



FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS · CITY OF ANTIOCH, CALIFORNIA

LEAD in Antioch

Findings and Recommendations

Purpose Dignity Action

Prepared by Rebecca Brown

September 2026



Contents

01	Public Report	1
	<i>LEAD in Antioch: Findings and Recommendations</i>	
	I. Summary	1
	II. The LEAD Model	2
	III. Project Methods	3
	IV. Project Findings	4
	V. Conclusion	8

02	Data Analysis	10
	<i>Methods, findings, and limitations in full</i>	
	1. Data assembly, screening, and refinement	10
	2. Arrest analysis	11
	3. Population analysis	13
	4. County health-system involvement	13
	5. Custody analysis: the blind spot	14
	6. Key findings that inform the report	14
	7. Methodology and limitations	15

03	Data Sources & Scope	16
	<i>How the datasets were assembled, linked, and screened</i>	

04	Diversion-Eligible Charges	19
	<i>The charges considered for diversion in this analysis</i>	



LEAD in Antioch: Findings and Recommendations

Public report · City of Antioch, California · September 2026

I. Summary

In March 2026, the Antioch City Manager retained the nonprofit organization Purpose Dignity Action (PDA), a leading voice in pre-arrest diversion, to analyze the feasibility and potential value of implementing Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) in Antioch. PDA retained Rebecca Brown as the primary consultant on this project; she is the author of this report. This report presents the findings of that analysis and describes a feasible path for putting LEAD principles to work.

This report considers both the potential need for LEAD in Antioch and the practical question of how its approach could be implemented. The analysis identifies a relatively small group of people — perhaps fewer than 50 people per year — who account for a disproportionate share of repeat contact with law enforcement and other public systems.

Antioch has had experience with LEAD in the past. In 2017, Contra Costa County, through its Behavioral Health Department, undertook a three-year, grant-funded LEAD pilot with Antioch as its primary focus. In addition to the city of Antioch and the Antioch Police Department (APD), multiple county entities and community groups were engaged in the pilot project, among them the Contra Costa County Health Services Department (HSD), including its Behavioral Health Division (BHD) and Health, Housing, and Homeless Services division (H3); the District Attorney's Office; the Office of the Contra Costa Public Defender (CCPD); and the Safe Return Project.

Although the LEAD pilot has ended, many of its foundational principles and methods are present in and consistent with multiple efforts operating in Contra Costa County today, including the Holistic Intervention Project (HIP), operated by the Public Defender; the Office of Reentry and Justice; the Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice; the District Attorney's mental health court prosecutors; the County Health Department's A3 Community Response Division and Coordinated Outreach Referral and Engagement (CORE) teams, including a team dedicated to the city of Antioch; Antioch Police Department's Community Engagement Team; the city's Public Safety and Community Resources efforts, including the Angelo Quinto Community Response Team; and multiple nonprofit partners and programs.

Taken together, these efforts provide ready leverage for a coordinated strategy to reduce the repeated arrest of people for unmet behavioral health needs in Antioch. To do so, we recommend that the City of Antioch and Contra Costa County enhance their current partnership by identifying a Project Manager who would be responsible for aligning efforts among all partners — health, housing, law enforcement, prosecution, public defense, service providers — to better address the needs of a small cohort of people

through multi-agency coordination, ongoing information-sharing, and by-name, sustained, street-based, harm reduction case management.

II. The LEAD Model

A. Foundational Elements

First launched in Seattle, WA, in 2011, the LEAD model has since been replicated in dozens of cities across the United States. LEAD (originally Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion, now Let Everyone Advance with Dignity) is a collaborative, community-based framework designed to address the cycle of arrest, prosecution, and incarceration for people whose unlawful or disruptive behavior stems from unmet behavioral health needs, substance use, or extreme poverty.

As a systems-change model intended to align efforts across many policy and implementation partners, the LEAD framework rests on several foundational elements:

– Project Manager

- In LEAD, the Project Manager is the go-to, primary point of contact for all aspects of a LEAD initiative and ensures its day-to-day operations align with LEAD’s core principles and goals, with several areas of responsibility.
 - o Provides strategic leadership and coordination, acting as the central facilitator, planner, and consensus-builder among diverse stakeholders, including law enforcement, service providers, prosecutors, public defenders, community leaders, and advocacy groups
 - o Facilitates meetings for both the Policy Coordinating Group (PCG) and the Operational Work Group (OWG), ensuring effective information flow and follow-through on decisions.
 - o Monitors referral and caseload volumes, prioritizes resources, and ensures the project adapts to changing needs.
 - o Is centrally engaged in community relations, building trust and relationships with neighborhood leaders, businesses, and the broader community
 - o Ensures that the effort is responsive to local public order and safety needs and is seen as a legitimate, effective alternative to traditional criminal justice responses

– Structured Multi-Agency Collaboration

- Policy Coordinating Group (PCG): Senior decision-makers from partner agencies (law enforcement, prosecutors, public defenders, health agencies, community advocates, etc.) set policies, oversee strategy, and ensure resources.
- Operational Work Group (OWG): Line staff and supervisors (case managers, police, prosecutors, service providers) coordinate daily operations and case conferencing.

– Field-Based Case Management

- Intensive, non-mandated, and non-time-limited harm reduction-oriented case management is the core modality, supporting participants in navigating systems and achieving stabilization.

