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**Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant**
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The purpose of the Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant (SPF SIG) final report is to solicit your feedback on implementation of the project, and to document the successes achieved and lessons learned. Please use the following outline as a guide for structuring your report.

**I. Needs Assessment**

* Please describe the extent to which SPF SIG data will be collected beyond the project and how it will be used to guide your county’s Strategic Prevention Plan needs assessment process.
* Include lessons learned or suggestions to improve the needs assessment process.

The county will include the SIG project collected data as part of the SPF’s needs assessment process as we update of our County Strategic Plan, which will commence in early 2017 by our evaluator. Should the data substantiate the need to shift primary prevention resources on a different direction to support different community needs, the county will prepare to do so based on available limited resources. As the State knows, funding of law enforcement activities has only been possible through SIG grant funding resources which supported a large portion of the cost of Antioch and Walnut Creek’s police officers.

Our lessons learned include: 1) always include key community residents in any type of

grant, this will insure support towards the implementation process. 2) The role of Sharon

O’Hara was extremely helpful throughout the life of the grant, as it allowed to reconcile

PRC and State’s needs along with county.

**II. Program Management and Collaboration**

* Describe the role of the county behavioral health office (alcohol and other drug services) in the project and the extent of their participation.

The AOD office participated as a convener, facilitator, and supported the project fiscally and administratively.

* The AOD office initiated contract with community partners before there was a subcontractor, to create community support to the project. When Sharon O’Hara and PRC contacted our office. The AOD office was also an internal navigator creating logistical support to ensure that contracts for all parties were in place so that funding would not be a barrier for implementation.

Additionally, AOD provided program oversight and fiscal monitoring. Besides fiscal monitoring, AOD intentionally leveraged the grant with additional financial resources via SAPT funding to further SIG activities, not within the focus of the SIG grant such as addition of stronger community based strategies, but which eased activity implementation. Through those SAPT funded activities our program fostered community support for PRC driven efforts along with support for the police departments.

The AOD office understood early in the process that the direction of the grant was substantially different and there were drastic differences from the original program design that the county submitted. We adapted rather quickly to respond accordingly, and decided to sub contract with a community based provider who would have more flexibility for hiring staff that could initiate the internal necessary work; nonetheless, we were also cognizant that the grant needed county oversight.

* Describe subcontractors and their roles. Note any changes in subcontractors during the project and the impact of those changes.

There were three subcontractors engaged to implement the SPF-SIG project in Contra Costa County: the Center of Human Development (CHD), the Antioch Police Department and the Walnut Creek Police Department. CHD was given the principal role of providing both project and fiscal management services, coordinating law enforcement activities to meet dosage requirements, soliciting and engaging community support, directly implementing a work plan to amplify visibility of law enforcement activities, and report results data on all SIG-related project results. The two law enforcement agencies in Antioch and Walnut Creek were responsible for recruiting and scheduling police officers to carryout evidence based law enforcement activities to abate underage and excessive drinking. In the successive years of the project, high ranking point persons within the police departments were instrumental in training officers and maintaining the morale and support of the rank and file to run the operations. There were changes in personnel at CHD and the police department’s that in the final analysis caused minimal disruption. About midway through the project, Contra Costa County changed the status of the law enforcement agreements from purchase orders to separate contracts. Initially, this change caused push back from Antioch Police Department, which was later resolved.

* Describe your interactions with the Prevention Research Center staff and the support and technical assistance provided.
* Pacific Research Center was consulted in regards to the range and specific types of deliverables that CHD and its law enforcement partners should include in its work plan. Much of our interaction with PRC consisted of check-ins to ensure that our city project’s activities were consistent with the objectives of the research. Sometimes these interactions included course corrections and/or training. For example, we dissuaded to employ the “Public Health Announcement” messaging in favor of sending audience-specific messages that “law enforcement was happening.” PRC provided a workshop for staff and stakeholders from both Antioch and Walnut Creek projects to further define and practice writing these law enforcement messages. PRS also was consulted when problems arose around law enforcements capacity issue and/or their willingness to fulfill their respective roles. This sometimes entailed special meetings, communications with the PDs and adjustments in the work plan. On a couple of occasions, PRC participated directly interactions with law enforcement partners in Antioch.
* Describe your collaboration with law enforcement and other stakeholder agencies.

Include lessons learned or suggestions relative to program management and collaboration.

The primary partnership was between law enforcement and the sub-contracting organization charged with the responsibility of developing and coordinating the visibility of law enforcement messages for our two city projects. Having a committed champion within law enforcement was the single important factor for a successful collaboration in the SPF-SIG. Although, paying for officer overtime worked well and was generally a good strategy, it was not the answer to the shortage of officers available to carry out evidence-based enforcements. Understanding the manpower issues of law enforcement became the key to determining what reasonably could and could not be accomplished in the project. Negotiating less dosage was sometimes a winning strategy for keeping the PDs at the table. Forced overtime is bad for morale and not a sustainable in the long run for an ongoing initiative.

