COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION
PROPOSITION 36 REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL MEETING – SERVICE PLANNING AREAS 3 & 7
DISCUSSION NOTES – NOVEMBER 5, 2008

COUNCIL MEETING ATTENDANCE

Behavioral Health Services / ELA Calif Drug Consultants Casa de las Amigas Family Services Long Beach Grandview Foundation, Inc. LACADA- Allen House	Latino Family Center (CHCADA) Latino Recovery Home Mariposa Recovery Center MELA Options- The Family Center Plaza Community Center	Prototypes STAR House and CASC Office Santa Anita Family Service & Fam. Couns. Service Southern Cal. Alc. Drug Program/ Cider House Southern California Hispanic Commission SPIRITT Family Services URDC Human Services

ADPA	Public Defender	Corrections	Treatment	Treatment (Cont'd.)	LabCorp
Yanira Lima Carmen Canto Dennis Koba **Superior Court** Judge Ana Maria Luna Judge Laurin Birnstein Judge Michael Tynan Judge Deborah Sanchez Judge Terry Smerling Comm. Loren DiFrank Comm. Harold Mulville Comm. Jose Rodriguez Comm. Collette Sermo Miriam Ayala Aide Correa Debbie Dolfi Sandy Lopez Debra Medina Cecilia Vega	Robert McBirney Laurel Mend **Probation** Art Sosa Daniel Antillon Richard Contreras Lonnie Johnson Brenda Kelly Susie Martinez John Mendoza Christy Rollins Adam Wiggins	Gilbert A. Saenz, Sup. Derrick Ross Manuel Garcia **CASC** Alicia Trivison Sonia Guardado Stephanie Armbruster Elizabeth Patterson Steven Shool Melissa Y. Hernandez Estela Marquez	Jackie Aguilar Melanie Arellano Steven Baima Jacqueline Bravo Calvin Butler Marie Carrion Denise Corrales Mercedes Flores Islas Tina Freeland Dorothy Garcia Fabian Gonzalez Irene Groves Joshua Henning Darin Hirasuna Steven Jackson Billie Kittrell Jason Knight Adelina Lopez	Vanessa Moses Ramona Muñoz William Nigh Tania Olvera Luis Ourta Linda Quinonez Ruben Raya Irene Redondo-Churchward Ong, Camvan Charles Shedrick Daren Scharer Robert Solorzano Duane Takayama Cynthia Tooredman Albert Valenzuela Isabel Velasco Lorie Whitaker Glenn Wright Catherine Ybarra	Kiah McIntyre

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / RECOMMENDATIONS
I. Welcome and Introductions	The meeting was called to order by Yanira A. Lima. Self-introductions were made. Ms. Lima expressed appreciation to SPIRITT Family Services for their willingness to host this meeting.	
II. Approval of Discussion Notes	The discussion notes for August 6, 2008 meeting were reviewed. Two corrections were noted and made. One a correction to a treatment provider name, the second a correction to the fax number to LabCorp. The corrected discussion notes will be posted on ADPA's website at	

	www.lapublichealth.org/adpa, under the "Proposition 36" link.	
III. Announcements/ Updates and Discussions	Handouts: 1) Agenda (November 5, 2008) 2) Discussion Notes from Previous Meeting (August 6, 2008) 3) List of Prop 36 Community Assessment Service Centers (CASCs) 4) Prop 36 Monitoring Courts Directory (Updated) 5) Dept. of Corrections & Rehabilitation Staff List (Updated) 6) Proposition 36 Calendar (Updated) 7) Proposition 36 Roster (Updated) 8) ADPA Bulletin: Phase Out of Current Point-of-Care Product **UPDATES** **Future funding for Proposition 36** • Judge Ana Maria Luna, Judge Michael Tynan and Yanira Lima facilitated a group discussion regarding funding and needs for further cuts given the status of funding of Propostion 36 and the results of elections with Proposition 5 (N.O.R.A) not passing. • Judge Luna presented several options that the committee is looking at in terms of funding cuts for the different types of modality. A 24% cut across the board is being suggested. Leaving residential untouched and putting people on wait lists is a problematic option. • The high cost of residential treatment drove the discussion and questions related to funding cuts. Costs and treatment duration for outpatient, day treatment, sober living, detox, and aftercare, as well as configurations and combinations for the same, other than the customary residential then outpatient and after care, were all discussed as possible options. Judge Tynan stated there is a need to think differently about assessment for treatment and treatment placement by the CASCs, as not everyone coming in may need to immediately go into residential treatment. • Providers also discussed the importance of residential treatment in program outcomes because they take the participant away from their environment. On the other hand it was also discussed that participants need to be learning how to manage and deal with their environment, while they are in treatment.	
IV. LabCorp	• Ms. Kiah McIntyre mentioned to the group that some of the lab requests had been sent without a TCPX number. LabCorp cannot process these so if they do not get results within 5 day maximum, the agency should contact Ms. McIntyre immediately to resolve the matter. The same applies if no donor consent information in completed with the lab	