- Legal System Alignment
 - LEAD coordinates with courts, prosecutors, and public defenders to ensure that legal actions do not undermine participant progress.
- Purpose-Built Information Sharing
 - A multi-party Release of Information (ROI) enables appropriate, participant-consented information sharing among partners, guided by strict rules to prevent harm.

B. Operational Elements

- Referral
 - Arrest Diversion: Police refer eligible individuals at the point of arrest instead of booking them into jail.
 - Social Contact Referral: Police refer individuals with chronic law violations related to behavioral health or poverty, even without a specific arrest.
 - Community Referral: Community partners (not law enforcement) refer individuals likely to otherwise be exposed to the criminal legal system.
- Enrollment
 - Enrollment requires only two steps: participants must complete a psychosocial intake and must sign the multi-party ROI.
- Case Management
 - Ongoing, voluntary, participant-driven support using harm reduction and motivational interviewing.
 - Case managers meet participants where they are (physically and emotionally), broker services, and maintain engagement without imposing deadlines or abstinence requirements.
- Multi-Agency Coordination
 - Regular case conferencing and operational meetings ensure all partners are aligned and responsive to participant needs.
 - Legal system partners coordinate on non-diverted or post-enrollment cases to avoid undermining progress.
- Evaluation and Adaptation
 - LEAD sites strive to collect and review data to measure outcomes at participant, program, and system levels, and adapt operations to local needs and feedback

III. Project Methods

The findings presented in this report are the result of a mixed-methods feasibility analysis combining stakeholder meetings, interviews, document review, and data analysis. Six activities made up the work.

- A launch meeting convened 17 attendees representing 11 city and county offices, establishing the shared questions the analysis would address and the institutional interests a diversion effort would need to align.
- Individual interviews were conducted with representatives of the Antioch Police Department, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, and health services, each drawing out that office’s role, its constraints, and its view of the population.
- A review of program and policy documents situated the analysis within Antioch’s and the County’s existing diversion and behavioral-health efforts.
- HSD’s Business Intelligence unit matched the candidate list against the county’s records, including its integrated Familiar Faces data, to establish existing contact with behavioral health, homelessness, and jail systems.
- An analysis of Antioch Police Department arrest data for 2025 identified the divertible arrest universe, the repeat-arrest cohort, and the charge, timing, and location patterns within it.
- A ride-along with the Antioch Police Department provided direct observation of the discretionary, point-of-contact encounters at which a diversion referral would operate.

The project produced this report together with three companion resources: a data analysis setting out methods, findings, and limitations in full; a data-sources appendix describing the datasets and how they were assembled; and a list of the charges considered diversion-eligible.

IV. Project Findings

A. Population analysis

The analysis conducted for this project revealed a small number of people who have repeated low-level law-enforcement contact and significant behavioral health, housing, and service-connection needs but whose complex challenges and often highly unstable daily lives make it difficult for them to identify and consistently engage with available providers and resources. Their high levels of involvement across multiple county and city agencies have disproportionate impacts on individual well-being, public order, and systemic operations.

39

Repeat-arrest cohort

3+ arrests in 2025

152

Cohort arrests

16% of all analyzed

1,579

Jail-bed-days

126 booking stays

- A small group drives this pattern. Of 764 individuals arrested on divertible charges in 2025, 39 people were arrested at least three times in the year, accounting for 152 arrests. For purposes of this report, we refer to this as the cohort population.
- The need is high and treatment engagement is low. Of the people whom the County could match to its records, a majority had contact with the county’s psychiatric emergency, homeless, or emergency department services in 2023, while only a quarter appear in mental health records and 13% in substance-use records.

- Many of the cohort were booked into jail, held for relatively short periods, released, and then the cycle continued. The 38 of the 39 who appear in the Public Defender’s booking records accounted for 1,579 jail-bed-days across 126 stays. Within the cohort, a smaller subset spent a disproportionate share of the cohort’s time in jail; 88% of the cohort’s jail time was attributable to only 44% of the cohort. When out of custody, the people in this subset were then re-arrested at shorter intervals than the rest of the cohort.

People experiencing homelessness are not necessarily LEAD’s population, and only some of LEAD’s focus population may be homeless. However, this population overlaps substantially with the population CORE regularly encounters. People with repeated law-enforcement contact, unmet behavioral health needs, heavy emergency-system use, and difficulty staying connected to services are exactly who CORE already engages.

B. Arrest types, locations, and times

The full category, location, time, and officer breakdowns are set out in the data analysis; here, we offer a few high-level observations.

- Arrest types
 - Warrants: Warrant and failure-to-appear arrests are the single largest category of divertible activity, at 36% of all arrests. Many of these warrants are likely to follow a missed first court date, which is typically set months after a cite-and-release contact; when the person misses that date, a judge issues a warrant for their arrest.
 - Drug possession (16%), theft or shoplifting (9%), and trespassing (5%) follow.
 - Although diversion-eligible charges for LEAD are typically misdemeanors, 78 of the cohort’s 152 arrests were recorded as felonies. Most of these felonies did not arise from the conduct at the arrest: 43 were warrants on an earlier case, and 12 came from a prior record or supervision status, including nine Proposition 36 (2024) enhancements, which allow a felony charge for petty theft or drug possession after two or more prior convictions (Penal Code 666.1; Health and Safety Code 11395). The remaining 23 were for conduct at the arrest, mostly property offenses charged as felonies.
- Arrest locations & times
 - The data analysis shows that the cohort population’s arrests were concentrated in a few identifiable places, chiefly the retail corridor along Lone Tree Way, which accounts for about one in five cohort arrests, and the East 18th Street and A Street area, with the largest share of arrests (35%) occurring between noon and 6 PM.

