

**ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**  
**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (CCPEC)**

**Hybrid Special Meeting**

Friday, March 17, 2023· 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

**MEETING MINUTES**

**CCPEC Members Present:**

Marcus Dawal, Chief Probation Officer (Chair)  
Rodney Brooks, Public Defender Designee

Judge Charles Smiley, Superior Court  
Dr. Karyn Tribble, Health Care Services Agency

**CCPEC Members Not Present:**

Chief Gina Anderson, Newark Police  
Richard T. Lucia, Undersheriff, Designee  
Pamela Price, District Attorney

**Attendees:**

Barua, Francesca	Margarita	Lee, Corrine	Sjöberg, Jason	Turner, Charles
Belowich, Steven	Conner, Shauna	Lewis, Clyde	Smith, Shadeequa	Wilkerson, Riley
Bituin, Maria Eleonor	Cruz, Ayana	Luckett Fahimi, April	Smith, Shanice	Williams, Shahidah
Brodie, Daniel	Eddy, Charlie	Ly, Vy	Stevens, Tanasha	Young, Alexa
Cao, Binh	Fraix, Madeleine	Martin, David	Sy, Luwissa	Zatcoff, Tyler
Castanada, Mildred	French, Nancy	Morimoto, Masanao	Taizan, Juan	Zaw, Myo
Chambers, Adrienne	Grigsby, Janene	Pedrotti, Christopher	Temporal, Gina	Additional Guests: 1
Colon-Rodriguez,	Khan, Shereen	Perez, Margarita		

1. **Call to Order and Introductions** – The meeting was called to order at 1:29 PM
2. **Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below for "Discussion Only"** – No public comments
3. **Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from [January 23, 2023](#)** – Minutes reviewed and adopted as written
4. **Workgroup Updates:**
  - A. **Fiscal and Procurement – Shauna Conner, Designee for Marcus Dawal and Pamela Price**

The Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup met on February 7 and March 7, 2023, where they focused on reviewing the below Fiscal Year (FY) 23/24 budget allocation ask from Alameda County Probation Department (ACPD), Community Development Agency (CDA), and Alameda County Behavioral Health (ACBH) for contracts with community based organizations' (CBO)

i **[Allocation Spreadsheet Overview](#) – Janene Grigsby**

- Current Year: Remaining Unallocated CBO Balance = \$1,207,285 (line 77, column M)
- Current Year: Funds Previously Allocated But Unused and Available To Reinvest = \$668,326 (line 77, column O)
- Next Year: Fiscal Year (FY) 2023/2024 (FY23/24) CBO Allocation = \$34,924,984 (line 73, column N)
- Total Available: AB 109 Funding For Realignment Clients = \$36,800,594 (line 79, column O)
- *Total Proposed Allocation = \$27,755,123 and Total Remaining if approved = \$9,045,471*

(1) **[Contingency Funding](#) – Shauna Conner**

- a. A new funding list has been added to the Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup which identifies programs and initiatives that will potentially need additional funding during the fiscal year as a result of information gathered during procurement planning or program implementation

- b. There is currently no data or analysis for these programs as required by the Agenda Item Request (AIR) process, but the workgroup will keep note of the potential need for additional funding for these programs and consider this information when evaluating new allocation requests
- c. Contingency Funding Total = \$5,500,000

Discussion:

- (1) ***The money needed to continue these programs, is \$5.5 million the total?*** Response: Yes, \$3,000,000 for Employment, \$2,000,000 for Pre-Release, and \$500,000 for Cognitive Behavior interventions (CBI); the breakdown is in the [package](#). Nothing formal, but something we keep as part of our notes in that workgroup so we know these allocation requests might be coming up before we allocate any other funds.
- (2) ***How did you come up with the estimate?*** Response: It's an approximate; what's happening is we are implementing these programs and some of the providers are coming back saying maybe these things weren't considered. Or, based on negotiations, we know there's going to be additional funds needed.
- (3) ***Did they come forward with a hard number?*** Response: It's a general, so we won't know until we formally come to this body for an ask what the number actually is. We wanted to let you know this will be attached to the Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup documents moving forward.

