AGENDA
Thursday, March 28th, 2024
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Location:
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr Carlton D Goodlett Pl, Room 201
San Francisco, CA 94102

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or by calling in to the number below. Instructions for providing remote public comment by phone are below.

Join Zoom Meeting: https://sfdistrictattorney.zoom.us/j/7507631551?omn=81940820608

Meeting ID: 750 763 1551

One tap mobile
+16699006833,,7507631551# US (San Jose)
+14086380968,,7507631551# US (San Jose)

Members of the public attending the meeting will have an opportunity to provide public comments at the beginning and end of the meeting, each member of the public will be allotted no more than 3 minutes to speak on any item(s). Explanatory and/or Supporting Documents, if any, will be posted at: https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sentencing-commission-relevant-documents

1. Call to Order; Roll call

   Pursuant to Sentencing Commission bylaws, the Chair shall present the ancestral homeland acknowledgment of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula

2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below (discussion only)

3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from September 26th, 2023 (discussion & possible action)

4. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from December 5th, 2023 (discussion & possible action)

5. Staff Report on Sentencing Commission Activities, and Reports from the Reentry Council and the Family Violence Council (discussion & possible action)

6. Update on the MacArthur Foundation-funded Just Home Initiative by Aaqilah Islam, Manager of Housing Justice System Initiatives & Ashley Qiang Senior Strategy & Planning Analyst (discussion & possible action)

7. Update on MacArthur Foundation-funded Safety & Justice Challenge Initiative by Alexandra Lopes, Director of Safety & Justice Challenge (discussion only & possible action)

8. Presentation: Jail Population Trends by Lucas Jennings, Senior Administrative Analyst (discussion & possible action)
9. Presentation: Toward a New Understanding: California Statewide Study of People Experiencing Homelessness by Kelly Knight, PhD, Professor at the Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, University of CA – San Francisco (discussion & possible action)

10. Members’ Comments, Questions, Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion & possible action)

11. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Above, as well as Items not Listed on the Agenda

12. Adjournment
SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SAN FRANCISCO SENTENCING COMMISSION

Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the San Francisco Safety and Justice Challenge Subcommittee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and brought to the attention of the Subcommittee. Written comments should be submitted to: Alexandra Lopes, San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, via email: alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org

MEETING MATERIALS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Explanatory and/or Supporting Documents, if any, will be posted at: https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sentencing-commission-relevant-documents. The material can be faxed or mailed to you upon request. In addition to in-person public comment, the Sentencing Commission will hear up to 20 minutes of remote public comment in the order that commenters add themselves to the queue to comment on an item. Because of the 20-minute time limit, it is possible that not every person in the queue will have an opportunity to provide remote public comment. Remote public comments from those who have received accommodation due to disability (as described below) will not count toward the 20-minute limit. Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely by submitting written comments electronically to Alexandra Lopes via email at alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org. These comments will be made part of the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the committee.

ACCOMMODATIONS

The meeting location is wheelchair accessible. To access the meeting remotely as an accommodation, please visit https://sfdistrictattorney.zoom.us/j/86037257374 or call (669) 900-6833. For remote public comments, instructions on how to use the Zoom platform can be found here. Captions can be enabled – instructions can be found here. Sign Language Interpretation is available upon request (see “Translation” section below). Allowing a minimum of 48 business hours for all other accommodation requests (for example, for other auxiliary aids and services) helps ensure availability. To request an accommodation, please contact Alexandra Lopes, San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, via email or telephone: alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org, (628) 652-4296.

TRANSLATION

Interpreters for languages other than English are available upon request. Sign language interpreters are also available upon request. For either accommodation, please contact Alexandra Lopes at alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org at least two business days before the meeting.

CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES

To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: www.sfgov.org/sunshine.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683; Telephone: (415) 554-7724; E-Mail: soft@sfgov.org

CELL PHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and website http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/.
3-28-24 REVISION to Agenda Item 4 Only; all remaining Minutes remain unchanged.

1. Call to Order; Roll Call

Representative Edward McCaffrey, San Francisco District Attorney’s Chief of Communications and Policy, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 10:15am.