Read alongside the population and systems findings, the concentration points to a focused response. The same small group is arrested repeatedly, at predictable hours and in a handful of predictable places, and it turns up across the same county systems.

C. Current Alignment with LEAD

CORE is a foundational outreach strategy for Contra Costa County: small teams of street-based case workers meet people physically where they are, strive to connect them to services, and stay with them

over time. Antioch has partnered with the county to assign a dedicated CORE team to the city; half of this team's time is funded by the state's encampment-resolution grant and committed to the Sunset/Devpar encampment and the railroad-tracks site, while the other half, funded by Antioch, works on the encampments that Public Works and Code Enforcement identify. The Antioch-funded half is under growing pressure, particularly downtown, where unsheltered homelessness is affecting businesses and public space.

As an existing outreach team already engaging the high-need, service-disconnected population in Antioch, the CORE team is an invaluable resource. However, much of its work is focused on resolving homeless encampments, limiting its capacity to conduct sustained, by-name case management. Further, although there is substantial overlap between the unhoused population and the LEAD population, LEAD's particular focus is people operating at the intersection of repeated criminal legal involvement and unmet behavioral health needs, who may or may not be part of the recognized homeless population in Antioch. In addition, LEAD's intervention includes intentional and ongoing case coordination with criminal legal partners to stay informed of court processes and reduce failures to appear; this kind of legal-system coordination is beyond the scope of responsibilities for CORE teams.

In October 2026, HSD's Health, Housing and Homeless Services division confirmed that the Antioch CORE team lacks the capacity to take on this work as it is deployed now, and that the County could support a LEAD effort if the City redirected to it the half Antioch funds. The CORE team is funded through March 2027. The City is separately considering \$312,000 in General Fund support to maintain CORE services beyond that period, and is pursuing outside funding that could offset future costs. That question concerns the continuation of CORE rather than LEAD, and the two carry different operational and financial implications.

Antioch could leverage CORE's existing capacities by appointing or recruiting a full-time Project Manager responsible for establishing the multi-system governance framework of the PCG and OWG; developing shared policies and procedures to ensure partners are not inadvertently working at cross-purposes; developing a multi-party Release of Information to enable and steward appropriate, participant-specific information among partners; engaging with stakeholders relevant to these issues, including businesses, community members, family members, and service providers; and stewarding the development and management of a by-name caseload to improve ongoing case management among partners.

D. Supporting Analysis

In this section, we provide a brief summary of the data analysis that undergirds this report. The analysis drew on three datasets:

- Antioch Police Department arrest records for calendar year 2025
- A match of the candidate list against HSD's records, including its integrated Familiar Faces data, covering contact with county behavioral health, homelessness, and emergency systems
- Jail booking records provided by the Contra Costa County Public Defender's Office, covering bookings and length of stay.

Taken together, these datasets were used to answer a connected set of questions: who is arrested repeatedly in Antioch, and for what; how that group intersects with county health, housing, and jail systems; whether the cohort's custody burden is driven by arrests or by holds; and where, when, and how those arrests occur, including how much discretion an officer holds at the point of contact.

Four accompanying resources produced for this project provide greater detail:

- A data analysis carries the full methods and limitations
- A data-sources appendix describes the datasets
- A diversion-eligible charges appendix lists the charges considered for diversion

D1. The population and its system contact

The arrest data provided by the Antioch Police Department detailed 1,797 arrests for diversion-eligible offenses in 2025 involving 1,464 unique individuals, 66 of whom had been arrested three or more times in that year. After excluding every arrest that carried a charge for domestic violence, sex offenses, serious violence, DUI, or traffic-only offenses, or that involved conduct under the age of 18, 953 potential diversion-eligible arrests remained, involving 764 unique individuals. The large majority, 649 people (85%), were arrested only once; 76 were arrested twice; the remaining 39 were arrested three or more times, and these became the cohort population. The other 27 of the original 66 fell below three arrests once the excluded arrests were removed. The cohort is likely somewhat low: an arrest was excluded in full if any one of its charges was ineligible, even when another charge on it would have qualified for diversion, and counting those arrests would add about four people.

Repeated contact at this rate is the marker of people with complex behavioral health needs. To assess this group's engagement with county health and emergency systems, HSD's Business Intelligence unit matched the candidate list against the county's records, including its integrated Familiar Faces data set. Of the 66 candidates submitted in May 2026, 25 (38%) had county jail bookings in 2023 (the most recent year that enabled a complete recidivism window). The figures below describe that matched set.

County-managed system	Share of matched cohort	Avg. contacts / person
Psychiatric emergency	58%	4.58
Homeless services	58%	—
Emergency department	54%	1.83
Enhanced Care Management	29%	—
Mental health services	25%	0.38
Familiar Faces cohort	21%	—
Alcohol & other drugs	13%	0.17

HSD, Business Intelligence unit, May 2026. Percentages and averages are as reported by the County for the 25 matched individuals. These figures describe the 25 people from the list of 66 whom the County could match to its records through a 2023 jail booking. The match depended on linking individuals by name and date of birth across systems that do not share a common database. The 25 are also a small group drawn from 2023, the most recent year that allows a full twelve months of follow-up in which to measure rebooking into jail. The figures therefore show the pattern of system contact for this population but cannot be generalized to all 66, to the cohort of 39, or to 2025. Nonetheless, they show a clear pattern within this group: more than half had contact with psychiatric emergency services and more than half with homeless services, while far fewer received ongoing mental health or substance-use treatment. Only county-managed services are visible. A dash indicates a count not reported by the source.