Secondary relationships were developed as needed with schools, PTSAs, various city departments, neighborhood watch groups, churches and area businesses to provide access to a variety of community-based communication channels. Incidences in which secondary partners were given too much latitude to also craft messages sometimes fell short of the researcher’s expectation of good visibility. It was an important early lesson in the project that message development needed to be centralized or tightly monitored for quality control. For the most part, CHD assumed this role.

The PRC researcher and consultant were generally able to assert the interests and aims of the research framework without becoming intrusive to the planning and operations of the local projects. Communications with PRC was both periodic and on an “as needed” basis. There was a need for technical assistance, to make course corrections, and achieving clarity between PRC and the community and law enforcement partners. For the most part, this was accomplished by recurrent 1-2 hour sessions led by PRC and CHD and law enforcement, both directly with individual organizations and as a group.

**III. Planning**

* Please comment on the use of a research-based prevention logic model to guide selection of project activities. Include how this process might be improved.

The logic model was a useful tool for orienting stakeholders and identifying the local strategies, potential partners, and channels of communication. It was visual and helped chart a preliminary course of action. The PRC researcher and consultant did an outstanding job facilitating the discussion to develop local logic models. But once a work plan and “enforcement calendar” were developed and put into place, the logic model became quickly outdated with the many adjustments necessary in the implementation phase and was not something regularly referred to in the later phases of the project. There were some brainstormed ideas were eliminated, but continued to appear on the logic model. The logic model was more of a computer model and not easily transferred to paper; the aims of the project were segmented into multiple categories, which resulted in several different versions with headings that were not always explicit, sometimes leading to minor confusion among participants.

* List any leveraged resources, activities, or funding sources. If available, quantify the fiscal benefit to the project.

County AODS leveraged other funding to help augment SIG staffing with additional 0.50 FTE. Walnut Creek PD leveraged OTS funding to sponsor additional law enforcement operations which was reported in SIG results. Local Merchants donated space and catered food and refreshments for RBS Training. Deer Valley High Schools and Walnut Creek T.V. provided in-kind video production and air-time. A volunteer videographer also donated time to shoot and produce PSAs. School districts and auto malls provided free messaging on marquees and billboards. A discount from Contra Costa Times was obtained for advertising space. Both Antioch and Walnut Creek PD’s provided "buy money” for RBS Enforcement operations.

* Describe the successes and challenges encountered during the planning phase of the project.

The major success born out of the planning process was a sense of trust,

share ideas and the development of a working relationship between the primary

partners charged with carrying out SIG. The outcome of this was a strong

commitment between the police departments, CHD and PRC to accomplish the

project’s aims, which persisted through to the project’s end. At different junctures,

law enforcement, particularly in Antioch, needed to recall and revisit this

commitment in the face of severe manpower issues. Ultimately, accommodations

and adjustments were worked out with the support of PRC to ensure the

continuation of this project.

Conflicting and unclear grant expectations. Counties were asked to submit a proposal following the description of the grant, but failed to provide clarity about the emphasis the grant had in law enforcement and visibility. The latter created a major challenge for stakeholder participants to let go of ideas generated during the planning stage. Initially, planning discussions were not directed to adopt any specific actions or activities and participants were encouraged to think creatively. Toward the end of the planning phase however many of the organic ideas offered by the group were not included in the work plan. Participants with strong attachments to particular planning ideas eventually dropped out. Law enforcement was not given the option to choose among the listed enforcements as they had been led to believe, but had to adopt the entire range of evidence-based activities. There were misunderstandings about whether police departments had the discretion for choosing what they believed was the most effective and worthwhile operations (e.g. shoulder taps vs. minor decoy). As time went on, PRC defined activities more tightly and drew boundaries on what would be included in the confines of the project.

The state analyst assigned to the two city projects in Contra Costa County was a tremendous resource throughout the budget development process and provided helpful guidance and detail-oriented feedback to allow CHD and the County AOD office to construct a complex budget with four operating components. The state analyst played a liaison role with PRC to provide approval of the budget per each contract period and played a key role to ensure that project expenditures conformed with Federal OMB regulations. The analyst was undoubtedly a positive factor in the successful planning of the projects. The analyst was intrinsic to the success of our program.

**IV. Project Implementation**

* Please describe the differences between how the program was planned versus how the program was actually implemented.

Implementation of the project was a process of continuous adjustments based on emerging ideas (e.g. dosage) and new understanding of the project’s requirements (e.g. shift in operation specifications) by everyone involved. Two planning documents really help to solidify our mutual agreement of the actions taken was the negotiated work plan and “Enforcement Calendar.” The partners in Contra Costa County met and referred to these planning documents regularly as a reference point to determine whether the project was on track or not. The Enforcement Calendar was also useful to schedule visibility to coincide with law enforcement activities. The aforementioned planning documents were also a basis for rescheduling dosage, when manpower or arrangement fell through. But, for the most Contra County was able to deliver on most of the planned project activities.