ii **Annual Realignment Allocation Recommendations \$27,755,123 – Gina Temporal & Janene Grigsby, Riley Wilkerson, Juan Taizan & Clyde Lewis**

(1) Alameda County Probation Department Recommendations \$16,651,300

a. [New Family Reunification Program \\$4,800,000](#)

- (1) This [recommendation](#) is for \$4,800,000 for a new two-year Family Reunification contract; the current contract runs from February 1, 2019 through January 31, 2024 with a total contract amount of \$5,167,260
- (2) Because the existing contract will reach its five-year limit per county policy, Probation is required to go back out and bid through a new competitive Request for Proposal (RFP); the program will be revamped
- (3) The current providers are Asian Prisoner Support Committee, Centerforce, and Tri-Cities Community Development

Discussion:

- (1) ***Which of the elements are new, why did you choose to add that, and what elements have you taken away, and why did you choose to remove them?*** Response: It's really not a replication of the programs that we had, but components of each of the programs we had are going to be part of this new program. We looked at everything being provided from those programs, and that will still be available to clients in this one, but we also broadened and expanded what's going to be available. ***Nothing has been removed and things have been added, is that correct?*** Response: Yes. ***Can we talk about what has been added and why?*** Response: We cannot get into too much detail yet, but for most of the items, the *new* comes in how we are providing the service and not necessarily what is being done. For example, Centerforce offers parenting classes. We will still offer parenting classes, but what it looks like will be new; every item listed will not look exactly the same as it did in our old program.
- (2) ***With the housing stipend, the families would receive \$800 per month for six months, and once the program approves their residence, they won't have to go through any additional visits, correct? Is there anything that would limit their family from***

- continuing to receive support when the person is living in their home?*** Response: Again, I cannot talk too much about it because the RFP is still in development, but we did hear feedback from clients – for those on fixed income, the \$800 was too much and negatively impactful; for others, it wasn't enough or the six months was not long enough. As we revamp the family reunification program, these are things we are planning to modify with the new RFP.
- (3) ***Starting with the housing stipend, how will it be managed because, I'm concerned there is no safeguard with tenants' rights. How will it be managed or supervised?*** Response: We worked with the Oakland Housing Authority a lot when we were developing guidelines around the existing contract, and it was rolled out when COVID hit, and it became a self-certification. Now things have changed again and all the providers who do housing stipends were required to go out and do an actual certification, which means they go out and do a check of the space to ensure the person is actually living there. They also have to document who the check is going to, and we only reimburse them after receiving verification that the check was cut for that individual. We also occasionally go out and audit the providers to make sure those checks did clear.
- (4) ***There was also a mention of case planning. When does that arrive and what does it look like in this context?*** Response: We are asking all the providers across the board to create some type of plan, and not necessarily a court case plan, so the client and probation officer know what service is being provided. The case plan is to distinguish what the family reunification provider will be offering the client that may be distinct or collaborative with what they may already be receiving. ***And all that is voluntary; it's an ancillary service that's available to people who reach for the support?*** Response: Yes.
- (5) ***I saw a slide that mentioned 10 parenting classes as a part of an offering.*** Response: Yes, that is what the current program offers. ***I want to make sure that whatever is ultimately decided is aligned with what happens in the court and to make sure the District Attorney's office is onboard with whatever the services are so people can also get credit in court for completing the program.*** Response: Yes, especially because we are trying to tie into those existing resources in the community. ***In court, you can probably tie it to completion of a program instead of 10 sessions.***
- (6) ***What are the current metrics for measuring success and challenges of the current program and what are we going to build into this next iteration if approved?*** Response: We are measuring qualitatively how connected clients feel back to their family. We're also measuring family reunification opportunities, and that might look like a parent who had child custody restored completely; it might be a parent who previously didn't have visitation and now they are regaining visitation. Any progress on child-family relationships, child support services, stability within the household. We've made the push to put all of our vendors into Enterprise so we can capture this information. We have a dashboard on our side where we get to see what's happening each month. Unfortunately, the current system does not allow for the vendors to have a dashboard, so we are trying to share those dashboards with them, and we are consistently working with them to make sure the data is up to date.
- (7) ***And the next layer would be the aggregate data? Is that being shared somehow?*** Response: Yes. We share the data quarterly by doing a quarterly pull. In the May CCPEC meeting, you will get January through March, You will see it for employment, housing, family reunification, and I think the higher education providers just went into it, so you will start to see the data. You can see how many referrals the program received and how many people are actually enrolling. In regards to the new program, if you look at the [Logic Model](#) in the blue section, it's often written in terms of