The pattern is high crisis-service use with thin sustained connection to services: psychiatric-emergency contacts averaged 4.58 per person against 0.38 ongoing mental-health visits, and 29% were rebooked into county jail within a year. Each of these 25 is already known to county systems, which gives a LEAD-aligned effort concrete points for warm hand-offs and marks the gap in sustained case management.

D2. Bookings and jail-bed days

Although many of the cohort were repeatedly booked into custody in 2025, most of the jail time belongs to a smaller group. The 38 cohort members who appear in the Public Defender's booking records spent 1,579 days in jail across 126 stays; of these, 17 people (44% of the cohort) were held a month or longer, accounting for 1,382 (88%) of those days; they spent a median of 74 days in custody in 2025.

These 17 people were arrested less often than the rest of the cohort, a median of three arrests in the year against four for the other 21. Measured against their time out of custody, however, they were arrested about a quarter more often: 1.37 arrests per hundred days out of custody, against 1.11 for the other 21. About a third of the cohort's bookings were probation or court holds, or bookings that did not follow an Antioch arrest, but these stays were short, and most of the time in custody followed an Antioch Police Department arrest. What distinguishes the 17 is supervision status and prior record: five had a probation or parole violation, against none of the other 21, and six had a Proposition 36 enhancement, against three among the other 21.

The custody figures are drawn from the Public Defender's Office booking records; the Sheriff's Office declined to provide data, citing the level of effort required to do so.

V. Conclusion

Based on the fact-finding and analysis conducted for this report, it appears that Antioch is well situated to reduce the challenges of people with high behavioral health needs and substantial criminal legal involvement. The group of people it would serve is relatively small, readily identifiable, and disproportionately encounters multiple systems but with limited apparent sustained engagement: in 2025, 39 people were arrested three or more times in Antioch on diversion-eligible charges, a group the County's records show relying on crisis and emergency care far more than on sustained treatment, and within it a smaller group that accounts for most of the cohort's jail time.

The services these people need are also in place, including with CORE, A3, the Public Defender's Holistic Intervention Project, Enhanced Care Management, and the Angelo Quinto Community Response Team, and the officers and prosecutors interviewed for this project described the same people and the same frustration with seeing them cycle through. These resources can be leveraged and enhanced by establishing a structured framework focused on multi-agency policy alignment and operational coordination for individualized and sustained case management: a Project Manager; a Policy Coordinating Group to set priorities and agreements; an Operational Work Group that meets on a regular schedule; a shared release of information; and case managers who stay with each person through arrest, release, hospitalization, and housing.

References

The LEAD Toolkit, published by the LEAD Support Bureau (a division of Purpose Dignity Action), sets out the model's foundational elements, operational structures, and implementation guidance in full, and

is the primary reference for the LEAD principles summarized in this report. It is available through the LEAD Support Bureau at leadbureau.org.



LEAD in Antioch: Data Analysis

The analytical basis for the implementation report · Purpose Dignity Action · September 2026

Purpose and approach

This document is the analytical basis for the implementation report. It sets out how the data was assembled and screened, what the analysis found, and which findings carry the report's recommendation. Where the report states a finding in a sentence, the derivation is here; where the fullest detail is useful, it is set out here.

The analysis answers four connected questions about Antioch's divertible arrests — who is arrested, for what, where and when, and at what cost in custody — and then narrows from the full arrest population to the small repeat cohort a LEAD-aligned effort would serve. Three sources feed it: Antioch Police Department arrest records for 2025, a county-systems match from the Business Intelligence unit of the Contra Costa County Health Services Department (HSD), and booking records from the Contra Costa County Public Defender's Office. The agencies do not share a common database, so individuals were matched across them by name and date of birth. Their provenance, scope, and limits, and how the 66 people arrested three or more times became the cohort of 39, are set out in the accompanying data-sources appendix.

1. Data assembly, screening, and refinement

The starting point is the Antioch Police Department's 2025 arrest records for an array of commonly-eligible charges provided by the project's consultant — a set that by design leaves out offenses outside the scope of diversion, such as domestic violence, DUI, sex-offender registration, carjacking, child and elder abuse, murder, and sexual offenses. The resulting divertible universe is 953 arrests involving 764 unique individuals, made by 71 officers. The repeat cohort is defined within that universe as individuals arrested three or more times in the year. Individuals appear throughout as APD-2025-nnn codes and arresting units as OFC-2025-nnn codes; names are held in a separate confidential key and are not used anywhere in this analysis.

Refinement: who was removed, and why

The cohort was not taken as the raw output of an arrest count. Three screens were applied by hand, because a repeat-arrest list is only useful if every person on it is a plausible diversion candidate.

- **Juveniles.** Three individuals were minors and were removed in full. LEAD is an adult diversion model, and minors carry separate legal protections.
- **A violent-felony arrest in 2025.** One individual was arrested in 2025 for battery causing serious bodily injury together with assault likely to produce great bodily injury. That is violent conduct, which disqualifies a diversion candidate, so the individual was removed from both the cohort and the universe.

