COUNTY OF KERN
MENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT
Diane G. Koditek, M.F.T., Director

PAROLEE SERVICES NETWORK
REGIONAL MEETING
Kern County Mental Health
3300 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield
April 9, 2008

PRESENT:

Ramona Elizondo – Mental Health
Natalia Salinas – Mental Health
Rodney Armstrong – CDCR
Lily Alvarez – Mental Health
Kurt Klemencic – ADP
Elvira Diaz – ADP
Valentino Villegas – College Community Svcs
Cindy Coe – KCMH

SUMMARY MINUTES:

1. **Introductions**: Accomplished. Mr. Armstrong indicated that he was replacing John Bailey at CDCR on an interim basis.

2. **Approval of January 9, 2008 meeting minutes**: Motions to approve minutes by Diaz / Salinas; approved all ayes.

3. **Follow-up items**:

   A. Page 1, Item 3 A: *ADP will follow up on the issue of who had made the POC decision not to let the psychiatrists or psychologists go out in the field with the parole agent to service clients. Per an e-mail from Ms. Diaz, this issue will be on the agenda for the next PSN Administrators' Meeting to facilitate a broader discussion between the Central Region Alcohol & Drug Administrators, ADP and CDCR officials.* Ms. Alvarez provided background on the issue, which centers around clients in outlying areas not having psychiatric support, due to county policy not to provide these services to parolees. Mr. Armstrong reported that the POC (Parole Outpatient Clinic) psychiatrists are booked for sessions every 30 minutes, so it would not be practical for them to travel to see one or two patients, and bus passes are available for those in outlying areas that need to be seen. Logistical difficulties include finding an appropriate facility, having an on-site compatible computer system available, and transportation issues surrounding paying for the psychiatrist travel time and mileage.

3300 Truxtun Avenue • P.O. Box 1000 • Bakersfield, CA 93302
Voice: (661) 868-6600 • FAX: (661) 868-6666 • TTY Relay: 1-800-735-2929

Ms. Alvarez asked that College Community Services do historical research on how many PSN clients they had who are dual diagnosed; Mr. Villegas indicated that there are none at Lake Isabella. Ms. Alvarez asked that College determine whether this was still an issue.

Ms. Diaz questioned whether a census could be done on how many PSN clients are dual diagnosed; Ms. Alvarez responded that this may be able to be accomplished using the psychiatric history on ASI's (Addiction Severity Index) that are completed. Follow up will be done at the next meeting.

Ms. Diaz also questioned whether a recap could be done for fiscal year 2007-08 on PSN statistics. Ms. Alvarez responded that the July meeting may be too soon after the end of the current fiscal year.

B. Page 1, Item 3 B: *ADP will clarify the issue of whether ADP would support a zero tolerance for alcohol, including any environment where alcohol is the primary business. ADP has historically supported zero tolerance in program efforts to address alcohol and drug usage and has adopted a zero tolerance position for primary prevention activities. Treatment program policy matters, on the other hand, are deferred to local authorities*. Ms. Alvarez reported that the Prop 36 clients are precluded from going to bars or drinking, as a condition of probation. Mr. Armstrong responded that if a parolee goes to Prop 36 for drug use they do not normally have a condition not to drink alcohol or go to bars, although if they are in Prop 36 due to alcohol use, there is usually such a condition. Ms. Alvarez questioned what it would take for CDCR to consider a policy change; Mr. Armstrong responded that it would have to be done through the legislature, as it is statewide. Mr. Armstrong added that if a parolee is in a PSN program they have to follow the program's rules. Ms. Alvarez responded that in outpatient programs 70% of Prop 36 clients are identifying methamphetamine as their drug of choice with alcohol as a secondary alcohol.

Mr. Armstrong indicated that for Parole to put a non-alcohol condition on a parolee they must have a specific reason, such as use related to a current offense connected to their crime, to meet the criteria to make it a condition of parole.

