



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Date: January 28, 2019

In attendance:

(Listed in alphabetical order by last name)

Co-Chairs	Naveena Bobba (SFDPH, <i>alternate for Greg Wagner</i>), Sharon Woo (SFDA, <i>alternate for George Gascón</i>), Bill Scott (SFPD)
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. Lance Haight (BART Police, <i>alternate for Carlos Rojas</i>), Kathy Johnson (Sheriff’s Department, <i>alternate for Vicki Hennessy</i>), Jennifer Kiss ((Tenderloin Health Improvement Partnership), Robin Ortiz (Felton Institute, <i>alternate for Al Gilbert</i>), Theshia Naidoo (Sentencing Commission), Kyriell Noon (Glide Foundation)
Attendees	Lauren Bell (APD), Chesa Boudin (Public Defender’s Office), Frank Castro (Glide), Alejandra Cuspinera (Felton Institute), Janet Ector (Glide), Sercan Ersoy (Public Defender’s Office), Michelle Fisher (Sherriff’s Department), Kenneth Kim (Glide), Daryle McDaniel (BSCC), Jason Norelli (Glide), Nikesh Patel (SFDA), Daniel Perea (SFPD) Rani Singh (SFDA), Simin Shamji (Public Defender’s Office), Colleen Stoner (BSCC), Tiffany Sutton (SFPD), Cristel Tullock (SFAPD), Kasey Warmuth (BSCC)
LEAD SF Project Team	Angelica Almeida (DPH), Jessica Lee-Burleigh (HTA), Robin Candler (DPH), Maggie Hodges (Harder+Company Community Research), Aili Malm (CSU Long Beach), Dina Perrone (CSU Long Beach), Danielle Toussaint (HTA)

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
Welcome & Opening Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Angelica Almeida 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, describing trainings that occurred since the last Policy Committee meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to LEAD SF website for the presentation; Materials to be posted to website
Program Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robin Candler provided updates on program progress, which included a review of data on pre-booking/social contact referrals, referrals by agency, service connections, and demographics, noting the following considerations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The target of 250 total referrals has been exceeded. Yet, as of January 28, 2019, LEAD SF had made 112 pre-booking referrals, and the goal outlined for that category in the grant is over 200. Currently, the proportion of pre-booking and social contact referrals that have a history of contact with the SF jail system is 72 percent and 80 percent, respectively. LEAD SF is aiming for that proportion to be over 90 percent. One hypothesis for why the proportion is higher among social contact referrals is that in those cases, law enforcement has more discretion and is able to refer those with a history of contact with the jail system, whereas pre-booking referrals can only be made for cases with the defined charges, and thus are less discretionary. Only 1 active participant is working with an outside service agency. Program staff initially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentations; Materials to be posted to website The attendees of Policy Committee and Parking Lot meetings will continue to discuss barriers to referring eligible individuals based on incoming data and information. The LEAD Policy Committee will continue to have discussions



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	<p>anticipated that number would be higher, expecting more clients would come in with existing connections to case managers at other agencies. However, even those clients that have entered LEAD already connected to additional services have desired the extra support offered by LEAD case managers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Daniel Perea, Tiffany Sutton, and Nikesh Patel co-presented a Police Department and District Attorney analysis of LEAD referrals and arrests and bookings for LEAD eligible offenses from October through December 2018. Highlights from the presentation included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A daily case review process continues to be implemented at the Mission and Tenderloin stations to assess missed opportunities, or individuals eligible for LEAD who weren't referred. 2. LEAD training has now been provided for Healthy Street Operation Center officers. 3. The number of LEAD referrals increased from Quarter 6 to Quarter 7, while the proportion of referrals determined to be ineligible for LEAD by the District Attorney's office decreased during the same time period. This trend indicates that appropriate referrals are being made. 4. Two individual profiles of LEAD participants were shared, demonstrating that the program has appropriately targeted many individuals who have a longstanding relationship with narcotics and who have interacted with many touchpoints throughout the legal system. ■ Chesa Boudin presented and discussed a Public Defender analysis of LEAD referrals and arrests and bookings for LEAD eligible offenses from October through December 2018. Highlights from the presentation included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positive trends in demographics and felony pre-bookings were highlighted. 2. Concerns were raised that the targets for proportion of pre-booking referrals according to the grant requirements are still not being met. Another concern was raised about the lack of Latinx social contact referrals compared to other demographics during the last quarter. 3. Specific examples of cases that could have been referred based on public defender collected information were reviewed. 4. Suggestions to increase referrals were shared, including protocols for some in-custody referrals if CASC is closed, and continuing to build relationships with SFPD officers. ■ Committee members and attendees raised additional questions/comments and engaged in discussion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Question: Does the police department keep track of the LEAD eligible cases and the percentage of LEAD referrals within them? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response: The police department is doing daily reviews that we pass over to the District Attorney's office to compile. We would meet to discuss creating a consolidated record of all of this information, and we can report back on that. 	<p>based on data from the program in order to inform any changes/considerations for ongoing programmatic operation.</p>