- **Out-of-jurisdiction and serious-felony contact.** One individual’s repeat contacts were pickups on another jurisdiction’s warrants, referred back to that authority, together with a single first-degree burglary. None is a divertible Antioch contact, so the individual was removed.

These screens are why the cohort stands at 39 rather than the raw count, and why the figures that follow are defensible as a diversion-candidate profile rather than a raw arrest tally.

2. Arrest analysis

2.1 Charge mix

Warrants and failure-to-appear are the single largest category at 36.5% of divertible arrests, a high share. Drug possession and the named property and person offenses follow. Sixteen categories are tracked individually; the residual “Other” (8.5%) collects six low-frequency types broken out in the underlying data.

Crime category	Arrests	% of total	Notes
Warrants / FTA	348	36.5%	Largest single category; 76% felony-level within the cohort
Drug Possession	153	16.1%	Skews afternoon; often co-charged with warrants
Theft / Shoplifting	82	8.6%	Concentrated on the Lone Tree Way corridor
Other (6 sub-categories)	81	8.5%	Firearms, reckless evade, receiving stolen property, conspiracy, misc.
Trespassing	50	5.2%	Downtown L Street core; morning peak
Burglary	42	4.4%	459 / 460 PC; several charged as felonies on value or priors
Vehicle Theft	41	4.3%	Several repeat-cohort individuals
Assault / Battery	36	3.8%	Simple misdemeanor battery only; 243(e) domestic violence is excluded
Obstruction / Resist	33	3.5%	148(a)(1) PC, 69 PC; frequently co-charged
Vandalism	33	3.5%	594 PC; felony where the damage clears the value line
Marijuana	19	2.0%	11357–11359 HS
Disorderly Conduct	16	1.7%	647(f)/(b) PC, 415 PC
Prob Violations	8	0.8%	1203.2 PC
Contempt of Court	5	0.5%	166 PC
Fraud / Forgery	3	0.3%	530.5 PC, 470 PC, 476 PC
Parole Violation	3	0.3%	3056 PC, 3000.08 PC

The warrant share is the most operationally telling figure. Many of these warrants were generated by earlier cite-and-release contacts where the person failed to appear; each warrant arrest then risks a new court date that may itself be missed. This warrant cycling — arrest generating court date generating warrant generating arrest — is one of the patterns diversion case management is specifically built to interrupt, by addressing the barriers to appearance rather than re-arresting on the warrant.

2.2 The role of felony charges

A common assumption is that felony charges signal conduct requiring prosecution rather than diversion. The Antioch data does not support that assumption for this cohort. Each arrest record carries a single charge level for the whole arrest rather than one per charge, so a misdemeanor arrest made on an outstanding felony warrant is recorded as a felony. Within the cohort, **76.3% of warrant arrests carry a felony level**, and 78 of the 152 cohort arrests are felony-level overall. Of those, 43 rest on a warrant instrument — a bench warrant under 978.5 PC or an outside felony warrant — and in 37 the

warrant is the only felony charge in the arrest. A further 17 are property offenses charged as felonies on value or on priors, and 9 carry a Proposition 36 (2024) recidivist enhancement. The felony marker here records a prior case or an accumulated record, not present dangerousness.

The table below sorts the cohort's felony arrests by what made them felonies. Each arrest is counted once, under the first source that applies.

What made the arrest a felony	Arrests	Share	Charges included
Warrant instrument	43	55%	Bench warrant (978.5 PC) or an outside felony warrant. The felony is from an earlier case, not from the arrest.
Property wobbler	17	22%	Receiving stolen property (496), grand theft (487), burglary (459/460), vandalism over the value line (594), vehicle theft (10851).
Prop 36-related enhancement	9	12%	Proposition 36 (2024) and related priors: petty theft with priors (666.1 PC), hard-drug possession with priors (11395 HS), repeat vehicle theft (666.5 PC), strike priors.
Supervision violation	3	4%	Probation (1203.2 PC) or parole (3056 PC) violation.
Other felony	3	4%	None of the categories above matched the felony charges in the arrest.
Drug sales / transport	2	3%	Possession for sale or transport rather than personal use.
Firearm / weapon	1	1%	Felon in possession (29800), large-capacity magazine (30305), loaded or concealed carry (25850, 25400).

The recorded level does not always agree with the charge text: 6 cohort arrests are marked felony where no charge is written as a felony, and 6 marked misdemeanor carry one that is. The shares above are close but not exact.

2.3 Officer discretion at the point of contact

How an arrest is initiated determines whether diversion is even possible. An on-view arrest, made from an officer's direct observation, carries discretion at the moment of contact; a warrant or failure-to-appear arrest is effectively compelled once the warrant exists. About 45% of the cohort's arrests are on-view, which means that share already occurs at the discretionary, pre-booking moment where a diversion referral would be an available alternative. The warrant half is harder to divert at arrest but points upstream to the missed-court-date cycle.

2.4 When and where

Arrests concentrate in the afternoon: the noon-to-6 p.m. window is the peak at about 35% of cohort arrests, driven by retail-corridor activity. Trespassing runs against that pattern, peaking in the morning and consistent with encampment-related enforcement downtown. Geographically, activity concentrates on the Lone Tree Way retail corridor and the downtown L Street core; the exact per-location breakdown is held in the underlying data, and is best read there because a single arrest can carry multiple charges across categories. The point for design is that both the timing and the locations are predictable, which is what makes fixed-zone, peak-hour outreach feasible.

