

ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JOINT SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP &
THE COMMUNITY CORRECTS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (CCPEC)

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, November 20, 2023· 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

MEETING MINUTES

CCPEC Members Present:

Marcus Dawal, Chief Probation Officer (Chair)
Chief Gina Anderson, Newark Police
Assistant Sheriff Colby Staysa, Sheriff's Office Designee
Dr. Karyn Tribble, Health Care Services Agency
Brendon Woods, Public Defender

CCPEC Members Not Present:

Pamela Price, District Attorney
Judge Charles Smiley, Superior Court (virtual)

Attendees:

Ahmadi, Atiqullah, Probation
Almandsmith, Sherry, HCSA, OHCC
Aquil Naji
Barua, Francesca, ACBH
Chambers, Adrienne, Probation
Charles Eddy
Chee, Tommy, Probation
Chen, Howard, Probation
Cotright, Tamika, Probation
Dawal, Marcus, Probation
Donté Blue
Dorick, Five Keys
Earl Jacobs

Grigsby, Janene, Probation
Joseph
Keona Percelle-Roos, Roots Community
Health Center
Lacy, Shahidah, BOS Dist5
Lee, Corrine, Probation
Lewis, Clyde, ACBH
Marcella
Miley, Christopher, BOS Dist 2
Morimoto, Masanao, DA
Navarro, Sofia
O'Neill, Gavin, Superior Court
Pascal, Pujya, Probation

Sherita M., Five Keys
Sjoberg, Jason, DA
Smith, Shadeequa, Probation
Stewart, Darryl, BOS Dist 4
Temporal, Gina, Probation
Turner, Charles, SSA-Contractor
Wilson, Jenica, Probation
Wu, Dennis, Probation
Young, Alexa, Probation
Zatcoff, Tyler, Probation

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (CCPEC)

1. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:10 PM
2. **Public Comment on Any Item listed Below for "Discussion" Only**
3. **Review and adoption of meeting minutes from September 18, 2023** – Minutes reviewed and adopted as written
4. **Combining the Community Correction Partnership (CCP) and the CCP Executive Committee meetings in 2024**

It is being proposed that the two meetings (CCP and CCPEC) become a joint meeting on the same day.

Discussion:

- **How would this affect the length and efficiency of the meetings?** Response: The CCPEC meetings are four hours and the CCP meetings are two hours. Generally, both meetings are over within two hours. Joining the meetings may take up the whole four-hour time period.
- **How long have we had a problem with having a quorum?** Response: Once the declaration of the COVID emergency was lifted around February of 2023, it has been challenging to establish a quorum.
- **Is it possible for executive committee members to participate in the meetings remotely for voting purposes?** Response: One of two requirements would need to be met and there are time limits on those requirements. One requirement is if the person is ill and the other requirement is if the person is on business travel. By having the meetings combined it could help with better communication and interaction.
- **What is the schedule for both meetings?** Response: The CCP meets quarterly and the CCPEC meets every other month. It is recommended that four of the CCP meetings be combined with the CCPEC meetings.

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to combine the Community Corrections Partnership and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee meetings in 2024; **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley]

5. Workgroup Updates

A. Fiscal and Procurement Update – Adrienne Chambers, Designee for Marcus Dawal

i. Allocation Spreadsheet Overview – Janene Grigsby

- Fiscal Year (FY) 22/23 Remaining Unallocated CBO Funds = \$7,077,206 (line 80, column N)
- Funds Previously Allocated but Unused and Available to Reinvest = \$668,326 (line 80, column O)
- Total Available: AB 109 Funding for Realignment Clients = \$7,745,532 (line 82, column O)

(1) Potential Future Funding Requests - Janene Grigsby

a. The following programs may need additional funding in the future to keep them going:

- Domestic Violence = \$1,000,000
- Pre-Release Services = \$2,000,000
- AB 109 Funded Program Evaluation = \$500,000

b. Total Requests = \$3,500,000

c. Total Remaining After Potential and Proposed Funding Requests = \$1,537,206

ii. Request to Utilize Available Funding for a Cohort of Community-Based Organizations and Partners to be trained in the Transition-to-Success (TTS) model. A New Way to Combat the Social Determinants of Health: Food Insecurity, High Crime Rates, Inadequate/Unaffordable Housing. Lack of Access to Quality Healthcare, Poorly Performing Schools, Racism, Unemployment and Transportation – Dr. Marcella Wilson

