

COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD



May 12, 2020
By Online Conference
MINUTES

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

Not Present: Damon Johnson (Shuja)

- **Call to Order:** 6:17 p.m.
- **Review and Approve Minutes**
 - March 3 – Approved with following amendment: “Motion to adopt returning resident passed unanimously” was amended to state, Motion to adopt returning resident passed on a 3 (in favor) to 2 (against) vote.
 - April 1: Approved
- **CAB – Open Seats and Retention (Raymond):**
 - District 1 – 2 open seats, District 2, 1 open seat, District 3 – 2 open seats, District 5 – 1 open seat.
- **Brown Act and Proper Meeting Process (Scott Dickey):**
 - **See attached PP**
 - **Some Highlights:**
 - Created because of lack of transparency
 - The Public’s business must be conducted in public, with ample opportunity for public participation
 - CAB subject to Brown Act because created by Board of Supervisor
 - Ad Hoc committees (with less than quorum) exempted; Standing Committees are not
 - Meeting – all are open to everyone
 - A meeting (physically or electronically) is when a majority of the Board or a committee come together at the same place and time. Even if congregation is accidental.
 - Serial meetings (Chain: A to B to C....and Hub and Spoke) are also subject to Brown act. Serial meetings affectively allow business to be conducted/consensus reached without public input
 - Brown acts prohibits discussion of a matter not on the agenda
 - Be careful that General Public Comment doesn’t become an unagendized discussion
 - Public Comment
 - Persons needing translator get double the time
 - Board not required to reply to public comment
 - Closed sessions exception to/not governed by the Brown Act, but CAB unlikely to have business which would fall within the exception.
 - A Retreat is a meeting.
 - Responsibility of the Chair to keep public in order.
 - Q: If CAB recommendation is turned down by CCPEC, can the CAB appeal to the BOS

- The entire CAB cannot meet with BOS to advocate for a particular matter (as to recruitment transparency) and it is outside of the CAB's jurisdiction (which is to advise the CCPEC).
- BCC (blind copies) – if it's not about scheduling or is voicing an opinion, Dickey would discourage such form of communication because you don't know what others will do with the email.
- A scheduled (intentional vs. unintentional) meeting (i.e. at a Board) the better practice is to notice.
- Dissemination of information by one member to all members is not a violation of Brown Act as long as discussion amongst each other does not occur.
- Staff members polling members can result in consensus of members, so this would violate the Act.
- **CAB Recruitment/Retention Process**
 - Continued conversation – Lou thinks that CAB can create a document setting forth a transparent process for recruitment.
 - Per Dickey: Directing specific action by the Board is outside the CAB's jurisdiction. Asking the Board to meet and discuss such would be permissible.
- **Housing Recommendation revisited after CCPEC**
 - Increase budget 30% for sex offenders, women and children
 - Prior conversation - allocations were not specific enough. Karen/Barbara feels that housing/type of housing for women needs further support and discussion. Recommendation must be built out and specific.
 - Neola: Annual budget \$3.375 million relates to all forms of housing including permanent housing. Several allocations are in the RFP process related to housing projects. Pg. 29, the annual allocation includes all types of housing. Chief Still - 1 million dollars has already been allocated to women for housing. Chief said "permanent" must be more specific. There is no ability to fund someone outside of supervisory period. Goal is to set persons up for ability to secure/manage housing on their own.
 - CAB – concern is still with amounts designated for permanent housing for sex offenders and women and children.
 - CAB/Raymond – understands that CAB recommendation needs to be refined. Does not think that duplication of services is an issue as there are not enough services to go around. KaMarlo does not see sufficient services for sex offenders. Neola indicates that given housing shortages in the state/Alameda County, housing will always be a challenge.
 - Chief Still: RFP for \$1 million will include/appreciate support around sex offenders and women and children housing. Those that fall within AB 109. Will be for agencies that have actual beds available (direct beds), not for referral to housing. RFP will be out in about 60 – 90 days.
 - Tanasha concerned that agencies that "assist with housing" are conducting the same service.
 - Beth Waikus – Executive Director, Insight Garden conducts pickups from prison and facing housing problems. Chief Still is prioritizing persons needing housing and those at risk (such as coming from congregated housing). Chief has indicated that so far, 100% of the persons coming from prison (that Probation was aware of) have been housed.

