



COUNTYWIDE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATION COMMITTEE



September 13, 2013

TO: Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael Antonovich

FROM: Jerry E. Powers, Chief Probation Officer *J.P.*
Chair, Public Safety Realignment Team
Mark Delgado, Executive Director *MD*
Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee

SUBJECT: Public Safety Realignment Implementation – August 2013 Update

The County’s Public Safety Realignment Team (PSRT) continues to coordinate realignment implementation and identify emerging implementation issues. This PSRT implementation report provides current data reported by departments and addresses three areas:


- I. Post-Release Community Supervision Trends
- II. Penal Code 1170 (h) Sentences to County Jail and Custody-Related Matters
- III. Emerging State Issues: Parole Revocations and Prison Population Reduction Efforts

I. POST-RELEASE COMMUNITY SUPERVISION (PRCS)

PARTICIPANT NUMBERS AND PROJECTIONS

Probation reports that 17,386 cases were accepted onto PRCS between October 1, 2011 and July 31, 2013. Of those, 6,413 have been closed, 1,690 are outstanding on a warrant, and 958 have resulted in deportation. A total of 8,325 PRCS cases were active as of July 31, 2013.

Figure 1 – PRCS Active and Projected Caseload



ABSCONDER ISSUES

On August 31, 2013, there were a total of 2,456 outstanding PRCS warrants. However, 1,013 of those warrants were either for known deported individuals or for individuals apprehended but denied extradition. The remaining 1,443 warrants represent at-large individuals.

Table 1 provides data on the number of Postrelease Supervised Persons (PSPs) who have been the subject of multiple absconder warrants since October 1, 2011.

Table 1 – Multiple Absconder Warrants

Number of Warrants Issued	Number of PSPs
6 PSP Absconder Warrants	1
5 PSP Absconder Warrants	9
4 PSP Absconder Warrants	66
3 PSP Absconder Warrants	311
2 PSP Absconder Warrants	972
Total with multiple warrants	1,359

As previously reported to your Board, Probation, the Sheriff’s Department, the Police Chiefs Association, and the District Attorney’s Office have established a Complex Case Committee review team to address the issue of repeat absconders and PSPs who repeatedly present public safety issues. By case conferencing on repeat absconders, habitually non-compliant PSPs, and individuals arrested multiple times, the team can ensure that individuals who are repeatedly named in warrants, subject to arrest, or non-compliant are responded to appropriately.

COMPLIANCE CHECKS

Compliance checks are an important tool for the effective supervision of individuals on PRCS. They can both promote public safety and assist rehabilitative efforts by ensuring an individual is complying with the terms of his or her supervision.

By their nature, however, compliance checks are intrusive operations. Conducted without coordination, they have the potential to be disruptive to an individual’s reintegration efforts or a treatment setting at which he or she may be residing. They also have the potential to impact non-supervised persons at a visited location.

In this context, your Board directed Probation to survey treatment providers for their input and feedback on their experiences with compliance checks operations. Survey responses, summarized in Attachment I, indicated general satisfaction for the manner in which checks have been conducted. Most importantly, responses also indicated providers’ belief that there have been improvements since realignment began in how compliance checks are being conducted.

As requested by your Board and to continue progress in improving compliance checks operations, PSRT’s Law Enforcement Subcommittee convened a work group to develop a “best practices” document for compliance checks. This document aims to recognize and promote the interests of public safety, officer safety, and PSP compliance and rehabilitation, while at the same time mitigating unintended consequences of such checks. The work group consists of representatives from Probation, the Sheriff’s Department, the Los Angeles Police Department,

the County Police Chiefs Association, Department of Mental Health, Department of Public Health, and treatment providers.

The work group has collectively identified several core principles and practice areas that should guide compliance checks throughout the County. These practices address:

- relationship building between law enforcement and treatment providers in their jurisdiction;
- increased collaboration with Probation on prioritizing which PSPs should be the subjects of compliance checks; and
- improved information sharing practices.