There was a fatigue within the Antioch Police Department that played a role in the reduction of the operations, dosage and communications toward the end of the three year project. Although, the Antioch P.D. technically finished out their contract, there was a marked drop off in deliverables. Forced overtime for officers, many of whom lived out of the area, assigned to carry out the project’s operations was a major factor in feeling “burned out.” Supervising ranks were displeased with morale issues attributed to this. This coupled with the retirement of a particular captain who served as the project’s internal “champion,” we were fortunate to run a few operations and report some dosage during the last contract period.

* The SPF SIG project demonstrated the practical application of prevention research under various community conditions. Please comment on your experience of bringing research to practice in your community.

It was an outstanding opportunity to test whether environmental prevention strategies that greater community visibility could amplify evidence-based law enforcement activities in our mid-sized cities. The research study was an experiential way to explore and learn new environmental prevention strategies as community. The antidotal experience and independent statistics kept by project participants seemed to suggesting that there was a desired effect. For instance, we noticed that the visibility-law enforcement paring of Recognition and Reminder and Minor Decoy operations seemed to have had a dynamic relationship in which visited merchants indicate a heightened awareness. As a result fewer citations and Reminder cards we issued. In Walnut Creek, we saw a drop in DUI arrests and citations due to regular checkpoints and public service announcements. Local law enforcement, community prevention programs and County officials were encouraged by these unofficial and preliminary results.

* List the successes and challenges associated with project implementation.

Successes:

--Full range of environmental strategies was implemented for research testing and replication

--Recognition and Reminder was a particularly effective program

--Strong understanding (with lots of practice) of developing simple effective “Enforcement Messages” to specific audiences

--Developed inexpensive easy communications channels to deliver messages

--Developed Public Service Announcements

--Better understanding of how to effectively partner/collaborate with law enforcement

--Strong working relationships; having identified “champions” for the project

--Used project implementation as major training opportunity for community partners, law enforcement officers, merchants, and project volunteers

--Trial and error experience of what works and what doesn’t

--Law enforcement was able to obtain important tools, equipment and training to supplement implementation of operations

Challenges:

--Complexity of budgeting and reporting according to different state and county timeframes and requirements

--Law enforcement manpower issues

--Morale issues for law enforcement officers caused by forced overtime

--Sustaining operations for the sake of the research, such as Party Patrols and RBS Enforcement, when law enforcement does not perceive tangible results

--Maintaining dosage for manpower challenged departments was difficult to sustain

--Reliability and retention of volunteer pseudo-buyers

--Working with news media, particularly print media, to keep message newsworthy

--Turnover of key players and maintain commitment to project

**V. Results/Outcomes**

* Please describe how evaluation results will be used to refine, improve, and guide future prevention efforts. The county will include SIG evaluation as part of the SPF’s needs assessment process as we update of our County Strategic Plan, which will commence in early 2017 by our evaluator.

Please Include how program evaluation results will be made available to the public. We will post them in our web site and in the subcontractor’s web page. We will also share with all key community partners including each City local government and we will issue a media advisory, perhaps to gain media coverage. If the evaluation offers the basis for some type of policy change, we will definitely pursuit that venue. In Contra Costa, we have been very successful at engage local officials in the development, passage and support of alcohol related policy efforts.

**VI. Lessons Learned**

* List any recommendations that would be useful to other prevention providers who wished to implement this project.

--In hindsight, it would have better to have been to be more prescriptive at the onset of the planning phase, rather than engaging the group to openly brainstorm approaches and activities, most of which were later found outside the scope of the research.

--RBS training was a valued activity (by merchants and law enforcement alike) which should be a regular offering

--Party Patrols and RBS Enforcements appear to have more value as visibility than an effective law enforcement activity.

--Bringing the Fiscal and Program years, basis for contracting and budgeting more into alignment between different levels of government to uncomplicated reporting is advisable.

--We learned to both appreciate the ultimate aims of the research being conducted and respect the unique assets and limitations of the community to carry out the research.

--We learned to both appreciate the ultimate aims of the research being conducted and respect the unique assets and limitations of the community to carry out the research.

--It was important that law enforcement hear about best practices and lessons learned from other law enforcement participants from other areas in annual “Learning Community" convening(s).

--Education partners had a difficult time resisting taking a traditional public awareness campaign approach; most local community partners, including law enforcement wanted messages to be youth-focused instead of targeting adults.

--Community organizations should employ communication professionals to be responsible for crafting and developing visibility messaging.

**VII. Future Efforts and Sustainability**

* Identify all aspects of the program that will continue, and include what factors contributed to the decision to continue them.

In the Walnut Creek area, the police department was able to apply and receive an ABC’s Impact grant, they will continue to provide some degree of law enforcement activities. The AOD office will encourage Antioch PD to apply for an ABC grant and will provide technical assistance if needed. The City of Antioch has been impacted since the inception of the grant with a very weak economy and directly impacted by the effects of gentrification.

* Describe collaboration between agencies established for the purposes of this project that will continue and what form it will take.

The AOD office is committed to remain connected with some of the key players in hopes to reestablish some of our work sometime in the near future. Prevention staff dedicated in East County will be asked to reconnect with community partners as part of their work, including the police department. Similarly, if at all possible we will do our best to monitor the bar scenery in the Walnut Creek area as we did prior to the implementation of this grant.