Tara Agnese, San Francisco District Attorney’s Office’s Director of Policy, called roll for attendance by member seat.

Members in Attendance:
San Francisco District Attorney’s Office Representative Edward McCaffrey; Adult Probation Representative Alea Brown; Juvenile Probation Representative Derek Hom; Public Defender’s Office Representative Carolyn Goossen; San Francisco Sheriff’s Office Member Paul Miyamoto; San Francisco Police Department Representative Rachel Moran; Department of Public Health Member Naveena Bobba; Reentry Council Member Karen Roye; Superior Court Representative Melanie Kushnir; Member of Non-Profit Organization Serving Victims Chosen by Family Violence Council Member Andrew Tan, Member of Non-Profit Organization Working with Formerly Incarcerated People Chose by the Reentry Council Appointee Member William Palmer; Sentencing Expert chosen by the Board of Supervisors Member Theshia Naidoo.

Members Absent:
Academic Researcher with expertise in data analysis appointed by the Mayor – vacant member seat


Micah Park presented on The Way Out, a new recovery-focused homeless initiative of the Salvation Army. She presented information and data obtained through public records requests on housing and drug policies in San Francisco. Ms. Park also shared information on the early stages of this new initiative, noting that it offers long-term treatment and has had a 76% rate of success,
with 84% of all exits achieving full-time employment 6 months after program completion. During the Q&A, there was a robust conversation about Ms. Park’s analysis, data sources, and conclusions about drug and housing policies in the City. Member Roye asked whether the analysis accounted for the transient nature of unhoused people. Ms. Park responded to say that her analysis of public records data accounted for the inflows of homelessness and noted that these inflows are greater than the outflows of people who are able to get into housing. Member Roye commented on accounting for the success of people who move through city-funded services and asked about the criteria to measure success of the program. Ms. Park responded with information on program eligibility and the initiative’s four-step pipeline for placements into residential treatment. Representative Goossen commented on the lack of sufficient resources in the city and the need for treatment on demand. Representative Goossen asked whether Ms. Park’s negative view of Proposition 47 was reflective of Salvation Army’s views and expressed concern about the opinions expressed in the presentation that seemed to lack research or evidence. Ms. Goossen suggested that a future meeting of this body include a presentation by researchers or experts who can present on the roots of homelessness. Ms. Park invited Destiny Pletsch, from The Way Out initiative, to respond. Ms. Pletsch talked about the exploratory nature of the research project, which included public records requests and existing City reports, and noted the Salvation Army’s stance on recovery. Representative Melanie Kushnir asked a question about data sources and commented on Ms. Park’s analysis of Prop. 47, and asked a question about Penal Code (PC) 666 – Petty Theft with a Prior and the number of individuals who come into jail with this as a standalone charge. Representative Kushnir invited Member Paul Miyamoto to comment. Member Miyamoto noted that in his experience PC 666 is usually not a standalone charge. Member Theshia Naidoo commented on data missing from the research presented, including the impact of the pandemic and other complex factors fueling the homelessness crisis and overdose rates. Member Naveena Bobba thanked the Salvation Army for their work and partnership; noted that the city’s behavioral health system of care closely monitors the care needs of people who use drugs and looks to flex availability based on these needs; and shared that this system of care has a wide array of services that are evidence based across the continuum of care.
1. Call to Order; Roll Call
Representative Tara Agnese, Director of Policy for the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office’s, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. Alexandar Lopez, Safety and Justice Challenge Director, called roll for attendance by member seat.

Members in Attendance:

- Adult Probation - Representative Alea Brown-Hoffmeister, Policy Director
- Juvenile Probation - Representative Gabriel Calvillo, Assistant Chief
- Public Defender’s Office - Representative Carolyn Goossen, Director of Policy
- District Attorney’s Office - Representative Tara Agnese, Director of Policy
- Sheriff’s Office - Representative Kathy Johnson, Undersheriff
- Police Department - Representative Robert O’Sullivan, Acting Assistant Chief
- Department of Public Health – Representative Naveena Bobba, Deputy Director of Public Health
- Reentry Council – Representative Freda R. Glenn, Assistant Director of Child Support Services
- Superior Court – Representative Melanie Kushnir, Director of Collaborative Courts
- Member of nonprofit organization serving victims chosen by Family Violence Council - Andrew Tan
- Sentencing Expert chosen by the Board of Supervisors - Theshia Naidoo, Legal Director, Criminal Justice Drug Policy Alliance
- Academic Researcher with expertise in data analysis appointed by the mayor – Mia Bird, Assistant Research Professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkley

Members Absent:
- Member of nonprofit organization working with formerly incarcerated people appointed by the Reentry Council - William Palmer

Pursuant to Sentencing Commission bylaws, Representative Agnese read the ancestral homeland acknowledgement of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco – Peninsula.
2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below (Discussion Only)
No Public Comment received.

3. Welcoming a New Member: Mia Bird, PhD (Discussion Only)
Representative Agnese welcomed Professor Mia Bird to the Sentencing Commission. Professor Bird joins the Sentencing Commission as an academic researcher with an expertise in data analysis who was appointed by the Mayor’s Office.

Representative Agnese shared Professor Bird’s biography:

Professor Bird is a policy analyst and applied researcher focused on criminal justice system reform. She is an assistant research professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy. Before joining the Berkeley faculty, she spent seven years at the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) as a research fellow. At PPIC she co-founded and directed the Multi-County Study, an effort to create the first individual-level, linked criminal justice data infrastructure for the state and counties in California. These data allowed for evaluations of the effects of criminal justice reforms. Professor Bird started at Berkeley in 2019 to help build a sustainable criminal justice data system and leverage these data to inform and evaluate policy decisions. She currently leads projects focused on evaluating the effects of California’s AB 1950, which is focused on probation term limits; AB 372, a domestic violence programming pilot project; and the statewide Humphrey ruling on criminal justice outcomes. She also works with a team of researchers at the California Policy Lab to provide support to the California Committee on the Revision of the Penal Code. Mia holds a PhD in Public Policy, an MA in Demography, and an MPP from the University of California, Berkeley.

Professor Bird thanked Representative Agnese and everyone in attendance. Member Bird commented about living in San Francisco for at least 20 years and working in the Bay Area for at least ten years, some of which have been in San Francisco.

4. Preview and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from September 26th, 2023 (Discussion & Possible Action)
Members & Representatives reviewed the meeting minutes from the previous Sentencing Commission held on September 26th, 2023. Representative Agnese acknowledged Ifeanyi Ebochir, Youth and Young Adult Justice Coordinator, for drafting the meeting minutes.

Member Naidoo requested an edit to the minutes for agenda item four. Member Naidoo acknowledged the technical difficulties at the previous Sentencing Commission, including audio issues, and expressed an understanding for the difficulty of trying to capture what was said in the minutes. Member Naidoo commented that the summary for this agenda item did not accurately reflect the discussion of the presentation and some members’ critique of the presentation’s findings. Representative Goossen agreed with Member Naidoo and also requested edits to the minutes for agenda item four to more accurately reflect comments on the presentations’ findings.
Representative Agnese thanked Member Naidoo and Representative Goossen for their feedback and acknowledged the audio and technical difficulties experienced at the September meeting, which presented significant challenges related to the capturing of Minutes. Representative Agnese proposed to pass the September meeting minutes for all items except Agenda item four and agreed to work with Member Naidoo and Representative Goossen on revisions to this agenda item, which would then be presented for a vote at the next meeting of the Sentencing Commission.

Representative Agnese moved to accept the September 26th Sentencing Commission Meeting Minutes, without item four. Representative Calvillo moved to accept the meeting minutes. Member Tan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a Roll Call vote.

5. Staff Report on Sentencing Commission Activities, and Reports from the Reentry Council and the Family Violence Council

Representative Agnese informed attendees of the recent activities since the last meeting on September 26th. Since the last meeting, the Commission filled the vacant member seat for an academic researcher with expertise with data analysis appointed by the mayor. Staff are working on the next Annual Report for the Sentencing Commission, which will be shared with members and submitted to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors in December. Lastly, the Sentencing Commission meeting will move from the third Tuesday to the fourth Thursday of the month due to scheduling conflicts with the current time. The fourth Thursday came as a recommendation from member agencies. The next Sentencing Commission meeting will be on Thursday, March 28th, 2024 at 10am.