Attachment II summarizes the best practices document, which is still being refined and finalized by the work group. The final document will be included in the next realignment report to your Board. It will also be disseminated to all agencies involved in supervision and compliance checks efforts in the County. The Law Enforcement Subcommittee believes that when finalized, the best practices guidelines developed will help lead to continued improvements in compliance checks operations and further reductions in unintended treatment disruptions.

SUPERVISION EFFORTS OF OTHER URBAN COUNTIES

On August 6, 2013, your Board directed CCJCC to survey other urban counties about their supervision efforts of AB 109 offenders. CCJCC developed a survey to gather such information, including:

- the size of supervision caseloads and risk level classifications;
- the manner and frequency in which home visits and compliance checks are conducted;
- the role of probation and law enforcement agencies in field supervision efforts and level of coordination between the two;
- reporting requirements for PSPs and use of EM/GPS monitoring; and
- other general strategies to ensure PSP compliance with his or her terms of supervision, including program referrals and rehabilitation efforts.

CCJCC contacted Probation staff managing AB 109 operations from the 11 other counties that comprise the Urban County Caucus: Alameda, Contra Costa, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura.

Surveys and interviews with seven of the counties have been conducted. Preliminary feedback includes:

- *PRCS Caseloads* – Caseload supervision ratios, as well as how cases are assigned, vary by county. Some counties assign caseloads according to risk level, while other counties assign mixed risk levels per caseload. One county assigns an integrated caseload inclusive of PRCS, probation, and mandatory supervision cases (PC 1170(h)). The range of caseload supervision ratios for the different cases range from a low of 20:1 to a high of 135:1, with most averaging 40-60:1.
- *Compliance Checks and Home Visits* – All responding probation departments conduct compliance checks and home visits, some with and some without assistance from local

law enforcement agencies. In general, probation departments are the lead agency on these efforts.

- *Transportation* – The majority of responding departments provide county vehicles to staff for conducting field supervision work.
- *Referrals to programs* – All responding departments implement and emphasize processes to connect PSPs with needed mental health, substance abuse, and reentry services. Participation in mental health and substance abuse programs is largely a condition of supervision. Non-participation in treatment is communicated back to Probation by treatment providers for appropriate motivational strategies or sanctions.

CCJCC is in the process of finalizing the survey and interview process with the remaining probation departments. A full briefing will be provided to your Board following completion of the survey project and organization of survey responses.

II. PC 1170 (H) AND CUSTODY RELATED ISSUES

In September 2011, just prior to the implementation of AB 109, the Los Angeles County jail population was approximately 15,463 inmates. The population count is now 18,789 and includes 6,114 individuals sentenced per PC 1170 (h), the realignment statute that mandates certain non-violent, non-serious, non-sexual offenders be sentenced locally. Table 2 provides more detailed information on the population growth and shifts since realignment.

Table 2 – Jail Population Breakdown – Final day of the Month

	Pre-realignment	Post-realignment							
	Sep-11	Oct-12	Dec-12	Feb-13	Apr-13	Jun-13	Aug-13	+/-	Change
Other (open charges, probation violations, PRCS flash, etc.)	10,560	10,322	9,678	9,973	10,248	10,198	10,232	-328	-3%
Sentenced N3	0	5,599	5,676	5,775	5,775	5,905	6,114	6,114	-
Sentenced Parole Violators	0	590	472	493	279	145	10	10	-
Pending Parole Violators	1,321	344	280	356	345	311	56	-1,265	-96%
County Sentenced	2,300	1,791	1,248	1,193	1,069	1,131	1,427	-873	-38%
State Prison Population	1,282	821	802	1,007	941	886	950	-332	-26%
Total Physical Count (ADP)	15,463	19,467	18,156	18,797	18,657	18,576	18,789	3,326	22%

The Sheriff's Department reports that as of the end of August, 9,266 individuals sentenced pursuant to PC 1170 (h) had been released from jail having served their full custody term. In

addition, 40 women sentenced per PC 1170 (h) have been placed in residential treatment programming as an alternative to custody for the tail end of their sentence.