numbers because that's the kind of metrics we're going to be looking at: how many people go into the program, what services they receive, what their need is, and tracking every part and component of the program so we can see if we're reaching the outcomes we wanted or what we need to change to better adapt to the actual needs of the clients coming to receive the services

- (8) ***How many clients are you presently serving and how many do you hope to be serving with this next RFP?*** Response: Right now, there are 96 individual clients between the three programs. ***Does that include children?*** Response: We just track the client. We can't share details completely, but we do have some projections of how the quote was built of how many people we do intend them to serve, which is around 250 people per year. ***I have a comment that is forward-looking and goes over everything we're about to discuss today: In planning or anticipating what needs will be, I think in this venue it's going to be very important to have a better understanding of what our District Attorney is going to implement as policy. Because if we're going to continue to have an AB 109 eligibility definition that limits us to felonies, and if there is a push to have a different charging approach to different offenses, that could really impact some of the services that are available here. And then I think we need to have a discussion about whether we can expand our reach in other ways under AB 109, but I'm wondering if that's part of the planning that we need to at least consider when matters are put out for RFPs, and if we need to find some language that allows us to recapture; if the numbers are changing, and we need resources to go in a different direction, like to misdemeanor diversions because there are more misdemeanors being charged and there's a greater need over there, I would hope the County would consider the redeployment of resources.***
- (9) ***Why would we put the housing piece for families into the housing contract? Why wouldn't we still put it into the family reunification contract?*** Response: The way we have our existing RFQ for housing is strictly for them to provide us beds; it's not a stipend. It has been open for a year and a half, and we have not been able to procure family housing. We have been able to do women with children, and we have looked at some properties, but there is not a space we felt comfortable putting a family into. We have it currently in our family reunification as a way to help unite families and as we expand this family reunification program and the different services we offer; it made the most sense to do the housing stipend through this program.
- (10) ***I heard the providers would be responsible for doing home inspections. What about security concerns? The family is not on probation and didn't necessarily consent to having random people in their house searching to say if it's acceptable for them to live in it? What about their concern about that?*** Response: They are not forced to do this in any way. The providers do go out or they're having that conversation, because the check is not made out to the client; it's made out to the individual who actually has to pay the rent, so it's not something they are forced to do, because it is income that could impact them as well. So, for security purposes, they must be willing to do this. They are not forced to take in a client in any way. ***Are there parameters around what is acceptable housing?*** Response: We do have some guidelines and it is going to vary. I don't have them with me, but it is going to vary by the situation. When it was developed, they used the HUD guidelines, just in terms of if a house is habitable. It really is a benefit to families who are already welcoming a returning citizen in, so it's just a stipend to support that connection. The providers are not going into the house every single week and checking the house; it's just at the beginning to verify there is a lease in this person's name, they do have a right to be there and if we issue them a check, it can actually go to them.
- (11) ***And for the childcare, I expect you're going to make connections with First 5 to get***

*people signed up to BANANAS and all of those things, so that once this money runs out or their time is up, they are connected to the greater concept.* Response: That is the intention without going into too much detail about childcare. Yes, it is about connecting them to those different services.