The group agreed that it would take legislative action at the state level to change the current practice.

Ms. Diaz felt that the issue should also be brought up at the PSN Forum to be held at the ADP conference.

C. Page 2, Item 3 C: *A meeting will be scheduled between College Community Services staff and parole to discuss the low census in Lake Isabella and Ridgecrest.* Ms. Alvarez reported that this is an ongoing issue, and gave Mr.

Armstrong background on Parole's initial desire to have services in these communities, but the failure to utilize the 10 outpatient slots due to assigned parole agents not being treatment supportive. Ms. Alvarez also explained the financial impact not utilizing the slots has on the provider and the Department. Mr. Armstrong responded that there are parolees in those communities who should be referred, and would follow up with the agent.

Ms. Diaz questioned whether there were PSN residential slots in those areas; Ms. Alvarez responded that all gatekeepers are trained to screen for Levels of Care, and if someone in these communities needed a residential slot, they would be placed in a program in metro Bakersfield. Ms. Elizondo added that there has not been a request for a Level 5 PSN placement. Mr. Villegas also indicated that if a PSN client reached the need for a Level 5 placement, their parole officer usually revokes them. Mr. Armstrong requested the addresses and contact information for the College Community Services in Lake Isabella and Ridgecrest.

Ms. Diaz questioned whether there are PSN residential settings in rural areas; Ms. Alvarez responded that there has never been enough client volume in rural areas to support a residential facility. Data has indicated that only about 15% of Prop 36 parolees needed residential treatment.

Mr. Villegas reported that there is a new sober living environment in Lake Isabella, and the owner also has an SLE in Ridgecrest. Mr. Klemencic questioned whether Parole would consider an SLE as an option for parolees in these areas; Mr. Armstrong responded that the cases are determined on an individual basis, but it may be an option they would consider. Ms. Alvarez added that in order for someone to be placed in a facility by a gatekeeper, any contractor that is used must be certified and meet contractual requirements; small SLE's do not find it financially viable. Ms. Diaz felt that this issue should also be discussed at the ADP conference PSN Forum.

4. State ADP Issues:

A. Ms. Diaz distributed "Save the Date" information for the ADP conference to be held June 18th through 20th. Registration is not yet open, but the PSN Forum should be held on June 19th from 10:30 to noon.

B. Mr. Klemencic reported that the Little Hoover Commission had issued a report, *Addressing Addiction: Improving & Integrating California's Substance Abuse Treatment System*, that offered recommendations to develop a comprehensive substance abuse treatment system; institutionalize understanding, leadership and oversight of substance abuse issues; and transform programs for nonviolent drug offenders.

5. State CDCR Issues:

A. Mr. Klemencic relayed regrets from the DARS staff, as they were not able to be here today. Because of a combination of state budget factors and workload issues, they will most likely not be able to attend the PSN quarterly meetings until further notice; they will instead be represented by Mr. Klemencic and Ms. Diaz.

6. Kern County Parole Issues:

A. Mr. Armstrong reported that the time gap between referral and treatment placement is an issue, especially for their Prop 36 parolees, but not so for the PSN referrals. Ms. Elizondo responded that there is a PSN Orientation held once a week, so there is not really a wait time. There is one bed available for the residential program, but there is no waiting list.

7. Provider Issues:

A. College Community Services: Mr. Villegas reported that they have not had meetings with the parole agent assigned to their area, and would like to have monthly meetings to discuss the PSN caseload and build a collaborative relationship. Mr. Armstrong agreed.

B. WestCare: Not present.

8. Mental Health Issues:

A. Ms. Elizondo reported that WestCare's submission of PSN admissions and discharges has gotten better.

B. Mr. Klemencic questioned whether there is a comparison with CalOMS (California Outcomes Measurement Systems) reports and those submitted for PSN. There have been problems identified with the CalOMS system and PSN data, which should be fixed soon. If the accuracy of the CalOMS PSN data could be validated, should both reports continue to be completed?