Finally, the Sheriff’s Department reports a slight growth in the jail’s PC 1170 (h) population in recent months. As illustrated in Table 3, this population count had largely remained steady in the eight month period of October 2012 to May 2013. Since May, the number of new PC 1170 (h) inmates has outpaced the number of those released. The Sheriff’s Department will continue to monitor this in an effort to determine whether this is due to seasonal fluctuations or other causes.

Table 3 – PC 1170 (h) Population Breakdown

Year	Month	1170 (h) Admits	1170 (h) Releases	1170 (h) In Custody
2011	October	930	23	907
	November	738	65	1,580
	December	651	51	2,180
2012	January	785	58	2,907
	February	675	97	3,485
	March	688	133	4,040
	April	703	242	4,501
	May	682	374	4,809
	June	692	380	5,121
	July	607	412	5,316
	August	741	387	5,670
	September	581	536	5,715
	October	708	567	5,856
	November	596	621	5,831
	December	517	535	5,813
2013	January	713	600	5,743
	February	636	559	5,775
	March	667	635	5,778
	April	651	644	5,775
	May	733	606	5,839
	June	643	624	5,905
	July	687	558	6,023
	August	678	559	6,110
	Total		15,702	9,266

III. EMERGING STATE ISSUES

PAROLE REVOCATIONS

Beginning July 1, 2013, revocations for violations of state parole became a local Court process. The Board of Parole Hearings no longer issues warrants or conducts revocation hearings; the parole warrant and revocation process goes through the Court, with the District Attorney, Public Defender, and Alternate Public Defender handling these matters.

Table 4 provides early data on the number of matters presented to the Court by parole. The large increase in matters from July to August is likely due to parole’s adjustment to a new process.

Table 4 – State Parole Warrant and Revocation Requests

	July	August
Requests for Warrants	367	601
Requests for Revocation	88	244

The Court, District Attorney’s Office, Public Defender’s Office, and Alternate Public Defender’s Office will continue to monitor workload volume in the months to come so that any necessary staffing adjustments can be identified.

PRISON POPULATION REDUCTION EFFORTS

On August 2, 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court denied the state’s petition to stay an existing federal court order to reduce California’s prison population by approximately 9,600 inmates by the end of the year. As such, the governor and legislature proceeded with planning efforts to meet the imposed deadline.

On September 11, 2013, the state legislature passed Senate Bill 105, an agreement that avoids the early release of state prisoners. The Governor signed the legislation on September 12, making it effective immediately. Item 4 on your Board’s September 17th meeting agenda is a joint Board motion pertaining to this matter.

As indicated in a CEO memo developed for your Board, SB 105:

- allocates \$315 million in FY 2013-14 for the State to contract with in-State and out-of-State facilities for beds, including private facilities;
- requires the State to work with stakeholders to assess the prison system and develop recommendations to reduce recidivism rates and the prison population;
- revises and extends the SB 678 funding formula to January 2017 to provide stable and ongoing funding to counties that reduce prison admissions; and
- creates a Recidivism Reduction Fund from which the Legislature can appropriate funding for programs aimed at reducing recidivism.

In the event the three-judge panel modifies the court order or grants an extension which results in State savings from avoided contracts, the first \$75 million would be deposited in the Recidivism Reduction Fund.

Attachments

- c: Chief Executive Officer
Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Public Safety Realignment Team
CCJCC Members
Civil Grand Jury

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
PRCS (AB109) PROVIDER SURVEY – COMPLIANCE CHECKS**

As requested by the Board of Supervisors, the Department conducted a survey of AB109 residential treatment providers who provide in-patient treatment, shelter, or housing services to inquire about their overall experiences with law enforcement compliance checks conducted at their facilities. Contact names and email addresses were provided to the Probation Department by HealthRight 360, the Department of Mental Health, and the Department of Public Health. The survey was distributed via email on August 30, 2013 to 45 agency contacts. On September 4, 2013, the providers were sent a follow-up reminder. Department staff requested that the providers return the survey before September 6, 2013.