Discussion:

- **This application could work with community-based organizations. What would this look like with an institution like social services or probation?** Response: Based upon the program you are doing we integrate on two levels. First, from the top down. We train to the paradigm shift. That's a 60-minute orientation for everybody who's not in direct services. For individuals working with the clients directly, we certify them in the training. The training teaches them how to utilize the workbook within their practice. At the end of every section in the training, we do what's called a "My Plan". In the "My Plan" component, the attendees develop the framework for the implementation in their practice, in their organization and or their community based upon the organization that they represent.
- **How is this different than some of the things we already utilize – for instance, motivational interviewing? Second question How did you develop your training module and who helped you develop it or was it developed on your own? If we were to say yes to this, is there anyone in addition to you that would be doing the training? Would It include the opportunity for people with lived experience to be involved in the training as well?** Response: To the best of my knowledge, there is no standardized system that can be applied across the five systems of care (Education, Faith Based, Government, Healthcare, and Human Services) that create a uniform language. Data and analytics – that is a key component. Regarding how it was developed - I'm working with the Kellogg Foundation. We were able to hire curriculum writers, researchers, and my own team. Clients became part of the process to evolve the client workbook. It took almost three years to develop. Since then, it's been honed somewhat. We had a group of trainers that we sent for that first training. It is a three-day 22.5-hour training. We welcome people with lived experience to train as long as they can read. We can teach them how to use this workbook, how to inspire others, and how to map dreams.
- **If we say yes, how do we decide who does the training? Would people be self-selected, and would it be mandated that probation staff and CBOs participate?** Response: You identify a point person for me to talk with, and that point person can be by department, or it can be one person. At least two people in your organization are

positioned as trainers. That initial cohort is going to have your future trainers and the people who are going to implement and carry the work forward in both care management and your other delivery areas.

- **Are the materials licensed or are they part of the public domain for anyone who has gone through the training?** Response: Anybody who is certified in TTS has two years of full printing authority of all TTS materials.
- Janene stated that there are a lot of assessment and planning tools out there. This is an evidence-based, client-driven and client-led tool.

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to invite Dr. Wilson back when we are ready to talk more about the services. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley].

iii. AB 109 Funding Requests – Gina Temporal

(1) Transportation Services

a. CDCR Transportation Services

- The current contract term is from April 10, 2022, to March 31, 2024. The current contract amount is \$250,000. This contract is through Bonafide and is called Ride to Reentry. Our Ride to Reentry Program offers safe and reliable transportation with Alameda County individuals being released from CDCR. They also provide necessities and warm meals. Their capacity for the first two years was to serve approximately 83 clients, and have 24/7 availability, 52 weeks per year. For 2023, they received and served all 49 referred clients. The total mileage used was 26,597. The total cost of meals was \$1,600. With approval, they had expenditures of \$241 for a hotel stay for a client and provided 30 clients with phones totaling \$1,240. They have served all 159 clients that were referred. They are on track with their invoices. The contract expected cost per client was \$1,506 and the actual, based on expenditures is \$1,405. As of September 30, 2023, they had spent \$223,395 of the \$250,000 allocated to them.
- For this allocation we are requesting \$250,000 for a two-year extension.

Discussion

- **Is there a recommendation from Probation?**

- Chief stated that this program has been utilized as the norm now more than in the past. San Quentin is no longer a reception center. In the past, a lot of our PRCS clients were released from San Quentin. Now they can come from anywhere throughout the state. There are times when the PRCS releases do not have transportation or don't have a good plan in place and we're able to utilize this provider.

b. Safe Landing Transportation – Shuttle Bus

- This provider is located at Santa Rita Jail. Their current contract term is June 1, 2021 – December 31, 2023. The contract amount is \$1,042,739. The services are being provided by Roots Community Health Center. The shuttle bus operates Mon – Sat from 8:00 am – 12:00 midnight. They transport individuals to Dublin BART and Oakland once per shift. They provide essential needs such as food, clothing, and hygiene items. They also inform and connect clients to resources/linkages (211, CORE, programming). Their 22/23 data is as follows: They served 3,397 people. Of that number 750 were identified as Probation clients. Of that 2 people identified as family members. The total number of service hours was 4,112. Total Days in Service was 305. Total mileage 29,920.5. Regarding the budget of \$1,042,738, Personnel & Benefits was \$696,615.25; Program Costs \$172,564; Participant Costs \$37,550; Indirect Costs \$136,009.39. Total expenditures as of April 30, 2023 was \$544,079.73. A majority of the funds go to Roots rather than vendors. If the CCPEC would like to continue funding this contract it would cost \$540,000 for a one-year extension.