Ms. Alvarez reported that at the last CADPAAC meeting, DARS presented and reported a lack of PSN information. Counties send information quarterly, yet CDCR never shares the data, and did not widely distribute the San Marcos report done a few years ago. Mr. Klemencic offered that the CSU San Marcos study was on reducing criminal behavior and preventing parolee crime, and was commissioned by CDCR. Ms. Alvarez responded that counties input data into a cumbersome system, yet are not able to extract data or receive reports. If one duplicate system was to be eliminated, Ms. Alvarez responded that she favors

getting rid of the CDCR system. Mr. Klemencic added that the only information not available through CalOMS would be the financial expenditures.

Ms. Diaz reported that Kern County staff have consistently done a good job of submitting reports in a timely and accurate manner.

C. Ms. Alvarez questioned the status of the FY 2008-09 PSN Work Plan. Mr. Klemencic responded that ADP's Interagency Agreement with DARS has held up the release of the Work Plan, as it was changed to cover a two-year period instead of one year. As a result, there has also been no reimbursement to counties for FY 2007-08 PSN services. As soon as the Work Plan is released the funds should be issued. The Interagency Agreement is awaiting final administrative approval.

D. Ms. Alvarez presented local PSN data for calendar year 2007:

a) There is a difference between what Kern reports on their activity reports versus CalOMS data. Is CalOMS losing PSN data or is the PSN CDCR report overstating data? Mr. Klemencic clarified that there are three systems; CalOMS is based on admission and discharge and is regarded as the most precise system, the manual reports, and the local KernOMS version. The reason the state PSN CalOMS numbers are off is due to a glitch that allowed non-PSN counties to mark a client as a PSN client when they were not; part of the problem was that counties were mistaking PSN for perinatal services network and also marking PSN when the client was a parolee. This resulted in the PSN data being over represented by a significant amount. Ms. Alvarez indicated that the data her staff used to compare came from KernOMS and the PSN monthly reports we had submitted.

b) A discharge report review for College Community Services (CCS) revealed:

East Kern statistics

- 17 screens were done from January to December 2007, which speaks to CCS under-utilization, and 2 screens were done at the Sillect Avenue site for East Kern residents
- 100% were screened at Level 3 – outpatient
- 9 did not show up at the treatment provider, 50% were discharged for unsatisfactory progress, 1 was incarcerated, 2 were unsatisfactory discharges, 2 were referred or transferred, and 5 were still in treatment

Metro Bakersfield statistics

- 85 screens were done from January to December 2007
- 69% screened at Level 3 – outpatient
- 14% screened at Level 4 – intensive outpatient
- 10.6% needed residential placement
- 21 failed to show up at the treatment provider, 3 were incarcerated, 23 were unsuccessfully discharged, 14 were discharged, and 24 were still in treatment

c) There is a need for parole agents to collaborate with the treatment provider, which would reduce the number of no-shows in the outlying communities. Mr. Klemencic cited a UCLA study indicating that drop-out rates speaks more to geographic distance than staff diligence; Ms. Alvarez responded that the UCLA study addresses the collaboration in Prop 36. Locally, data was run for Probation to determine the follow through rate for those probationers who were seeing their probation officers and then being referred. Almost 90% of the probationers seeing their probation officer followed through with treatment admission. The statistics above reflect those cases in which a parolee was not seen by a parole officer and no collaboration occurred between the parole officer and treatment provider.

E. Members discussed consistency in discharge codes and the need for standardized completion descriptions. Ms. Alvarez questioned whether ADP would work to standardize treatment packages and completion criteria for all 58 counties. Ms. Alvarez reported that CADPAAC is starting to address whether ADP will standardize treatment for all 58 counties.

9. Next meeting **July 9, 2008**, at Kern County Mental Health Administration.

LA:cc

Attachments to original minutes:
None