The Department received 23 completed surveys representing 20 organizations and 23 sites. The providers estimate that 74 compliance checks were conducted during calendar year 2012 and 84 compliance checks were conducted during calendar year 2013. The providers report that the compliance checks were most often conducted by the Los Angeles Police Department and Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, followed by the Los Angeles Probation Department.

Generally, providers report positive experiences and support for the compliance check process. It appears that positive experiences and support for the compliance check process increased during 2013. As an example, during 2012 only 60% of providers reported that the officers conducting the compliance checks appeared to be well trained on the purpose of the checks. In 2013, however, 95% of the providers reported that the officers appeared well trained during the compliance checks. The following table reports the provider responses to report overall experiences with law enforcement compliance checks.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
PRCS (AB109) PROVIDER SURVEY – COMPLIANCE CHECKS**

Statement	2012 Somewhat Agree / Completely Agree	2013 Somewhat Agree / Completely Agree
The officers that conducted the law enforcement compliance checks at my agency appeared to be well trained on the purpose of these checks.	60%	95%
The officers that conducted the law enforcement compliance checks at my agency understood the importance of the AB 109 client's participation in the treatment/services we provide.	67%	90%
The officers that conducted the law enforcement compliance checks at my agency were respectful of the AB 109 client's commitment to treatment.	60%	90%
The officers that conducted the law enforcement compliance checks at my agency did so without being disruptive to the agency and our other clients.	60%	81%
The officers that conducted the law enforcement compliance checks at my agency were sensitive to the AB 109 client's treatment/ service needs being provided by our agency.	60%	90%
The officers that conducted the law enforcement compliance checks did not intrude on the functioning of the agency during the process of these checks.	67%	86%
There were no major issues or problems that arose as a result of the law enforcement compliance checks conducted at my agency.	73%	90%
The compliance checks conducted at my agency did not produce any negative impact on the client's engagement with the treatment process.	53%	81%

Compliance Checks Best Practices For Treatment Facilities, Sober Living Homes, and Halfway Houses (Summary Fact Sheet)

Compliance checks are an important tool for the effective supervision of individuals on PRCS. They can both promote public safety and assist rehabilitative efforts by ensuring an individual is complying with the terms of his or her supervision.

By their nature, however, compliance checks are intrusive operations. Conducted without coordination, they have the potential to be disruptive to an individual's reintegration efforts or a treatment setting at which he or she may be residing. They also have the potential to impact non-supervised persons at a visited location.

In an effort to mitigate the unintended consequences of compliance checks, the Public Safety Realignment Team's Law Enforcement Subcommittee has convened a working group to develop best practices and guiding principles for compliance checks in Los Angeles County. The following is a summary of the best practices that are being finalized by Probation, Sheriff, local law enforcement, Department of Mental Health, Department of Public Health, and treatment provider representatives.

- 1.** Compliance Teams should strive to build strong relationships with Providers.
- 2.** Compliance Teams should build strong relationships with LA County Probation and their co-located AB 109 Deputy Probation Officers to ensure lines of communication remain open and updates on PSPs are being quickly and efficiently disseminated to stakeholders.
- 3.** Compliance Teams should prioritize their Compliance Checks based on PSP risk-level and compliance status.
- 4.** Compliance Teams should engage in advanced planning activities prior to any compliance check, including verifying residence and reviewing previous compliance check activities at the location.
- 5.** Compliance Teams should ensure that the interior is not unreasonably disturbed nor property damaged during the compliance check.
- 6.** Compliance Teams should strive to communicate the objective and expectations of the compliance check effectively to each occupant of the residence to mitigate unintended disruptions.
- 7.** Compliance Teams must be aware of and mindful of the other occupants at the facility, including children and those not currently on supervision.
- 8.** Compliance Teams should exercise discretion and good judgment that takes into account officer safety, public safety, and the therapeutic environment when determining appropriate resource allocation.
- 9.** Following every compliance check, Compliance Teams should document all relevant details of the compliance check in their case management file, including updating any incorrect information as well as inform the co-located AB 109 Deputy Probation Officer of the results of the compliance check.
- 10.** Probation, the Sheriff's Department, local law enforcement, and treatment provider representatives should convene periodically to assess compliance checks operations.