- **Approve \$3,625,000 in Realignment Funding for 20/21: Karen moves to approve as submitted (Two designated categories). Raymond seconded. Passed Unanimously**
 - Housing: \$3,375,000
 - Probation Client Support: \$250,000
- **Civil/Community Sub Committee**
 - Model of Engagement
 - Entrepreneurial – 10 small loans/grants of \$25,000
 - Raymond feels necessary. One reason for unemployment
 - Neola indicates that an RFP is already in the works for \$1 million for leadership and entrepreneurial skills/business. RFP should be out within the next 60 days.
 - Two listening sessions have occurred within the last two months with justice impacted related to such.
 - Karen asks if RFP will address grants and small loans. Chief Still indicates the funding has been talked about in the context as a grant. But proposals will be competitive...with winners being the most solid proposals. This is what came out during the listening sessions, not all has been flushed out yet. Chief Still indicated that the lack of funding for additional Probation staff dedicated to this work makes for delays in getting money out.
 - Raymond wants the grants to be in the amount of \$25,000.
 - Taqua Bonner – served 30 years 2 months. Certified in electrical trade. Been home for 4 years and has been trying to start his own business. Too many structural barriers. He wants to know if these grants are going to individuals trying to start business or to organizations. Feels discriminated as the funds will not be for parolees.
 - Chief Still indicated that the funds will go to individuals who have submitted a business plan. Leadership training and entrepreneurial which includes grants. Will be for AB 109 participants such as PRCS and does not include parole.
 - Raymond asks if there is “wiggle room” for those other. Chief Still indicates there has been money allocated for services for returning citizens through BSCC.
 - Jabar Watson – spent significant time, most of life in prison - Feels relegated to a permanent criminal class because convictions have kept him from keeping a job. Wants to challenge the Board not to give money to organizations that work with prisons but to the individuals who need the job. Invest in the human being.
 - Neola: One of persons who attended the listening sessions indicated that the process should include expungement. Per DC question, the expungement is limited to the expungement that is already available....
 - Raymond would like to see a dollar amount to the grants. Raymond moves that the grants will be up to \$25,000. Withdrew motion. Discussion ensued. Chief Still indicates they will consider recommendation but they will rely heavily on the inputs over 2 years from the listening sessions. Will not limit the amount for leadership skills.
- **Institutional Perception of Returning Residents**
 - **Retreat:**
 - Raymond believes the retreat should be optional. Feels that the retreat is being generated by the Chief and DA O’Malley/did not originate within the CAB.
 - Chief Still said that is not the case.

- Karen Roye indicated she brought up the idea of having a retreat to better acquaint CAB members with each other and to plan/build consensus in voice, energy in one direction.
- DC and Jasmine both expressed interest in the retreat – could also include a training. A good format to have a day spent honing skills and getting training. Barbara is also for a retreat.
- The retreat would be planned for a time when the group can be physically together, so the matter can be tabled for a few months or so until after the COVID 19 restrictions.
- Raymond moves to table discussion of the retreat until after the pandemic. DC seconds. **Passes unanimously.**
- **Agenda Building:** Recruitment Transparency; John Jones - Housing Advocate, Service Delivery and COVID 19, Mental Health provider, AC Behavior health care guidelines substance abuse and PPE and testing...congregate situations, Black Men Speaks – impact of COVID on BM
- **Public Comment:** Chief Still – Brown Act discussion (for retreat) just occurred. Neola indicates that for security reasons, the department will not be using Zoom. “GoToMeetings” meets the CAB requirements. Program and Services work group meeting – 11 organizations will talk about how they are delivering services given Covid 19. On the 28th from 10 – 12. Notices will go out.
- **Adjournment:** 8:41

Next Meeting

June 2, 2020
6:15 – 8:15