- (12) *In the structure that I'm seeing for how we're going to spend money; I don't see a lot that talks about housing for men with children – men being the primary caregiver. I don't know the numbers statistically or what the need is, but if it's true that there is not really infrastructure out there for that, I want to point out that this \$800 could mean everything to fill that gap for a person who wants to reunify with their young person but has nowhere else to go. And oftentimes, that can be a huge barrier.* Response: Yes, absolutely. We have housing for women with children, but we don't have a men's facility with children, and so that is one of the goals of that as well.
- (13) *I have a follow-up to the other question. If a family never takes in a client, that residence is subject to being searched as if the client is living there?* Response: When you say search, are you talking about Probation conditions? **Yes.** Response: No, this is separate and apart. They are going just to make sure it's habitable, make sure it will be safe for the client, and that the person is an actual lease holder. *Is the residence subject to being searched?* Response: It can be separate and apart from the Probation conditions. *Will the search conditions apply to places under that person's control? I'm not aware of an order that says you can search anybody's house full scale. There has to be that nexus. At first, it's clear to see if it's an appropriate habitable domain, but I was wondering ongoing if there would be additional inspection or review of any kind that would impact the person receiving support. That could be a barrier.* Response: Hypothetically, it could be their bedroom and it could be common areas that they have access to. *But has that happened?* Response: Not to my knowledge. If they're going to be searched, I would say it would be within standard Probation parameters, regardless of whether they're receiving the stipend or living with anybody, it would fall under that. This housing stipend doesn't expose anybody to extra search parameters or anything like that. I don't think that we can definitively say one way or the other. Certainly, we could know if our staff did a Probation search, but we wouldn't know necessarily if another law enforcement agency performed a Probation search. *This is a data point, though. It's a little distressing that the investigation comes on the frontend but not the backend. Ideally, it would be nice to get some type of data at the conclusion to see, one, quantify whether or not the full six months actually occurred, and if it didn't, why not? Because if we have people participating in the program opening their homes to someone, and we're doing something, anything, even if it's a search clause, we would want to know so we can figure out how to enhance the program to accomplish its purpose.* Response: We did talk to the providers about the housing stipend, and they did share that sometimes the \$800 is too much. And the way the contract is written with GSA, we had no flexibility around that, it was \$800 per month for six months, and we couldn't reduce it or extend the time. We are taking their concerns into consideration as we revamp the program. I think we need to have a measure to capture that. *My concern is that if the client is only there for three months, we want to know why.* Response: Yes.
- (14) *This is regarding expanding AB 109 eligibility. Many services have been underutilized other than employment and housing and depending on what policy changes are made by the District Attorney's office, less people may become eligible for services. For this particular contract, what's been the utilization over the last couple of years, and going forward how is it being redesigned to promote better utilization?* Response: We have seen uneven utilization across the three providers and the capacity that was identified for these contracts was not science, so we have many programs that go over the capacity they indicated and some that are under. So, what

we are attempting to do at the front end, we will have a pre-release process that will be coming up, which we've spoken about at length. We hope to have a CBO embedded who will help us with screening and start directing clients to those programs. We will still have to start looking at data to see if we need to expand, because we haven't been necessarily serving the pre-trial clients or the clients in collaborative courts the way that we should, so before we begin to really look at expanding the eligibility, we need to make sure we're serving the clients we're supposed to be serving. With the policy changes that have been implemented with the new District Attorney, it's really to be determined because we don't know. There could be an increase on the lesser included offense as far as cases being resolved with misdemeanors or misdemeanor probation, but there could also be an increase in cases resolved with probation grants rather than state prison sentences. As we look at the contracts that we have in place, some of which are first iteration of the contracts that have been extended over the past few years, they were put in place initially because that's what the CCPEC and the community thought was needed. Yes, there are issues with utilization with some contracts, but we also have to consider whether the contract is the right thing for the population we're serving. Because have some allocations for services that may not be what the majority of the population needs. What is proposed is a recommendation for a new RFP. We've done the maximum number of extensions, the contacts end January 2024, and this is an opportunity for us to have an informed RFP based on some outcomes we saw with the current iteration and some outcomes that we did not see. We have an opportunity to put out an RFP based on feedback from the provider and client outcomes, that will meet the needs of the clients that we're serving, and not just rubberstamp what we had in place before.

