



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Date: Monday, July 23, 2018

In attendance:

(Listed in alphabetical order by last name)

Co-Chairs	Barbara Garcia (SFDPH, Director of Health), George Gascón (SFDA, District Attorney), Bill Scott (SFPD, Chief of Police)
Committee Members	Jeff Adachi (Public Defender's Office), Joe Calderon (Workgroup to Re-envision the Jail Replacement Project), Angela Coleman (Reentry Council), Karen Fletcher (Adult Probation Department), Lt. Gil Lopez (BART Police, <i>alternate for Carlos Rojas</i>), Theshia Naidoo (Sentencing Commission), Kyriell Noon (Glide Foundation), Al Gilbert (Felton Institute), Ali Riker (Sheriff's Department, <i>alternate for Vicki Hennessy</i>), Laura Thomas (Drug Policy Alliance)
Attendees	Tara Anderson (SFDA), Danny Balzer (Glide), Nicole Brooks (DPH), Frank Castro (Glide), Faith Fabiani (DPH), Britt Gunnertoft (Glide), Tal Klement (Public Defender's Office), Maria McKee (SFDA), Jason Norelli (Glide), Curtis Penn (Felton Institute), Daniel Perea (SFPD), Armando Sandoval (BART police), Simin Shamji (Public Defender's Office), Rani Singh (SFDA), Tiffany Sutton (SFDA), Carolyn Tingzon (Public Defender's Office), Cristel Tullock (SFAPD), Joe Williams (Glide)
LEAD SF Project Team	Angelica Almeida (DPH), Robin Candler (DPH) – on the phone, Maggie Hodges (Harder+Company Community Research), Michelle Magee (Harder+Company Community Research), Aili Malm (CSU Long Beach), Julianne Perez (Harder+Company Community Research), Danielle Toussaint (HTA)

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
Welcome & Opening Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Michelle Magee welcomed the committee and guests, and provided an overview of the agenda. Co-Chairs provided opening remarks. 	
Quarterly Communication Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Angelica Almeida provided a quarterly update, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An update that the Operational Workgroup is now alternating their meetings between the Mission and Tenderloin stations in an effort to demonstrate commitment to collaboration. 2. A reminder that information regarding those meetings and other developments can be found in the Quarterly Updates to the Policy Committee and Monthly Demographic Reports. 3. A review of past and upcoming trainings, including a site visit by Seattle Police Officers on 6/29/2018. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Refer to LEAD SF website for the presentation (references specific trainings, and recent demographics); Materials to be posted to website
Program Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Angelica Almeida provided updates on program progress, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A real time implementation update based on discussions during the site visit by Seattle Police officers that took place 6/29/2018, which involves a change in tactics around offering feedback on pre-booking referrals, and is meant to create the opportunity for police officers to become more comfortable with the program. 2. Data on pre-booking/social contact referrals, referrals by agency, service connections, and demographics was reviewed. 3. A review of the expansion of charges approved at the April 23rd meeting. ■ Tal Klement, Tiffany Sutton, and Commander Daniel Perea presented and discussed an analysis of LEAD referrals and arrests and bookings for LEAD eligible offenses (based on charge type) from April through July 2018 in the identified districts. Highlights from the discussion included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns were raised about the racial demographics of referrals to LEAD, which do not match 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation; Materials to be posted to website ■ Operational Workgroup will continue to discuss the parameters of drug sales for subsistence in order to clarify the definition of a LEAD participant for officers. This topic will be revisited at the next Policy Committee meeting if needed. The Organizational



