <li>Barriers</li> <li># of Referrals</li> <li>Other data?</li> </ul>	Lisa Elliott with the Interfaith Shelter Network (IFS) In-Reach reports learning a lot of "dos" and don'ts" during this process. She has had 20 referrals to date from several different places including the public defender's office, the jail Mental Health program, the in-jail hospital, Mental Health Diversion and JMHCP. They've provided services to five clients post-release and continue to engage three of those. They're working with six clients who are currently in custody and three pending release with plan to engage post-release. They've had clients who cycle in and out of jail and are monitoring for possible future need. Lisa reports providing services such as establishing or reestablishing food stamps, Medi-cal, obtaining	

California ID, connecting clients with transitional housing programs, basic necessities (toiletries, sleeping bags, blankets, etc), bus passes/rides (shelter, intake, food bank), and assisting with SSI applications. An early barrier was clarifying which felony charges we could or could not serve. To mitigate this challenge, it was decided to adhere to the Prop 47 exclusions list. Contingency plans are in place to keep staff safety a priority. ♦ Lisa reports an improvement of

- Lisa reports an improvement of referral relationships. JMHCP will now send referrals to the IFS In-Reach (Lisa Elliott) for JMHCP clients who do not qualify for JMHCP.
- Lisa reports that IFS In-Reach has a seamless way of being aware of when a client is being released. Plans can then be made to assist those clients upon release. Clients have also reached back out when services are needed after release independently. Connecting within a week of release is crucial to successful client connection and retention.

Elizabeth Goldman expresses interest regarding when clients are released. It can be a surprise for all involved. The order comes down from court and it is executed quickly. This is a barrier for connecting people with services.

David Evans agrees with Elizabeth. Can we provide information to the client as a "Safety Plan" so they know what to do, where to go, and who to contact for services once released? Lisa responds this has been implemented and is a large

reason why we have client retention.

Elizabeth shares that Kaitlyn is aware of all bookings so that list is continually updated. Elizabeth agrees there could be a potential hole if Kaitlyn is out of the office. Elizabeth offers a line of communication between herself	zabeth asks at if Kaitlyn is it of the office, a Elliott could onnect with her keep the lines ommunication oen.
Alison thanks Elizabeth for housing Kaitlyn among the mental health jail staff. It's been a huge help to the other programs.	
<ul> <li>Lynne Slater says that unless the client calls them while at booking, they won't know the client is back in custody unless and until the court calendars them for a first appearance. She reports they're likely 48-hours out from booking before receiving that notice, so their report would be too late. She agrees Elizabeth's system is likely better than relying upon public defenders.</li> <li>David Evans talks about Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST)</li> </ul>	

Discussion	♦ Justice & Mental Health	
	Collaboration Program (JMHCP)	
	Update from Alison Lobb. Kaitlyn	
	Dunaway becoming established	
	with court/justice partners. In the	
	last quarter (Jan-Mar) there were	
	32 releases to JMHCP. They	
	recently launched a completely	
	voluntary participation survey. No	
	answers are required. The survey	
	includes fine-toothed racial	
	identification questions at the	
	end. Not many participants want	
	to complete that portion, but the	
	hope is participants will become	
	more comfortable with answering	
	those questions. Spanish version	
	coming soon.	
	Elizabeth Goldman requests	
	guidance. What are all the	
	possible avenues to help our in-	
	custody clients? How do we	
	better serve someone who is in	
	custody that is clearly suffering?	
	One pathway is to reach out to a	
	clerk to ask to move up the court	
	date to get them services more	
	quickly. Court would be unaware	
	of severity of individual. What else	
	can we do? Lynn answers; Let	
	Public Defender/ District Attorney	
	know what's going on and the	
	client can be put on calendar.	
	Depending on the severity of the	
	charges, a client could be	
	released from custody if the court	
	can be assured there will be a	
	5150 hold in place and the client	
	will be transferred to CSU. Court can consider the calendar but	
	may not be able to expedite a 1368 petition. Another possible	
	pathway is a §2602 emergency order for medication. Contact	
	County Counsel to initiate the	
	petition. Elizabeth reports doing two of those with success. Matt	
	Henning adds that just presenting	
	the information is more helpful for the prosecutor to hear and	
	consider. Lynne says it is surprising	
	how little the §2603 statute is	

	utilized. Elizabeth plans to use it where appropriate to assist clients.	
Community Q&A	No questions or comments from the community.	
Next Meeting	July 17, 2024 12:30pm	