**Public Safety Realignment
Summary of Implementation Data**

Year 1
TOTAL

OCT 2012
NOV 2012
DEC 2012
JAN 2013
FEB 2013
MAR 2013
APR 2013
MAY 2013
JUN 2013
JUL 2013

Year 2
TOTAL

Years
1 and 2
TOTAL

Postrelease Community Supervision

Pre-Release Packets

1	No. pre-release packets received	14,102	613	428	663	427	573	540	512	525	509	545	5,335	19,437
2	No. pre-release packets processed	14,083	538	455	591	395	486	568	465	484	504	538	5,024	19,107
3	No. pre-release packets deemed ineligible (of those processed)	649	28	19	20	23	9	17	9	10	8	29	172	821
4	No. PSPs with Special Handling Requirements	148	12	6	7	6	22	7	4	11	18	14	107	255
5	No. of PSPs who are registered sex offenders	240	9	12	19	17	13	23	27	24	10	25	179	419
6	No. address verifications conducted	1,902	149	108	116	171	116	154	102	109	89	253	1,367	3,269
7	No. homeless/transient PSPs per CDCR	1,484	90	69	132	139	73	57	100	64	97	80	901	2,385

PSP Reporting Population

8	No. PSPs released to County per pre-release packet dates	11,500	578	534	566	533	518	518	513	31	516	511	4,818	16,318
9	No. PSPs directly released to County per CDCR LEADS	11,248	644	564	564	548	479	482	470	426	431	443	5,051	16,299
10	No. PSPs released to Federal custody with ICE detainer	770	33	34	49	40	23	28	44	31	24	23	329	1,099
11	No. of PSPs released to the community by ICE	8	3	0	2	1	2	4	1	2	3	3	21	29
12	No. PSPs released to other jurisdiction custody	450	29	25	28	28	21	24	32	19	18	11	235	685
13	No. PSPs transferred to L.A. County from other counties	456	31	29	23	25	34	36	51	40	42	29	340	796
14	No. PSPs transferred from L.A. County to other jurisdictions	528	54	32	19	27	29	21	50	56	59	57	404	932
15	No. PSPs processed at hubs (intake/assessment)	9,761	629	549	523	546	468	486	520	467	459	480	5,127	14,888
16	Male	8,600	585	501	477	491	430	443	486	420	427	454	4,714	13,314
17	Female	1,161	44	48	46	55	38	43	34	47	32	26	413	1,574
18	No. PSPs by risk tier, as assessed at hubs:													
19	Low Risk	161	7	5	6	10	7	6	6	2	7	3	59	220
20	Male	128	7	4	6	9	4	6	5	1	5	2	49	177
21	Female	32	0	1	1	1	3	0	5	1	2	1	15	47
22	Medium Risk	3,944	261	205	186	169	138	116	141	135	116	123	1,590	5,534
23	Male	3,429	244	184	169	150	122	99	132	121	109	116	1,446	4,875
24	Female	515	17	21	17	19	16	17	9	14	7	7	144	659
25	High Risk	5,259	346	311	290	346	296	339	329	292	301	304	3,154	8,413
26	Male	4,696	321	288	267	313	278	314	309	262	282	290	2,924	7,620