Discussion

- **Would this be the final extension of this contract?** Response: No. The contract can be extended through May of 2025. Behavioral Health funds the trailer stationed at Santa Rita.
- Judge Smiley stated that the contractor did a thorough job of going through the proposal at a previous

meeting explaining the large expense for labor and driving the vehicles.

c. CORE Transportation

- The current contract term is May 1, 2023 – April 30, 2025. The contract amount is \$4,000,000. This request is to augment their existing contract. CORE is our one-stop resource hub. They're co-locating services there, and they host our client resource forums. In the beginning, they were very helpful in providing transportation services. They do provide pick-up service from the Probation Center and BART and have been providing transportation between their Hayward and Oakland sites. They have also been providing transportation between the CORE and AB 109-funded housing sites such as the Care Campus and MOVA. They have also provided transportation for a client to a job interview and social services. Currently, they provide transportation through Lyft and a CORE van. Over the last two months, they have completed 58 pickups. They have coordinated about 15 Uber and Lyft rides, and distributed 17 bus passes and 82 Clipper cards, of which 32 were distributed in October.
- When we originally wrote the contract for CORE, transportation was not a major component. As clients needed transportation from our probation offices to the CORE it became apparent that transportation is a bigger need. We're looking to augment direct transportation from Santa Rita to the CORE or a contracted Probation housing program. With the current contract, CORE did lease a van to provide transportation. This augmentation would allow them to lease a second vehicle and also hire a designated CORE staff. Currently, the reentry coaches are providing transportation services. Additionally, we are interested in providing stipends for ambassadors. Clients who are active on probation will serve as ambassadors. They will ride along with the CORE staff driver and have conversations with clients.
- We are asking for \$500,000 to augment the existing CORE contract to expand their transportation services through the end of the first contract term.

Discussion

- **What are the hours of operation?** Response: Currently the CORE hours are Monday, Thursday, and Friday 9:00 am – 5:00 pm and Tuesday and Wednesday from 9:00 am – 7:00 pm. They are also open every other Saturday from 9:00 am – 1:00 pm. Staff numbers are increasing so the hope is that next year they will have more evening and weekend hours.

d. Pilot Program for Transportation

- This program is also through CORE and the request is to augment the existing funding. There was a workgroup a couple of months ago where we talked about transportation being a very useful service for clients. It was discussed that clients do not have issues with having a car. Whether or not they're driving legally is a different situation. Providing them assistance with car registration fees, license fees, suspended license fees, parking tickets and car insurance would help them with having reliable transportation. For clients obtaining new jobs oftentimes they don't have the money to pay for these fees. Barrier removal would be built into assisting clients. This is different in that normally we might pay for someone's registration but not their parking tickets. CORE would have a Transportation Specialist who would work with the client as well as the DPO to understand what the client needs to get their transportation up and running. Also, the DMV has a program to help folks reduce fees on tickets and car registration that can assist clients. We're still working out the parameters with this. We don't want to limit what we would be able to do to help a client.
- We are asking for \$250,000 to augment their existing contract for a transportation pilot program.

Discussion

- **What happens to the money if no one uses the program?** Response: It's highly unlikely that no one would utilize this program. If so, the money would sit in the contract. We would find a way to outreach to our DPOs as well as our Reentry service coordinators.
- **What is the allocation for transportation?** Response: Previously we allocated \$1,000,000 and that went to Bonafide's initial contract of \$250,000 as well as the remaining money that went to Safe Landing. With

Safe Landing, we did an extension that went over \$1,000,000.