Representative Glenn provided an update on the recent activities of the San Francisco Reentry Council. The last Reentry Council meeting was last held on October 19th, 2023. During the meeting, the council welcomed its newest mayoral appointees Tatiana Lewis, Antonio Napoleon, and Allen Harvin who were reappointed to the Reentry Council by the mayor. In addition, the Reentry Council welcomed new member, David Mauroff, CEO for the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, who is now in a Board of Supervisors appointed seat for an organization that provides pretrial services.

Representative Glenn informed everyone of the Reentry Council Retreat, which is scheduled for Monday, January 22nd, and shared that the retreat serves as an opportunity to engage and recruit new members for the subcommittees. If anyone is interested in joining one of the three subcommittees, please contact Victoria Westbrook, the Reentry Policy Planner at the Adult Probation Department.

Representative Glenn also shared that the Public Defender’s office presented to the Reentry Council on their freedom project, a program dedicated to decarcerating, successful transitions to the community, and post-conviction systemic change. The project has helped shorten 93 prison sentences, reuniting 80 people with their families and communities, including 42 people with life sentences, all within the last 4 years. The Public Defender’s office also shared their College Pathway Project, an initiative used to formalize partnerships with San Francisco State University’s Project Rebound program and City College of San Francisco’s New Directions program for their former or current clients to apply for, attend, and succeed in college. All
individuals are eligible, including those who have pending misdemeanor or felony charges, are currently in mental health or collaborative courts, or are using a clean-slate post-conviction service.

The next Reentry Council Meeting is on Thursday, January 18th, 2024 at 12pm in Room 305 at City Hall.

Member Tan provided an update on the recent activities of the Family Violence Council (FVC). The last Family Violence Council meeting was held on November 15th, 2023. Data collection activities associated with data needed for the Family Violence Council’s Annual report are almost complete. In addition, the FVC received a presentation by Nancy Tung and Rebecca Wagner regarding the prosecution of elderly abuse cases, and a presentation by the Street Outreach Team.

The next Family Violence Council meeting will be held on February 28th, 2024.

6. Update on MacArthur Foundation-funded Safety & Justice Challenge (SJC) Initiative by Alexandra Lopes, Director of Safety & Justice Challenge (discussion only & possible action)

Ms. Lopes provided updates on the Safety & Justice Challenge Initiative. Since the previous Sentencing Commission in September 26th, 2023, the MacArthur Foundation and Justice System Partners (JSP) came to the Bay Area for a two-day convening on CalAIM, which provided an opportunity to talk about the SJC initiative and receive input on work done thus far. Ms. Lopes has been reviewing all three grants and has done extensive outreach to SJC partner agencies to capture their input and needs regarding efforts to safely reduce the jail population and address racial and ethnic disparities.

Ms. Lopes shared that a no-cost extension was submitted and approved in October, that efforts are underway to finalize a budget modification request that includes SJC partner input, and that great progress has been made with the accept and spend (A&E) process for the sustainability grant.

Ms. Lopes shared information about an SJC evaluation that is underway by the Urban Institute, in coordination with the City University of New York (CUNY) and the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), University of Chicago. NORC was asked by the MacArthur Foundation to evaluate the SJC initiative in all implementation sites.

Ms. Lopes also shared that the first kick-off meeting of the SJC Work Group is scheduled for December 12th, 2023.

Representative Goossen asked about the Renewal grant and the goals and deliverables of the Sustainability grant, and whether that information will be shared before the kickoff meeting. Ms. Lopes shared that she expects to have the discussion with the partners about the information at the meeting.
7. Presentation: Jail Population Trends by Lucas Jennings, Senior Administrative Analyst

Lucas Jennings, Senior Analyst at the Sheriff’s Office, presented jail population data for October, 2023, including data on bookings, releases, and average daily population with breakdowns for age, gender, race/ethnicity, charge level, etc.

8. Members’ Comments Questions, Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion & possible action)

Member Naidoo asked a question about whether the Homelessness presentation that was rescheduled due to presenter illness would occur at the March 2024 meeting of the Sentencing Commission. Representative Agnese confirmed that this presentation would take place at the March 2024 meeting if the presenters are available.

9. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Above, as well as Items not Listed on the Agenda

No Public Comment.

10. Adjournment

Member Naidoo motioned to adjourn the meeting. Representative Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a Roll Call vote.
Safety and Justice Working Group

Tuesday March 28th, 2024

Safety + Justice Challenge
Supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
**Jail Population February 2024 Report**

### Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Month</th>
<th>Change from last month</th>
<th>Change from last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bookings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Month</th>
<th>Change from last month</th>
<th>Change from last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Month</th>
<th>Change from last month</th>
<th>Change from last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Monthly Difference in Bookings vs. Releases

- **Total Bookings**
- **Total Releases**
- **Average Daily Population**
Jail Population February 2024 Report

Population 1160
Average time in custody 315
Median time in custody 94
Mode time in custody 7
Median age at booking 32

Time in custody snapshot population on February 20th, 2023

Feb | Last 12 Months
---|---
Black | 44% Low 39 High 44
White | 23% Low 19 High 24
Hispanic | 26% Low 24 High 28
API | 6% Low 5 High 7
Other | 2% Low 1 High 7

Ethnic and Race Percent

- Other: 2%
- API: 6%
- Hispanic: 26%
- White: 44%
- Black: 23%

Gender

- 2%, TGN
- 8%, Female
- 90%, Male

Age at Booking

- 55+: 7%
- 45-54yrs: 13%
- 35-44: 29%
- 25-34yrs: 35%
- 18-24yrs (TAY): 16%
**Jail Population February 2024 Report**

**Time in custody over three years on February 20th 2024**

- Average time in custody: 5.25 yrs.
- Median time in custody: 5 yrs.

**Transgender/Non-Binary Population**

- Snapshot Population: 106
- Percent of Population: 9%
- Average in custody: 5 yrs.
- Median in custody: 5 yrs.

**Legal Status**

- 96%, Pretrial
- 4%, Sentenced
- 0%, Other

**Ethnic and Race Percent**

- 21% API
- 3% Black
- 26% Hispanic
- 44% Other
- 8% White

**Gender**

- 94%, Male
- 5%, Female
- 1%, TGN

**Age at Booking**

- 55+ years: 6%
- 45-54 years: 16%
- 35-44 years: 16%
- 25-34 years: 29%
- 18-24 years (TAY): 33%
Jail Population February 2024 Report

Crime Class at Booking:
- 73% Felonies
- 27% Misd.

Caseload Per Booking Number:
- 42%, Multiple Cases
- 58%, One Case

On View Charges:
- New Felonies and Non-Citable Misdemeanors: 60%
- Other: 40%

Ethnic and Race Percent:
- Black: 32% Low 32 High 36
- White: 30% Low 23 High 30
- Hispanic: 31% Low 28 High 34
- API: 7% Low 5 High 7
- Other: 1% Low 1 High 5

Gender:
- 1%, TGN
- 17%, Female
- 82%, Male

Age at Booking:
- 55+: 8%
- 45-54yrs: 12%
- 35-44: 32%
- 25-34yrs: 36%
- 18-24yrs (TAY): 12%
Jail Population February 2024 Report

Average and median length of stay for released individuals

- Average length of stay in days 24
- Median length of stay 2.96 days
- Mode length of stay 1 day

Released for month 998

- 18% Female
- 81% Male
- 1% TGN

Age at Booking
- 55+ 8%
- 45-54yrs 30%
- 35-44 36%
- 25-34yrs 13%
- 18-24yrs (TAY) 13%

Ethnic and Race Percent
- Black 32% Low 32 High 37
- White 31% Low 24 High 31
- Hispanic 30% Low 28 High 33
- API 6% Low 5 High 7
- Other 1% Low 1 High 5

2024-Feb
Jail Population February 2024 Report

Black/African American Population

- Monthly Difference in Bookings vs. Releases
- Monthly Bookings
- Monthly Releases
- Average Daily Confined Population for the Month

Age at Booking:
- 55+ 8%
- 45-54 yrs 13%
- 35-44 26%
- 25-34 yrs 38%
- 18-24 yrs (TAY) 17%