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"> ■ At the previous Policy Committee Meeting on October 22nd, Dina Perrone and Aili Malm provided an overview of the mid-term Fidelity Assessment, which was informed by comparisons between the LEAD SF and LEAD Seattle/Santa Fe programs, focus group data, a review of LEAD SF policies and procedures documents (through March), some provider treatment data (through March), and 34 client surveys. The presentation included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of themes regarding successes and challenges identified in the process evaluation 2. An overview of the findings from the thematic analysis of focus group data ■ Committee members received the Fidelity Assessment Report a week prior to the January 28 PC Meeting to review and bring questions to discuss at the end of the evaluation update. ■ Aili Malm (CSU Long Beach) provided a follow-up presentation with evaluation updates since the last Policy Committee Meeting including: client surveys and preliminary analysis on criminal histories (e.g., exploring differences between social contact and pre-booking referrals based on review of District Attorney’s office criminal history data). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The case management team has now completed a total of 55 client surveys. CSU Long Beach will provide a preliminary assessment of survey findings during the April 22 Policy Committee Meeting. 2. Criminal History Analysis: For this analysis, CSU Long Beach reviewed cases and arrests specifically filed in San Francisco County since 2011. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They plan to conduct a broader analysis of California-wide criminal histories and will be requesting this data from the CA Department of Justice. They estimate receiving this data by September of this year, and will provide updates. ○ Highlights from the presentation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation team did not find a significant difference between the criminal history of pre-booking and social contact referrals, except for arrest convictions. They noted this is encouraging as it indicates that law enforcement is still capturing the target population. • Question: Is the only data point the number of arrests? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response: No, the evaluation team also looked at misdemeanor vs. felony arrests, jail contact vs. jail sentences, county vs. state jails, etc. • Clients likely have a more extensive criminal background pre-dating 2011 data—though the evaluation team noted that while case management started in 2009, sometimes that early data is not reliable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Refer to the LEAD SF website for the presentation; Materials to be posted to website ■ CSU and HTA will both provide an evaluation update at the next PC meeting.



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Committee members and attendees raised additional questions/comments in regard to the evaluation update and Fidelity Assessment Report, and engaged in discussion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment: For the LEAD Santa Fe study they look at the period before diversion and after to measure recidivism. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response: The evaluation team is assessing outcomes before and after the initial screening for LEAD SF clients. In order to reach goal of having the same level of rigor as the federal DOJ ranking, the team will conduct the following analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess outcomes against a comparison group (in SF the comparison group is those eligible for LEAD but not referred) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEAD Santa Fe did not have a comparison group. • Match each individual on demographic characteristic and criminal history <p>Since social contact and pre-booking clients are not statistically different across several variables (i.e. demographics, criminal backgrounds, and other variables known to impact recidivism), this provides a larger sample for the comparison.</p> ■ Aili Malm (CSU Long Beach) provided a recap on upcoming reporting timelines and considerations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At next PC meeting, CSU Long Beach will report back on client survey results, and preliminary assessment of pre/post data (e.g., is arrest rate slowing down?) 2. The final report deadline is currently January 1, 2020. Recidivism data is currently bound to one year for oldest clients and three to six months for newer clients. CSU Long Beach is seeking an extension to have a longer time period of data in order to hopefully demonstrate stronger outcomes. 	
Closing and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ BSCC staff congratulated the committee and program implementation team on their work and collaboration, and emphasized the value of the evaluation and reaching a high level of rigor. ■ Committee members and attendees shared final thoughts in a group discussion. Highlights and follow-up considerations include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stakeholder focus groups will be conducted this week, and findings shared at a later date. 2. LEAD has allowed the city to expand diversion efforts. 3. City Departments need to get together to figure out how to address budget issues coming up, request is stronger together. Group needs a comprehensive proposal to move this forward and make it a permanent part of the work. 4. Budgets are due on February 21 across departments. It will be important to refer to the same 	



LEAD SF

Policy Committee Action Minutes

Agenda Topic	Discussion, Agreements, Key Learnings	Action and Follow-up Items
	<p>plan. Stakeholders anticipate that the mayor's office will be supportive, need to connect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o City departments should work together on this. <p>5. HSOC funding concepts and issues are integrated, and may provide an opportunity to expand LEAD to the rest of the city if departments can coordinate on funding requests.</p> <p>6. The Public Defender's office offered to put together a proposed plan for funding requests and share with other departments.</p>	

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