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	<p>racial disparities in San Francisco’s criminal justice system. The group discussed this concern which will continue to be an ongoing topic at the Policy Committee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. An uptick in pre-booking felony referrals this quarter was highlighted, and presenters shared that a portion of these 6 referrals were based on charges from the expanded criteria. 3. Attendees discussed examining data regarding admissions to emergency rooms for drug overdoses and other data on drug use to better understand the demographics of drug users. 4. Concern was raised that one reason why LEAD eligible individuals are not referred is that the CASC is not open at the time of the encounter, and so further discussion may be needed regarding handling drug offenses after hours. 5. Attendees noted the need to establish the meaning of drug sales for subsistence to clarify the definition of a LEAD participant for officers, as well as the importance of continuing to discuss overall eligibility criteria for LEAD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Committee members and attendees raised additional questions/comments and engaged in discussion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Question: What is happening to the individuals who are referred to LEAD but are not becoming active participants? 2. Question: Do the demographics of the referrals reflect the demographics of drug users in the City and County of San Francisco? What does success look like in regards to addressing racial disparities—should the proportion of different demographic groups among the referrals match the proportion of those groups in the community? 3. Question: Is there a way we could make incident reports more robust to include substance abuse issues? 4. Comment: There is a need to continue addressing the issue and logistics of how to handle outstanding warrants, which don’t exclude individuals from LEAD eligibility but can contribute to them not being referred. 5. Comment: Of drug sale felony cases reviewed after not being referred to LEAD, many had to do with weight or occurrence in a school zone. Most of the Tenderloin falls within a school zone, so it may be worth considering removing this and weight as disqualifying criteria. 6. Comment: We must keep in mind that LEAD is only going to service a certain number of people. We should continue to review case by case rather than completely removing qualifying criteria. 7. Comment: Police officers will continue to make referrals that don’t meet LEAD criteria for consideration. 8. Comment: Criteria for LEAD eligibility should be based around the question of whether including an individual in LEAD will reduce their recidivism. 	<p>Workgroup will also consider additional training or orientation materials that can serve this purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ DPH/LEAD Planning Team to follow up with CASC. ■ Operational Workgroup, Policy Committee, and attendees of Parking Lot meetings will continue to discuss barriers to referring eligible individuals based on incoming data and information. ■ The LEAD Planning team will follow up on obtaining additional data related to substance use in San Francisco and will provide this to the Policy Committee. ■ The LEAD Policy Committee will continue to have discussions based on data from the program in order to inform any changes/considerations for ongoing programmatic operation.



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
Evaluation Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Aili Malm provided an update on the state evaluation, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A procedural change to their survey incentives that they hope will boost client participation. 2. A review of preliminary themes regarding successes and challenges, based on data gathered so far from focus groups, interviews and client surveys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Positive perceptions among clients of participating partners, including law enforcement, and early indications of enhanced well-being among participants. ○ A sense of improved stakeholder investment. ○ Concern among partners that many procedural issues are being added to the parking lot with a lack of follow-up and resolution. ○ Concern among police officers and case managers about a sense of pressure and a lack of autonomy. 3. An overview of the elements of the upcoming Fidelity Assessment, the results of which will be shared at the October Policy Committee meeting, and which will consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mid-term program assessment on whether SF LEAD is following stated procedures and progressing toward stated goals. ○ Further insights on data gathered from client surveys, focus groups, Policy Committee meetings, client data, and health outcome data. ■ Danielle Toussaint provided an update on the local evaluation, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of data trends on six client outcomes from November 2017 through March 2018. Trends identified include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A gradual decrease in percentage of clients who are homeless. ○ No net change in percentage of clients who are receiving public benefits. ○ No consistent change in percentage of clients with medical coverage. ○ A gradual shift in the distribution of clients toward reporting greater safety. ○ A gradual shift in the distribution of clients toward reporting lower severity of mental health issues, and less substance use and related harm. 2. This information was gathered from a combination of baseline data and 30 and 90 day follow-up assessments, but the data does not represent a consistent cohort of clients over time. A cohort study is planned for the future. Another limitation acknowledged is small sample sizes. ■ Committee members and attendees raised additional questions/comments and engaged in discussion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Question: Are there any other studies on LEAD that are further along, in Seattle, for example? Are these findings consistent with what other sites have seen? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The LEAD Planning Team referenced the LEAD SF website (https://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/leadSF/Law-Enforcement-Assisted-Diversion-SF.asp) and LEAD National Support Bureau website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation; Materials to be posted to website ■ The Operational Workgroup and Policy Committee will work to ensure follow-up on parking lot issues and will encourage members to attend the meetings. ■ The LEAD Planning team will work with research partners to develop an up-to-date timeline matrix of evaluation activities and data reporting, and share with LEAD stakeholders.



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	<p>(https://www.leadbureau.org/) which include several programmatic documents, and any available evaluation studies. LEAD is more established in Seattle and pilots are currently active in several cities across the nation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Comment: There has only been one long-term LEAD study conducted so far in Seattle, which included three different reports covering housing, recidivism, substance use, and qualitative findings regarding client success. This report is available on the LEAD SF, and National websites.	

NEXT POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING: Monday, October 22nd, 1:00-2:30 pm