3. Population analysis

Across the 953 divertible arrests there are 764 unique individuals. The distribution is steep: the large majority appear once, and a small tail accounts for the repeat activity.

Arrests in 2025	Individuals	% of unique	Notes
1	649	84.9%	—
2	76	9.9%	—
3	19	2.5%	Cohort threshold
4	10	1.3%	—
5	7	0.9%	—
6	2	0.3%	—
8	1	0.1%	Maximum observed
3+ (cohort)	39	5.1%	Account for 152 arrests (16%)
Total	764	100%	Unique individuals

The 39 individuals in the cohort averaged 3.90 contacts each over the year, with a range of three to eight. Repeated contact at this rate, concentrated in so few people, is the defining marker of a population whose underlying needs — housing instability, substance use, mental illness — are not being addressed by enforcement. For this group, arrest alone is not producing behavioral change.

4. County health-system involvement

To test how visible this group already is to county systems, HSD’s Business Intelligence unit matched the candidate list against the county’s records, including its integrated “Familiar Faces” data set. Of the 66 candidates submitted in May 2026, 25 had county jail bookings in calendar 2023 — the most recent year with a complete twelve-month recidivism window — and the figures below describe that matched subset. That submission was the Public Defender’s repeat-arrest file: people arrested three or more times in Antioch in 2025 on potentially divertible charges. After excluding arrests for domestic violence, sex offenses, serious violence, DUI, traffic-only charges, or conduct under the age of 18, there were 39 people who still had been arrested at least three times on potentially divertible charges. The figures below therefore describe the candidate pool the cohort is drawn from rather than the cohort itself.

County-managed system	Share of matched cohort	Avg. contacts / person
Psychiatric emergency	58%	4.58
Homeless services	58%	—
Emergency department	54%	1.83
Enhanced Care Management	29%	—
Mental health services	25%	0.38
Familiar Faces cohort	21%	—
Alcohol & other drugs	13%	0.17

HSD, Business Intelligence unit, May 2026. As reported by the County for the 25 matched individuals, including those with zero contacts, so per-person averages understate intensity among actual users. These figures describe the 25 people from the list of 66 whom the County could match to its records through a 2023 jail booking. The match depended on linking individuals by name and date of birth across systems that do not share a common database. The 25 are also a small group drawn from 2023, the most recent year that allows a full twelve months of follow-up in which to measure rebooking into jail. The figures therefore show the pattern of system contact for this population but cannot be generalized to all 66, to the cohort of 39, or to 2025. Nonetheless, they show a clear pattern within this group: more than half had contact with psychiatric emergency services and

more than half with homeless services, while far fewer appear in the records of ongoing mental health or substance-use treatment. Only county-managed services are visible. A dash indicates a count not reported by the source.

The shape of the contact matters as much as its extent. Psychiatric-emergency contacts averaged 4.58 per person against 0.38 for ongoing mental-health visits and 0.17 for substance-use services, and 29% were rebooked into county jail within the follow-up year. This is a population repeatedly touching acute and crisis services without being connected to sustained treatment. Two things follow for the report: most of these individuals are already known to county systems, which gives an outreach model concrete points to build warm hand-offs from, and the thin treatment-engagement figures mark exactly the gap sustained case management is meant to close.

5. Custody analysis: the blind spot

The cohort's custody is concentrated, and across the cohort it tracks how long someone is held rather than how often they are arrested. Annual bed-days correlate with a person's longest single stay at $r = 0.88$ and with their 2025 arrest count at $r = 0.06$. The 39 individuals accounted for **1,579 jail-bed-days across 126 booking stays**, with 17 held 31 days or longer and a single individual reaching 182 days. The figures cover the 38 of 39 cohort members who appear in the Public Defender's booking records. Seventeen of the 39 were held a month or longer and account for 1,382 of the 1,579 bed-days, 88%. Their median is 3 arrests against 4 for the other 21 with a custody record, but that comparison is distorted by incapacitation: they spent a median of 74 days in custody, a fifth of the year. Measured against time out of custody they are arrested at 1.37 per hundred days against 1.11 for the rest, and their median interval between arrests is 45 days against 47 for the cohort. Five of the seventeen carry a probation or parole violation against none of the other 21, and six carry a Proposition 36 enhancement against three.

The central finding is that arrest counts understate this burden. About a third of the cohort's bookings are probation or court holds, or bookings that did not follow an Antioch arrest, but these stays are short, and most of the time in custody follows an Antioch Police Department arrest. Some bookings originate outside Antioch, and the custody data does not separate those from holds on local cases, so that split is an estimate: for the highest-custody individuals, an arrest-only measure reads them as low-frequency while a custody measure places them among the most jail-intensive in the cohort. The per-person custody record pairs each individual's arrests with their bookings.

Two implications carry into the report. The true custody exposure of this population is larger than an arrest count suggests, so any cost modeling should count probation-hold bed-days rather than arrests alone. And probation churn is itself a material, hidden driver of jail-bed use — the cycle a diversion model is positioned to interrupt — which is why prioritization should weight length of stay and supervision status, not arrest frequency in isolation.

Booking-to-arrest association is a date-proximity match validated at the cohort level against the Public Defender's Office booking records. Because bookings were linked to arrests by date, the share of custody time that follows an arrest is an estimate.