Public Safety Realignment Summary of Implementation Data		Year 1 TOTAL	OCT 2012	NOV 2012	DEC 2012	JAN 2013	FEB 2013	MAR 2013	APR 2013	MAY 2013	JUN 2013	JUL 2013	Year 2 TOTAL	Years 1 and 2 TOTAL
27	<i>Female</i>	563	25	23	23	33	18	25	20	30	19	14	230	793
28	<i>Very High Risk</i>	343	15	28	40	21	27	25	44	38	35	50	323	666
29	<i>Male</i>	297	13	25	35	19	26	24	40	36	31	46	295	592
30	<i>Female</i>	46	2	3	5	2	1	1	4	2	4	4	28	74
31	No. PSPs who are veterans	234	16	17	16	14	11	18	15	12	10	15	144	378

PSP "No-Show" and Absconder Population

32	No. "no-show" notifications to Sheriff	1,319	14	4	14	10	13	162	11	6	7	0	241	1,560
	No. Sheriff and LAPD attempts to contact "no-show" PSPs	1,040	14	17	8	16	13	19	4	6	0	7	104	1,144
34	No. warrants requested for absconders*	2,832	395	385	562	516	439	448	393	508	532	724	4,902	7,734
35	All warrants issued	3,185	533	385	394	624	551	462	408	516	713	671	5,257	8,442
36	All warrants recalled	2,347	398	298	331	506	419	363	284	354	391	215	3,559	5,906
37	No. of active warrants remaining**		973	1,060	1,802	1,241	1,373	1,472	1,596	1,758	2,080	2,536		

*Does not include the number of Deportation Warrants. An additional 958 Deportation warrants were requested through the month of July.

** The number of active warrants remaining is cumulative and includes remaining warrants from previous months. Number of active warrants includes 893 Deportation Warrants through the month of July.

PSP Violations/Revocations/New Charges

38	No. of petitions for revocations (other than warrants)	1,281	221	393	254	199	157	81	94	135	127	135	1,796	3,077
39	Pending Revocation Hearing		33	88	92	23	82	37	32	39	44	52		
40	No. of Revocation Hearing Cases Heard	704	189	212	167	242	244	247	225	334	284	383	2,527	3,231
41	Revocation Results													
42	Intermediate sanction (includes custody 0-10 days)	43	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	47
43	Custody 11 - 45 days	58	12	10	12	11	11	9	10	16	1	13	105	163
44	Custody 46 - 90 days	124	32	46	35	41	47	48	34	48	7	25	363	487
45	Custody 91 - 180 days	143	62	57	45	86	115	108	99	135	17	124	848	991
46	Custody days, other	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	13
47	Other (Continuances, Bench Warrants, etc.)	324	82	98	75	103	72	93	116	248	41	221	1,149	1,473
48	No. of PSP arrests / bookings	7,023	907	809	749	845	697	724	1,235	1,307	1,297	1,410	9,980	17,003
49	<i>No. arrests/bookings for prior matters</i>	858	37	40	28	31	24	38	47	52	49	61	407	1,265
50	<i>No. arrests/bookings for new offenses</i>	5,647	746	565	504	590	465	481	998	1,012	1,147	1,238	7,746	13,393
51	<i>No. bookings for flash incarceration (AB 109 Supervision Only)</i>	518	124	204	217	224	208	205	190	243	101	111	1,827	2,345
52	No. of cases presented to the D.A. for filing	3,287	506	454	484	572	502	550	574	581	537	604	5,364	8,651

**Public Safety Realignment
Summary of Implementation Data**

	Year 1 TOTAL	OCT 2012	NOV 2012	DEC 2012	JAN 2013	FEB 2013	MAR 2013	APR 2013	MAY 2013	JUN 2013	JUL 2013	Year 2 TOTAL	Years 1 and 2 TOTAL
Sanctions													
53 No. of verbal warnings	1,691	247	340	331	283	263	193	266	285	202	312	2,722	4,413
54 Increase reporting (to DPO) requirements	129	20	21	20	30	19	18	39	26	25	46	264	393
55 Additional conditions of supervision	83	7	6	7	7	2	2	7	7	1	2	48	131
56 PAAWS (Cal Trans)	99	13	19	10	8	13	5	12	8	11	8	107	206
57 Referral to Treatment Program	556	58	86	65	47	39	31	53	40	25	30	474	1,030
58 Flash incarceration (Supervision and Warrants)	2,598	543	674	732	913	805	893	791	872	790	852	7,865	10,463
59 GPS/EM	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	5	10	11