Gender Black Population:
- 2%, TGN
- 11%, Female
- 87%, Male

Snapshot Population Residency:
- 16%, Out of County
- 48%, Resident
- 35%, Unsheltered/Transient
- 1%, Unknown

Length of Stay among individuals released:
- Average (in days): 23.2
- Median (in days): 3.83
Jail Population February 2024 Report

Female Population
- Snapshot Population
- Monthly Bookings
- Monthly Releases

Age at Booking
- 55+ 5%
- 45-54yrs 9%
- 35-44 30%
- 25-34yrs 45%
- 18-24yrs (TAY) 11%

Ethnic and Race Percent of Female Population
- 24%, White
- 58%, Black
- 13%, Hispanic
- 1%, Other
- 4%, API
- 41%, Out of County
- 13%, Unknown

Snapshot Population Residency
- Resident
- 46%, Unshelter/Transient
- 13%, Unknown

Length of Stay among Individuals released
- Average (in days) 12.7
- Median (in days) 1.96
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Homelessness, Behavioral Health, and Justice Involvement: A Review of the Evidence

Kelly Knight, PhD
Professor, UCSF
Associate Director, UCSF Benioff Homelessness and Housing Initiative

Tiana Moore, PhD
Policy Director, UCSF Benioff Homelessness and Housing Initiative
Drivers vs. Precipitants of Homelessness

**Drivers**: Systemic factors that create overall homelessness rates and explain the difference in homelessness rates between communities

- Lack of affordable housing
- Income inequality
- Structural racism

**Precipitants**: Individual risk factors that increase the chance that any individual within a community becomes homeless

Aldern and Colburn, 2022
Homelessness is a racial (in)justice issue

- Home ownership primary means of wealth-building
- Legal discrimination in home ownership
  - Racial Covenants-Segregated neighborhoods
  - Redlining—restricted access to mortgages in segregated neighborhoods
  - Predatory lending
- Ongoing discrimination in rental market
- Criminal justice, employment and educational discrimination
- **Black Americans at 3 to 4 times increased risk of homelessness**
- **Black San Franciscans at 5 times greater risk of overdose mortality**
California Statewide Study of People Experiencing Homelessness (CASPEH)

- Largest representative study of homelessness in US since 1990s
- Conducted at the request of CA Health and Human Services Agency
Study Methods

- **8 counties** representing 8 regions (exact counties confidential)
- Target population: **Adults 18+** experiencing homelessness
  - 3,200 questionnaires
  - 365 paired in-depth interviews
- Community engaged practices
Where were people immediately before becoming homeless?

- Institutional settings (primarily prison and jail): 19%
- Non-leaseholding arrangements: 49%
- Leaseholding arrangements: 32%
Income and Housing Costs Prior to Homelessness

▪ All:
  - Median monthly household income: $960

▪ Non-leaseholders:
  - Median monthly household income: $950
  - 43% of non-leaseholders did not pay rent
  - Median monthly housing costs (among those who paid rent): $450

▪ Leaseholders:
  - Median monthly household income: $1400
  - Median monthly housing costs: $700
Primary Reasons for Leaving Last Housing, All Participants

- Lost or reduced income: 12%
- Conflict among residents: 9%
- Didn’t want to impose/wanted own space: 7%
- Conflict with property owner: 7%
- Someone else became sick, disabled, or died: 6%

Primary Reasons for Leaving Last Housing, Non-leaseholders

- Conflict among residents: 13%
- Didn’t want to impose/wanted own space: 11%
- Conflict with property owner: 7%
- Building sold or foreclosed; owner/primary leaseholder change: 7%
- Someone else became sick, disabled, or died: 7%

Primary Reasons for Leaving Last Housing, Leaseholders

- Lost or reduced income: 21%
- Conflict with property owner: 7%
- Someone else became sick, disabled, or died: 6%
- Violence or abuse in the household: 6%
- Breakup between residents: 6%
“The first thing I did was I cried because I *couldn't believe that I was actually homeless* for the first time ever… I've always had a job. If I was unemployed, I was never unemployed for more than a month before finding another job. As time progressed, those things became harder…”

- CASPEH participant
Re-entry support
for those exiting prison and extended jail stays

- Jail
- Prison

Jail re-entry support is only reported for individuals who reported jail stays of 30 days or more.