- **For us to approve this we would have to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for them to approve this allocation.** Response: Yes. We would go forward with three separate Board Letters asking them to approve them.
- **Does this put us over the transportation budget?** Response: In March of 2023 we requested \$1M or \$2M and were turned down. You all said you wanted more clarification about these programs, and this is what we have prepared.
- **For Bonafide would we have to go back to the Board?** Response: Yes. Their contract doesn't expire until March. We would go back to the Board before then to add this funding to continue their contract.
- **Same for Roots?** Response: Same for Roots. With CORE we would be asking GSA to go to the Board with us to add an amendment adding additional funding to their existing contract.
- **Would the committee be asked to increase the amount we have allocated in the past towards transportation?** Response: Yes and No. That original \$1,000,000 was from a couple of years ago and then we asked for a Roots extension. We haven't asked for money for transportation since then. It is increasing the amount. This will carry us over for another year and a half to two years.
- **Are some of the motions to increase and some to extend?** Response: They're all to increase. The first two are to increase and extend and the last two are to add additional funding, no extension. The first two are expensive. Our goal would be to ask for additional funding at a later date to run competitive procurements for those services. Neither of those were procured through competitive RFP so we're paying what we are paying for based on the budget that was submitted. We may be able to find the services cheaper elsewhere. However, unfortunately, it's a matter of do we want to lose this service at this time.
- **On the CORE Transportation, are there metrics to figure out how effective this ambassador position would be?** Response: CORE is one of our more robust data-tracking contracts. There are measures tied to the ambassadorship program that is outlined in the contract. One of the requirements of the contract is to remain dynamic based on our client's needs.

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley as to Item 5 A, iii (1) a: CDCR Transportation Services I move that the Board support the described \$250,000 as stated. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley]

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to move that we support the allocation for the next item as stated for Safe Landing Transportation for \$540,000. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley]

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to move that we support the allocation for the next item as stated for CORE Transportation for \$500,000. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley]

Discussion

- **Before we go to the last item just for my notes regarding the competitive process what are the earliest dates we would be able to move forward on this?** Response: I don't expect those RFPs to be released until later next year because of the projects we have prioritized.
- Judge Smiley stated he is not in favor of this one. He doesn't think the planning is concrete enough. From the discussion, there are certain elements he favors and a few items he is opposed to spending the money on. He will urge a no vote.
- I would request that the judge elaborate on his position as to what he is not in favor of.

- Judge Smiley stated that he is not in favor of using this money so that people can pay for suspended licenses and various types of tickets. It's not that sometimes those items aren't appropriate. Parking tickets can pose real obstacles to getting back on track when everything else is in order. I'd like to see a bit more definition of how the money would be used to overcome specific instances without it being a windfall. We see people every day in traffic courts handling their business, doing what they need to do. The court has different programs where people can earn dismissals and waive fines. I just need a little more definition to understand what we are trying to accomplish and the scope of where this money is going.
- Gina stated that she did rush through for the sake of time because people have other commitments. Someone is not going to be able to walk in and say, "Will you pay my parking ticket today?" It's going to be in collaboration with our DPO and we're hoping with our CRISP provider next year. This is going to be for individuals who are making progress in their current programs. This would be one of the barriers during their journey. It's not going to be for someone who is not showing up for their employment program. This would occur after someone has tried some of those other avenues like going through the DMV to see if they can have some of the fees waived. For every client, they are going to have a unique need. DPOs will be signing off.
- Dante Blue from Rubicon stated this program is the one that he is most excited about. Largely because it offers the opportunity to innovate. Innovation is often the driver of progress. I know we need to negotiate how this looks in the contract. This one is really about when a person gets to that point to take the next leap, they need to get themselves around and have their means of transportation. It's pretty challenging for someone living in the Bay Area to take care of their children, get to all their meetings/activities and have a well-paying job without reliable transportation. Transportation is a need. This is about systematized planning and strategic thinking with an individual to help them create their plan of action.
- Chief stated that we do something similar in Probation for our youth in the Positive Youth Development Division. The concerns and issues that Judge Smiley brought up I understand because when you're the one signing off you do need to look at things. There needs to be checks and balances in place and Dante, I believe that you're aware of that and there needs to be some clarity on both ends with Rubicon, with the Probation Officers, and the probation staff as far as appropriate expenditures or transactions. We need to be good stewards of the funds. When you're the one signing off, that comes with a lot of responsibility.