Mental Health Treatment Services

60 No. of pre-release packets forwarded to DMH for review at PRC	2,634	84	125	125	110	73	111	112	123	116	115	1,094	3,728
61 No. of mental health treatment conditions added by Probation***	2,966	125	109	124	103	112	123	137	122	114	110	1,179	4,145
62 No. DMH determinations -- treatment needed***	4,045	212	196	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91	1,279	5,324
63 No. of PSPs refusing Mental Health Services at HUBS***	329	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	338

*** Data are reported according to the PSP month of release.

Substance Abuse Treatment Services (Based on month of assessment)

64 No. of referrals made to CASCs at Hub for Substance Abuse Treatment only assessment	4,943	322	277	242	265	241	249	242	205	193	225	2,461	7,404
65 No. of substance abuse treatment conditions added by Probation***	7,329	400	319	273	225	293	234	285	271	249	294	2,843	10,172
66 No. of narcotics testing orders added by Probation***	7,931	429	329	357	274	345	339	309	275	268	293	3,218	11,149
67 No. of PSPs showing at CASCs for assessment	3,594	460	555	458	561	528	534	570	523	436	544	5,169	8,763
68 No. of CASC referrals to:	1,523	217	266	264	316	306	307	334	345	270	310	2,935	4,458
69 Residential Treatment Services	304	63	73	59	68	106	77	87	102	80	82	797	1,101
70 Outpatient Treatment Services	1,219	154	193	205	248	200	230	247	243	190	228	2,138	3,357
71 Sober Living	13	0	17	20	24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	61	74
72 No. of PSPs entering:	696	91	108	95	137	131	159	174	169	155	158	1,377	2,073
73 Residential Treatment Services	150	25	29	22	34	33	46	52	58	61	46	406	556
74 Outpatient Treatment Services	544	66	79	73	103	98	110	122	111	94	112	968	1,512
75 Sober Living	10	2	4	3	5		2	3	4	1	10	34	44

*** Data are reported according to the PSP month of release.

**Public Safety Realignment
Summary of Implementation Data**

	Year 1 TOTAL	OCT 2012	NOV 2012	DEC 2012	JAN 2013	FEB 2013	MAR 2013	APR 2013	MAY 2013	JUN 2013	JUL 2013	Year 2 TOTAL	Years 1 and 2 TOTAL
<i>Referrals for other Services (Based on month of assessment)</i>													
76 No. PSPs screened for benefits eligibility by DPSS	6,391	506	448	411	439	370	345	366	365	408	460	4,118	10,509
77 No. PSPs who DPSS referred to local DPSS office	4,731	381	357	335	337	294	263	286	282	337	362	3,234	7,965
78 No. PSPs enrolled in:	2,070	86	88	3,537	3,366	490	715	913	1,201	45	2,055	12,496	14,566
79 <i>MediCal</i>	4	0	0	18	12	2	2	2	5	0	7	48	52
80 <i>Med/CF</i>	17	1	6	56	50	4	6	7	8	0	31	169	186
81 <i>General Relief</i>	92	1	11	386	356	57	92	495	156	0	237	1,791	1,883
82 <i>CalFresh</i>	1,487	69	28	1,389	1,355	169	223	289	370	22	660	4,574	6,061
83 <i>CalFresh and General Relief</i>	456	15	43	1,687	1,591	258	392	119	662	22	1,120	5,909	6,365
84 <i>CalWorks/CalFresh</i>	14	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	19
85 No. PSPs referred to DHS for Healthy Way L.A. screening	2,457												2,457
86 Number of completed Healthy Way L.A. applications forwarded to DHS	739	279	237									516	1,255
87 Number of Healthy Way L.A. applications filed (from Hub)				207	243	201	147	171	166	239	243	1,617	

