

FY 2017-19 Budget Workshop Board Inquiry Form

Board Member	
Williams	
Wolf	X
Hartmann	
Adam	
Lavagnino	

Inquiry Number: 12

Department: PROBATION

Date: 4/13/17

Page(s) of Book or Powerpoint: Service Level Reductions/Restorations Restorations #1,2,3

Request/Question:

Reduction # 1 Eliminates 2 DPOs from the Prop 36 [Substance Abuse] Caseloads—what would caseload #s increase to, & how would the Courts be impacted?

Reduction #2 Eliminates 2 Juvenile Field DPOs--- what would those caseload #s increase to, with this reduction? What is the “industry standard” recommended for DPO Caseloads? [Both Juvenile and Adults]

Reduction #3 Eliminates 1 DPO for the Adult “banked” caseload; what would those caseload #s increase to with this reduction?

#1: Currently, the provision of service for offenders qualifying under Proposition 36 (1210.1 PC) is a six to nine month treatment program with the cases being heard on a court review calendar following a basic drug court model, with sanctions being modified to comply with the statute. Reduction of staffing would mean that DPOs would no longer be available to participate in court staffing or provide proactive supervision of offenders. The one remaining DPO's time would need to be focused on filing probation violations and processing warrant requests as decreased supervision would likely lead to increased absconding and other law violations.

Approximately 350 misdemeanor and low and medium risk felony Prop 36 offenders would likely be transferred to the bank caseloads. This cut is proposed as an alternative to impacting higher risk felony offenders or those being supervised for more serious or violent misdemeanor offenses. As a collaborative treatment court, this reduction would impact the court and our justice and treatment partners, as well as the offenders. The reduction would require changes to court operations as the remaining DPO would no longer be available to provide updates or assist the court in prioritizing the cases to be heard. It is anticipated that the offenders would be expected to independently follow up with enrolling in treatment and the responsibility for providing progress reports at each hearing would need to be shifted to the community treatment providers.

#2: Currently countywide juvenile high risk caseloads have an average of 35 juveniles per officer. A reduction of two officers would increase the caseloads to approximately 41 juveniles per officer. The American Probation and Parole Association provides the following juvenile caseload standards as industry recommendations: Case Type Cases to Staff Ratio: Intensive 15:1, Moderate to High Risk 30:1, Low Risk 100:1, Administrative Not recommended.

#3: Administrative or “bank” caseloads are utilized to oversee cases of offenders at low risk to reoffend or those that are not readily available for local supervision. This proposed reduction would eliminate one of four Bank Officers and would increase caseloads from approximately 425 offenders per officer to 570 per officer. If the Prop 36 Officers are eliminated, their caseload of approximately 350 cases would be added to the bank caseload and increase the caseloads to almost 700 offenders per bank officer. Although these numbers are well within industry standards for the caseload size, they are not in compliance with the standards because a good portion of the cases would be of a moderate or higher risk level. The American Probation and Parole Association provides the following adult caseload standards as industry recommendations: Case Type Cases to Staff Ratio Intensive 20:1, Moderate to High Risk 50:1, Low Risk 200:1, Administrative No limit.