

COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD



**January 7, 2020 – Alameda County Probation
1111 Jackson St. Rooms 226-228, Oakland, CA 94607**

MINUTES

Present: Raymond Banks, DC Barlow, Lou Rigali, Kamarlo Spooner, Tanasha Stevens, Jasmine Quinn, Karen Roye

- **Call to Order/Roll Call:** 6:15 p.m.
- **November and December Minutes:** November 5th and December 3rd . Ray made motion to remove from November minutes, under "CAB Responsibilities", the words "He is unclear about scope of CCP's powers". Lou seconded the motion. Vote was held and the motion passed unanimously.
- **CAB – Open Seats & Recruitment (Kamarlo):** District 1 – 2open seats, District 2 – 1 open seat, District 3 - 2 open seat, District 4 – 1 open seat, District 5 – 1 open seat
- **CAB Recruitment/Retention Processes:**
 - **Brown Act Training** – Passed
 - Kamarlo seeks to amend recruitment guidelines to be more transparent
 - Current process does not allow for CAB to reject a candidate. Seeks a committee to bring amended process to full CAB. The CAB voted unanimously to create a "Recruitment Committee." Volunteers for the committee: Kamarlo, Karen and DC.
 - Ray moved to have CAB chairs stay on for two extra months after completion of term to help with transition. Karen seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.
- **CCP Civic/Community Engagement Sub-Committee:**
 - Placing funds directly into hands of returnees
 - AB 109 does not provide brick and mortar. Rapid Rehousing includes rental support and support for finding permanent housing including rental subsidies (slide 26)
 - Prop 47 also supports housing
 - Neola suggests someone from Housing speak at CAB
 - Permanent housing numbers are contained within Material PowerPoint
 - Jasmine wants #s of those still housing after they leave the program – see page 32 of Realignment Report (RR)
 - Karen wants to know the intersection of mental health and housing and reasons for persons losing their permanent housing and where is the permanent housing located (in familiar neighborhoods). RR Page 27 addresses disabilities.

- Raymond wants a goal of persons achieving permanent housing; Karen suggests waiting until the CAB has further information on the housing situation, what is impacting the ability to obtain/keep housing
 - Joe believes support of those seeking/holding onto housing is critical
 - Santa Clara County has a program that pays a family to support a returning family member. Alameda County is seeking to adopt
- **“Returning Families”** is the phrase of choice to be used by the CAB (instead of formerly incarcerated)
 - “Returning Resident” is still favored by some including DC. “Returning Citizen”, “Returning Person” are other terms under cons
 - Raymond suggests that those wishing another term to submit to the CAB for consideration; the CAB will also revisit the term
 - CAB will choose a term to send to the CCPEC for use in written materials
 - Persons (Returning Family) can freely choose how they wish to be identified.
 - A vote will be held next month to determine which term will used by the CAB. Four terms will be considered: Returning Resident, Returning Citizen, Returning Person and Returning Family.
- **Realignment Funding (Neola)**
 - **Realignment Structure:** Recommendations can come from each workgroup. All financial recommendations must flow through Fiscal and Procurement. FP is co-chaired by Stills and O'Malley. All recommendations, especially the financial, come before the CAB for discussion and advisement. They will then go to CCPEC who makes final recommendation before going to the Public Protection Committee and/or the full BOS See “Alameda County Realignment/Reentry Reporting Structure.”
 - In short, recommendations going to CCPEC go thru the CAB
 - Senate Bill 678 is responsible for the CCP and was in existence before Realignment
 - **FY 19/20 Funding Allocations (new – total of \$6,267,600)**
 - \$810,542 Education contract extension
 - \$110,000 Employment (Food Program) to transport food for program
 - \$2,000,000 extension of Family Reunification project for 2 years
 - \$2,418,770 Probation Program Development to create infrastructure to do what is necessary to release/oversee RFPs and Contracts. (12-15 benefitted positions max)
 - CBO allocation (50%) would be reduced by 10% to fund this Probation Program Development
 - Stills said that Probation allegation will not increase as funding increases.
 - Shahidah of Supervisor Carson’s Office raises concern that the money is coming from the CBO 50% - suggests there are other options. No one disputes that the money is needed. Raymond suggests that a greater % (than 10%) might expedite the delivery of services.
 - Administrative costs (pg 49 of ??) suggests that Behavioral Health charges for administrative costs.
 - \$30,000 Realignment Evaluation contract extension thru June 2020
 - \$898,288 – Reentry Court PRCS

- Raymond moves to accept the requested funding as whole. Karen seconds. CAB votes, motion does not pass. (3 for and 3 against, no consensus).
- JC moves to sever Program Development from the other items. DC seconds. Motion does not pass (3 for and 3 against, no consensus).
- Karen makes motion to support 5 items (Education Contract Extension, Employment for Food Transport, Family Reunification Project, Realignment Evaluation and Reentry Court – PRCS) but not \$2,418,770 for Probation Program Development. DC seconds. Passes unanimously.
- **Year 7 Realignment Status Update** - passed
- **Institutional Racism:** Passed
- **Agenda Building:** Call to order, Minutes, CAB Update, Work Group Reports, CCP Civic Engagement, CAB Selection Process, Consumer Advocacy Process, Term for “Formerly Incarcerated”, Speaker on relationship between Mass incarceration and Gentrification, Retreat
- **Public Comment:** None
- **Adjourned:** 8:50

**NEXT MEETING: February 4, 2020
6:15-8:15**