	request form. It is recommended the agencies complete a portion of the form where the name of the client is printed, to avoid errors in spelling in chain of custody information. • Ms. Lima asked the group if they are getting lab results back within 24 hours. Most agencies are, while some having different sites may be the reason why the specific site does not receive them. Agencies need to call Ms. McIntyre immediately if there are any issues with not getting results. • The group received the information regarding the ability to now access lab results online. Providers were encouraged to call Ms. McIntyre to set up access for appropriate staff that can be set up to access the information for their specific agency. • Contact information for Kiah McIntyre: (800) 859-6046, Extension 73213. Fax number: (858) 391-7175.	
V. Court	• Some of the providers addressed an issue related to understanding information on the minute orders related to the type of treatment or level of treatment needed. When this is not clear the providers find themselves needing to address the confusion in understanding the order, with the clients. After discussion on several relevant exemplary situations, it was determined that more clarity and consistency in the language used was needed. The judges asked the providers what language would best work and providers stated that rather than using 'continued' it is best to state the level based on the matrix and the treatment modality, for example, Level 2, outpatient treatment. It is best to also just state the word 'after care' when referring to this, and not confuse it with continuing care. • Providers had additional questions related to working with the new matrix, extending treatment and placing clients in treatment as assessed by the CASC. Ms. Lima addressed several providers with questions related to needing to clarify the continuum of treatment from a level of service to after care, from residential to outpatient. While not all questions and situations could be answered, as they are specific, it is highly recommended the agencies act more proactively and communicate with the judges regarding the minute order and the treatment specified. • Representatives from the CASC expressed concern to the court that their recommendations may not always be taken into consideration on repeat violators re: clients who should not be continued in treatment due to multiple violations, and should be removed from Prop 36. Clients with 2, 3 or 4 violations are referred back to the agencies to resume treatment. The Commissioners and Judges reassured everyone that the recommendations are reviewed, and taken into consideration.	
VI. CASC	• Judge Tynan asked representative from the CASC regarding the current wait time for assessment, outpatient and residential treatment. Response from the CASCs was that generally wait time for assessment is from zero to one day, and it is up to three days after	

	assessment, for outpatient treatment placement. The wait time for residential treatment is approximately one week.	
VII. Corrections	• There were several requests for representative for the Department of Corrections to attend Proposition 36 participant court proceedings and increase the level of communication with the court. • There was an expressed need from the court for improved coordination and communication between Dept. of Correction's process of releasing or not releasing holds on parolees that are referred to the Prop 36 program and the Court's ability and timing for placing a person into Prop 36 so they can begin treatment. At present, there are delays, which leave high-risk clients to their own resources as they cannot begin treatment until the "hold is lifted" which can take weeks.	
VIII. Probation	• There were no public comments.	
IX. Treatment	**Question by treatment providers:** • Is there a timeline for when a new point-of-care testing product will be available? Ms. Lima stated that currently there is no timeline. ADPA continues to work with Labcorp on identifying a new product. Updates will be provided in a timely manner. • Another agency asked the question related to agencies that can take clients with medical marijuana prescriptions. Ms. Lima will speak further to the agency that brought up the question since they state that they did not receive the list of providers that will treat this population, which was developed and disseminated by ADPA after conducting a countywide provider survey. **Reminders for treatment providers:** • Treatment providers were reminded that court reports should be submitted through TCPX at least 2-5 day prior to the client's court date. The court should follow procedures to call ADPA if a client's report has not been received prior to the agreed upon timeline. Ms. Lima emphasized that this is a requirement that must be met.	
X. Other Matters/ Public Comments	There were no public comments. Next Meeting: **DATE: FEBRUARY 4, 2009 (THRUSDAY) TENTATIVE DATE** **1:30 P.M. - 3:30 P.M.** **LOCATION: Santa Fe Springs Neighborhood Center** **9255 Pioneer Blvd.** **Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670**	Meeting Notice will be mailed prior to the meeting.