6. Key findings that inform the report

The analysis above resolves into six findings, each of which carries a specific element of the report's design.

- **A small, identifiable group drives the pattern.** 39 people account for 152 arrests at nearly four apiece. This is what makes a by-name prioritization approach feasible rather than a broad program.
- **The conduct is low-level, not violent.** Warrant cycling dominates, with Proposition 36 theft and drug charges behind it; the refinement screens hold violence out. This is what makes the population appropriate for diversion at all.

- **Need is high and treatment engagement is low.** Heavy crisis-service use with thin sustained treatment is the gap the intervention targets, and it maps onto the population CORE already engages.
- **Custody is driven by length of detention.** Most of the cohort's time in custody follows an Antioch arrest and is concentrated in the 17 people held a month or longer, which is why the leverage is in sustained follow-up and care coordination rather than the arrest event.
- **The population is already known to county systems.** Existing county contact supplies the warm hand-off points a delivery model can build on.
- **Contact is predictable in time and place.** Concentration on known corridors during known hours is what makes fixed-zone outreach practical.

7. Methodology and limitations

- **Screening and refinement** were applied as described in Section 1; the resulting universe and cohort figures are internally consistent, and the category counts sum to the 953 total. The exclusion screen was corrected in September 2026: domestic-violence battery under 243(e) PC, failure to register under 290 PC, and elder abuse under 368 PC were passing through a pattern intended to stop them, and 202 arrests left the universe when that was fixed.
- **The county-systems match** cannot be generalized beyond the people it describes: it rests on 25 individuals linked by name and date of birth across systems that do not share a database, drawn from the 66-person May 2026 submission rather than from the cohort, uses a 2023 reference year against a 2025 arrest cohort, and sees only county-managed services, so private and out-of-county care is invisible and per-person averages understate intensity among actual users.
- **Custody figures** are drawn from the Public Defender's Office booking records. Bed-days and stays are counted directly; the records do not show which holds were on local cases and which originated outside Antioch, so that split is an estimate.
- **Warrant counts** total 348 in both the crime-category view and the officer/warrant-log view. A single arrest can carry more than one charge, so the two bases can differ; in this build they agree.
- **All individuals and officers are de-identified** in the analysis; identities are held in a separate confidential key, and the officer-code crosswalk is unverified and not used for attribution. Full source detail is in the data-sources appendix.



LEAD Antioch — Dataset Scope & Exclusions

Data sources and scope for the feasibility analysis · Purpose Dignity Action · September 2026

Sources

- The **Antioch Police Department** provided its 2025 arrest records matching an array of commonly-eligible charges provided by the project’s consultant; each record includes the arrest date, charge, charge level, disposition, arresting unit, location, and time.
- The **Business Intelligence unit of the Contra Costa County Health Services Department (HSD)** supplied a county-systems match against the county’s records, including its integrated Familiar Faces data set, covering jail bookings and bed-days, psychiatric emergency contact, emergency department contact, mental health and substance-use services, homelessness-system contact, Enhanced Care Management enrollment, and rebooking. The match was run in May 2026 against a 66-person candidate list, of whom 25 had a county jail booking in calendar 2023.
- The **Contra Costa County Public Defender’s Office** provided jail booking records for the 66 people in the Antioch Police Department data who were arrested three or more times in 2025, drawn from the 1,464 individuals in that data, recording each person’s booking dates and length of stay in custody. The cohort of 39 is drawn from these 66.

Linking the sources

The agencies that provided data for this project do not share a common database; as a result, in order to match individuals across systems, we used their names and dates of birth.

Our first dataset was provided by the Antioch Police Department: we provided APD with a list of charges commonly considered as diversion-eligible, and APD returned every arrest on any of those charges in 2025, yielding 1,797 arrests of 1,464 unique individuals. From that list we identified everyone arrested at least three times in the year, 66 people.

HSD matched those 66 against its records, including its Familiar Faces data. That data set is built around a year of county jail bookings followed by twelve months in which to measure rebooking (as a proxy for recidivism), so its most recent complete year is 2023. Of the 66, 25 had a county jail booking in 2023, and every county figure in this analysis describes those 25 from the 2023 data: the share known to the County’s systems (emergency department, psychiatric emergency, mental health, alcohol and other drug services, homeless services, and Enhanced Care Management) and the share booked into jail again within twelve months.

The Sheriff’s Office declined to provide 2025 jail booking records for these people, citing the level of effort required, but the County Public Defender’s Office searched its own database and provided the jail booking records, including the jail-bed days reported here.

On secondary screening, we removed every arrest for domestic violence, sex offenses, serious violence, DUI, or traffic-only charges, and every arrest made before age 18, leaving 953 arrests of 764 people. Of the 66, 39 still had at least three arrests after that screen, and they form the cohort presumptively eligible for LEAD.

Scope

- The analysis covers arrests made during calendar year 2025. Booking dates in the custody data range from October 2024 through September 2025 and are counted here as the 2025 custody record.
- The jail booking records came from the Public Defender’s Office, not the Sheriff’s Office, which operates the county jail and declined to provide them.
- The arrest records cover the City of Antioch. The county-systems and custody data reflect the same individuals’ contact with Contra Costa County systems, which extends beyond Antioch.
- The dataset comprises **953 arrests** involving **764 unique individuals**, all screened as potentially divertible.
- Within that group, **39 individuals** were arrested three or more times and account for **152 arrests**; these individuals form the repeat cohort.