Referrals for HealthRight 360 (Formerly Haight-Ashbury)

88 No. of PSPs referred this month	4,627	561	504	450	580	504	473	528	523	198	217	4,538	9,165
89 No. of Referrals	5,755	721	626	533	707	629	579	694	661	562	630	6,342	12,097
90 <i>Transportation</i>	164	25	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	55	219
91 <i>Sober Living</i>	249	43	41	35	23	16	15	27	24	49	33	306	555
92 <i>Sober Living With Child</i>	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	8
93 <i>Transitional Housing</i>	1,874	389	343	283	176	129	145	212	200	389	228	2,494	4,368
94 <i>Transitional Housing With Child</i>	17	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	10	27
95 <i>Shelter</i>	31	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	33
96 <i>Job Readiness</i>	3,417	261	221	203	143	105	73	82	82	121	66	1,357	4,774

PSP Supervision Terminations

97 No. of petitions submitted to terminate supervision	485	108	100	133	95	100	117	153	117	200	120	1,243	1,728
98 No. of terminations	867	555	564	551	571	619	552	516	506	629	483	5,546	6,413
99 <i>No. other (new criminal conviction, revocation settlement, court order, etc.)</i>	866	138	125	149	161	168	162	151	118	308	136	1,616	2,482
100 <i>No. terminations -- 6 months violation-free</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health
Post-Release Community Supervision Program
Data for PSPs Based on Release Month
As of 8/6/2013**

	2012			2013						
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul
I DMH Population										
DMH Population (Total Clients In Tracking System)	221	207	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
Prescreened, Not Assessed at HUB	38	35	6	20	12	17	11	8	4	2
Prescreened, Assessed at HUB	110	100	97	100	65	69	79	81	90	83
Not Prescreened, Assessed at HUB	46	51	22	16	16	20	8	12	14	6
Not Prescreened, Not assessed at HUB, Receiving Treatment	27	21	2	4	3	4	0	0	0	0
II DMH Treatment Determination										
DMH Treatment Determination	221	207	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
No Treatment Needed	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Prescreened, Left HUB without Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treatment Needed	212	196	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
II.a Type of Treatment Required										
Type of Treatment Required	212	196	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
Co-occurring disorder	177	138	94	119	76	98	87	89	97	83
Mental health	20	41	32	20	19	10	9	11	11	8
Substance abuse	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown/TBD	4	0	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0
III Client Acceptance of Treatment Referral										
Client Acceptance of Treatment Referral	212	196	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
Yes	139	125	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
No	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N/A - Substance Abuse Services	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N/A- Not Seen At HUB	58	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
III.a Accepted Treatment by Type Required										
Accepted Treatment by Type Required	139	125	127	140	96	110	98	101	108	91
Co-occurring disorder-	121	93	94	119	76	98	87	89	97	83
Mental health-	14	32	32	20	19	10	9	11	11	8
Unknown	4	0	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0

Inpatient++-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IMD Step Down-	3	1	2	1	1	4	2	3	1	1
Residential Treatment-	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Outpatient Services	89	83	93	90	61	69	55	59	64	31
Other	37	35	26	43	26	32	36	35	43	58
VII PSPs Who Have Accessed Services+++										
PSPs Who Have Accessed Services+++	182	164	164	161	128	121	129	123	119	91
PSPs with At least One Inpatient Admission	8	5	7	6	5	13	7	5	5	6
PSPs with At least One Crisis Service (PMRT, UCC, PES)	12	18	16	13	10	12	15	5	2	0
PSPs with At least One Services in Jail Since Release	106	93	97	83	81	71	84	76	72	69
VIII N3s										
N3s Assessed by CRM	64	47	63	54	58	56	59	51	56	50

+ Deaths due to medical conditions

++ Some clients placed in inpatient facilities or County Jail pending completion of conservatorship proceedings necessary for State Hospital/IMD Placement

+++ Based on IS data; data entry may lag up to three months after the month of service.