Benefits

- Jail: 19%
- Prison: 18%

Healthcare

- Jail: 17%
- Prison: 14%

Housing

- Jail: 17%
- Prison: 14%
- **30%** went to jail during their current episode of homelessness
- **2 days** median length of stay in jail
- **36%** noted a criminal justice record as a barrier to obtaining permanent housing

- **20%** noted a criminal justice record as a barrier to employment
In their lifetime:

- **25%** reported a PTSD diagnosis
- **31%** have attempted suicide
- **27%** experienced a psychiatric hospitalization

*(44% of those who experienced psychiatric hospitalization did so after their first instance of homelessness.)*
Current Self-Reported Mental Health Symptoms

- Any mental health symptom: 66%
- Anxiety: 51%
- Depression: 48%
- Trouble remembering, concentrating, or understanding: 37%
- Hallucinations: 12%
35% used illicit drugs 3x week or more
- 31% methamphetamines
- 11% opioids
- 3% cocaine
- 9% heavy episodic alcohol use (weekly)

- 40% either regular illicit drug or heavy alcohol use

- 11% reported an overdose during current episode of homelessness
“I started, I guess you could say using, when I became homeless... meth... I would use it to stay awake at night. So, it’s not like I would need a fix in the daytime or nothing else.”

- CASPEH Participant
### Evidence-based Care and Treatment for People Experiencing Homelessness with Co-Occurring MH and SUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harm Reduction Services</th>
<th>Substance Use and Mental Health Treatment</th>
<th>Recovery Supports:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harm Reduction Examples:</strong> Community-based, low threshold access to safer use supplies, overdose prevention and response, access to substance use and mental health treatment services</td>
<td><strong>Treatment Access Examples:</strong> Low threshold access to methadone, buprenorphine, &amp; naltrexone; access to mental health care and residential treatment services</td>
<td><strong>Recovery Supports Examples:</strong> Housing and employment services; policies to prevent housing discrimination; policies that prevent reincarceration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High rates of unmet behavioral health treatment need

- Of participants who reported a current mental health symptom:
  - 24% received mental health counseling or medication in the prior 30 days

- Of participants who reported current, regular illicit drug use or weekly heavy episodic alcohol use:
  - 26% wanted treatment at some point during current episode of homelessness, but were unable to access it
Housing First and Behavioral Health

What is Housing First?
- An evidence-based approach to housing people experiencing homelessness
  - Does NOT mean Housing Only
  - Range of models to meet individual needs

Why is it Important?
- Alternatives (e.g., treatment first models) struggle with engagement
  - Housing offers stability needed to engage with services
- Robust evidence in support of HF across populations
  - Including individuals with severe behavioral disabilities
Permanent Supportive Housing
Subsidized housing with voluntary supportive services

PSH with voluntary intensive services has been shown to successfully house those with complex behavioral health needs.
Denver Supportive Housing Social Impact Bond Initiative

Housing First randomized trial for those with criminal justice system involvement

- Those assigned to HF intervention:
  - Spent more time in housing
  - Remained stably housed
    - **86%** remained stably housed one year after;
    - **77%** remained stably housed after three years
  - Decrease in police interactions
  - Reduction in jail stays

Santa Clara’s Project Welcome Home

Randomized controlled trial of chronically homeless individuals with high rates of system utilization

- Enrolled participants when they presented at a system setting (e.g., hospitals, jails, etc.)
  - 423 participants (199 randomly assigned to intervention)

- At year 4, 86% in intervention group were housed; 91% at year 7

- Participants housed via HF model:
  - Decreased psychiatric ED use
  - Decreased shelter use
  - Spent >90% of nights housed on average

Policy Recommendations

- Lower housing barriers for those with criminal justice records
- Improve re-entry support for those exiting jail or prison
- Increase homelessness prevention in institutional settings
- Reduce carceral responses to homelessness
- Increase access to mental health and substance use treatments
- Increase outreach with harm reduction services
- Center racial equity in all responses