Included

- For every arrest, the dataset records the charge category, charge level, disposition, time of day, and location, reported in aggregate rather than by named individual.
- For the repeat cohort, it records 1,579 jail-bed-days across 126 booking stays, covering the 38 of 39 cohort members who appear in the Public Defender’s booking records.
- It also includes county-systems indicators for the 25 individuals who matched county records out of the 66-person candidate list submitted in May 2026, from which the cohort is drawn.

Recidivism measure

- For the purposes of this analysis, recidivism is defined as rebooking into county jail. It does not measure rates of rearrest, further prosecution, or new convictions.
- HSD’s Business Intelligence unit computed it from the Familiar Faces data set: of the 25 individuals from the May 2026 candidate list who had a county jail booking in calendar 2023, 29% were booked into county jail again within the following twelve months.
- Calendar 2023 is the reference year because it is the most recent year with a complete twelve-month follow-up window.
- The count covers bookings in Contra Costa County only. A booking in another county, a citation that does not lead to a booking, and a new charge filed without a booking all fall outside it.

Intentionally excluded

- Several offense types were screened out of the divertible universe: domestic violence, DUI, sex-offender registration, carjacking, child abuse, elder abuse, murder, and sexual offenses.
- Three juveniles were removed from the analysis in full, as minors fall outside the scope of LEAD.
- Two individuals were removed as ineligible for the cohort. One was arrested in 2025 for a violent felony — battery causing serious bodily injury, together with assault likely to produce great bodily injury. The other’s repeated contacts were out-of-jurisdiction warrant transfers alongside a single first-degree burglary, none of which is divertible.

Not captured (structural limits)

- The jail booking records come from the Public Defender’s Office’s own database, so bookings for individuals the office did not represent — those with private counsel, conflict-panel cases, or filings the District Attorney declined — may be missing from them. The arrest records come from the Antioch Police Department and are not limited in this way.
- Custody handled outside Contra Costa County, such as a booking on another jurisdiction’s warrant, does not appear in the Public Defender’s Office booking records.
- The county-systems indicators reflect only those individuals who matched county records.

De-identification

- Individuals appear as APD-2025-nnn codes and arresting units as OFC-2025-nnn codes, with real identities held in a separate confidential key.
- The crosswalk from officer code to identity is unverified, so it is not used to attribute arrests to named officers.



LEAD Antioch — Diversion-Eligible Charges

Charges considered for diversion in the feasibility analysis · Purpose Dignity Action · September 2026

The charges below are generally representative of diversion-eligible charges under LEAD. This list was produced by the project consultant and provided to the Antioch Police Department as the basis for the 2025 arrest records analyzed in this project.

CODE SECTION	OFFENSE
Drug Crimes	
<i>Includes charges eligible for LEAD under Penal Code 1001.87</i>	
H&S 11364	Possession of pipe, paraphernalia
H&S 11350(a)	Possession of cocaine, base cocaine
H&S 11377(a)	Possession of methamphetamine
H&S 11357	Possession of marijuana
H&S 11550(a)	Under influence of a controlled substance
H&S 11357.5/11359/11360	Possession for sale and transportation of marijuana
H&S 11378/11378.5/11379	Possession for sale and transportation of methamphetamine, PCP
H&S 11351/11351.5/11352	Possession for sale and transportation of cocaine/cocaine base
H&S 11395(b)	Possession of a hard drug with a prior
Crimes Against the Public Peace	
PC 415	Fighting, causing loud noise or using offensive words in public place
Theft Crimes	
PC 466	Possession of burglary tools
PC 459.5	Shoplifting under \$950
PC 459/460(b)	Commercial burglary
PC 470-476	Forgery
PC 476a	Fraud, bad checks
PC 484 / 488	Petty theft
PC 490.1	Petty theft of less than \$50
PC 490.2	Petty theft of \$950 or less
PC 490.8(a)	Retail crime criminal restraining order
PC 490.8(e)	Civil retail theft restraining order
PC 496(a)	Receiving stolen property
PC 666.1	Petty theft with a prior

CODE SECTION	OFFENSE
Miscellaneous	
PC 503	Embezzlement
PC 530.5	False personation / ID theft
PC 594	Vandalism
PC 602	Trespass on land (including various subsections)
PC 602.1(a)	Interference with business
PC 602.5	Unauthorized dwelling; aggravated trespass
Disorderly Conduct	
PC 647(b)	Prostitution
PC 647(c)	Begging or soliciting alms
PC 647(e)	Lodging without the owner's permission
PC 647(f)	Under the influence of drugs or alcohol or both in a public place
PC 647(h)	Loitering, prowling, wandering upon the private property of another
PC 647(i)	Peeking and prowling
PC 647(j)	Peeking and prowling with camera
Crimes Involving Persons	
PC 240	Assault, non-domestic violence
PC 242/243(a)	Battery, no citizen's arrest
Crimes Involving Police Officers	
PC 148 a(1), a(2)	Resisting, delaying a police officer
Vehicle Code Sections	
CVC 20002	Hit and run
CVC 23103(a)	Reckless driving
CVC 23222, 23223	Open container
CVC 12500	Unlicensed driver
CVC 14601	Driving while license suspended / revoked, including various subsections
CVC 14601.5	Driving with knowledge of suspension

H&S: Health and Safety Code · PC: Penal Code · CVC: California Vehicle Code