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to move that we move forward with recommendation 5 A iii (1) d: Pilot Program for Transportation for \$250,000. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley]

(1) Five Keys Behavior Therapy Program

- This is for a one-year contract extension of \$500,000 for our Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Services Incentives and Innovation Program known as CBI3. The current contract term is April 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024. It is a one-year contract for \$497,560. The services are provided by Five Keys. Cognitive behavioral interventions impact clients' thinking and ultimately their decision-making. Five keys is using an employment curriculum. If folks have been written up at their jobs or if they have had a hard time in interviews, they are using these experiences to ground the CBI foundation and work. In terms of incentive and innovation, clients are being incentivized for their participation with debit cards. Being able to use debit cards allows clients the flexibility to use their incentives however they need. Following ten weeks of participation, clients receive \$500. In total, clients can earn \$1000. The population of focus would be clients who have transitioned jobs several times or have had a hard time in our housing programs complying with rules or expectations. Sometimes the way we are thinking interrupts our success. Some of their contract metrics include the following: Facilitator Certification; the capacity to serve 96 clients in the first 12 months; offering eight ten-week cohorts; attempting to reach out to all clients who fail/drop; and providing clients a service plan with skill building and aftercare goals.

- Their first cohort started July 10th and their second cohort started October 2nd and is still in session. Nine people enrolled in the 1st cohort. Eight people completed the program. Of the \$497,560 budget, \$304,847 is allocated to staff, \$69,641 (\$1000 per client; \$50/week; \$500 at graduation) is allocated to the incentive program and Indirect Costs are \$45,232. We are requesting an additional \$500,000 to continue funding this program for a one-year extension.

Discussion

- **What is the definition of a participant?** Response: A participant is somebody who signs up and agrees to the service. What Five Keys did for Cohort 2 was outreach and pre-case management with folks which helped to drive up the numbers for that Cohort. Cohort 1 held classes at CORE and virtually. Cohort 2 extended services virtually and during evening hours.
- **At the end of 12 months when we say 96 participants – what does that mean?** Response: Anybody who gets marked active will be considered a participant.

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to move that we move forward with the recommendation to extend the contract for one year for \$500,000. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley]

Public Comment

Following up about the Batterer’s Intervention Treatment program. Response: Janene stated that she has met with some members of the court and current providers to figure out the best way to model this program. There are a few more partners to engage with. If it is not heard in January, it will be ready for a March request.

CCPEC Meeting Adjourned at 3:52 PM

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

1. **Call to Order and Introductions** – The meeting was called to order at 4:20 PM
2. **Review and Approval of the Community Corrections Partnership Annual Plan and Report**
 - There have been some updates to the Road to Reentry, Introduction and Work Group, State Prison, and Realignment Funding Early Intervention Court sections. There have been some changes to the numbers and graphs in the Probation Demographics section. The data page for our CORE Program has been updated. Percentages have been put in place and updated in the Fiscal Investments section. There were some changes made to the data in the EIC section. A word was changed in the Behavioral Health section from “severe” mental illness to “serious” mental illness.

Discussion:

- **If there are just grammatical changes would you prefer an email? And, if that is correct, what is the best way for us to identify the page and/or the pages for you?** Response: If you have scribbled some notes on a page, I can take that.
- **There are no page numbers on the draft.** Response: Yes. The page numbers are the last thing to be added because when going through a draft we don’t want to have to renumber the pages again.
- **If there are significant changes we need to know while we are all together because we need to take a vote to approve the Plan and then this will move forward to the Board of Supervisors.**
- **We got the draft on Friday which is not a lot of time to review the Plan to make any substantive changes.** Response: Noted. Thank you.
- **As I scroll through the different entities under District Attorney there are several items I thought would have been listed in the Courts section.** Response: In the Partners sections, I collect those reports from the partners. This is reflective of what was given to us.

Discussion

- **How do the discussions happen about the use of growth funds? What is the decision-making on these**

accounts when the funding is higher? Response: The growth funds have been discussed before. You don't see it in the additional Fiscal and Investment section because we are only dealing with the 50% CBO allocation funds with the EC.

- Chief stated that this body does not make decisions in this County regarding the growth fund. The money is with the County Administrator's office historically. He is only aware of at the most maybe two or three expenditures that have been approved by the Board of Supervisors to utilize the growth fund. There has been a recommendation made by the Probation Department as far as accessing and utilizing the growth fund. No decision has been made so far and that was about 12 months ago when we provided a proposal to the County. The proposal was submitted to the CAO's office.

Motion

- Motion made by Judge Smiley to move that we approve the Plan allowing for amendments to be forwarded to Janene after today by any of the representatives here or appropriate staff members from other county departments. Motion seconded. **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Roberts, Brooks, Smiley, Stevens, Rigali]
3. **Public Comment on Any Item Not Listed on the Agenda Within the Jurisdiction of the Committees** – No public comments.
 4. **Meeting Adjourned at 4:42 PM**