- (15) ***A comment and a question: I want to remind everyone that the court has collaborative and treatment courts, and one of the eligibility criteria includes people who are on pre-trial status. So, for your diversion cases – felony, misdemeanor – I assume folks are eligible to receive these types of services that will only strengthen people's footing in the community and help curb recidivism. So, that's my comment – you perhaps need greater integration with what's happening, because in a lot of the treatment courts, some of them are not managed; we've made partnerships with Behavioral Health and other entities, but some are not but could be, and we're missing a whole bunch of people who could fill-up the roles. The question I have is because our AB 109 eligibility definition talks about people who are on pre-trial status, for the person who has been charged with any level offense, and as they await trial and can start receiving services, if at some point a good attorney or the DA makes a decision to reduce the level to a misdemeanor and the case pleads to a misdemeanor, does that mean that people's services will be interrupted in the relationships that we're creating just because someone's charge was modified to whatever parties agreed it should be?*** Response: We've had both scenarios. We've had individual vendors that stay on longer to see a person through service completion. We've made special modifications to certain programs to extend it 60- and 90-days past when their legal status changes. But we also have had individuals get terminated from service because their legal status has changed. We have had people adversely affected with respect to programs because their legal status changed. We've also made an effort with the providers that we're contracting with to make sure they are showcasing what other services are out there that are not funded through Probation and connecting clients to those linkages. And that will be a big part of this family reunification program so things can continue even when their probation term ends.
- (16) This recommendation is for \$4.8 million. This is for a 2-year contract at \$2.4 million per year for a new RFP to be issued. The current contract started February 1, 2019, and runs through January 31, 2024, and the current contract amount in total was \$5.1

million.

- (17) ***Before a motion is made, one comment: in the future, the Court's position will be we need to reach more people. For this price tag, we need numbers; that's what I would be expecting to reup in the future.***

**Motion**

- (18) Motion made by Dr. Tribble including Judge Smiley's comment; seconded by Rodney Brooks; ***Motion passed by unanimously vote*** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]

b. [Alameda County Probation Department Managed Realignment Funded Programs and Services \\$11,851,300](#)

- (1) This recommendation is for \$11,851,300 and is the annual allocation ask for the AB 109 programs and services that were previously implemented; transportation was discussed at the last CCPEC meeting
- CAB Notetaker \$900
  - CAB Web-Based Application \$400
  - Realignment Housing Programs \$10,000,000
  - Probation Client Support \$300,000
  - Sex Offender Treatment \$550,000
  - Transportation \$1,000,000

Discussion:

- (1) ***For the CAB notetaker, will they need to be here in-person, and have you factored in all that it will take for a person to participate?*** Response: This is on top of the stipend they receive to participate on the CAB board. They get \$100 to go to each meeting.
- (2) ***For the housing data slide, it's hard to extrapolate proportionally which sites, if at all, have greater success because there are a variety of factors. Are you all able to evaluate not only a referral to a particular location, but keeping in mind which environments can be more successful?*** Response: We are keeping track of this. You're right, there are a variety of factors, and we're looking at that. We are keeping track of those percentages. Tyler Zatcoff does a monthly report of all this data and talks to all the housing providers about it. We're trying to look at how we can best support them, and how we can do more outreach with permanent housing providers to assist them in trying to help our clients get permanent housing after leaving these programs. But it is difficult; housing is very expensive around here, and despite numerous laws and things put in place to try to help our clients who have justice involvement in their past, it's still something that's going to be held against many of them, that's just the reality of the situation. Those are all things we have to consider but it is something that we're monitoring and that we're continuing to look at with all the providers. ***Thank you, that's helpful. It would also be helpful at some point for us to have a little bit more of that context in what you all are presuming could be the contributing factor to success.*** Response: You're right. And I can definitely look at that in the future. In the last two years, we've gone from 64 units of transitional housing to over 266 units of housing with a lot of these coming on relatively recently, so we are still collecting data. But that is definitely something we can break down and talk about in the future. And to add about why some have not stayed in particular housing situations, Shauna Conner and Tyler Zatcoff have done some training for our managers on the housing pool on the different types of programs and will be also provide this training to the deputy probation officers, which should yield better outcomes, because despite similarities, all of the housing is unique and sometimes it's about a best match.

- (3) ***By my estimation, we're paying an awful lot for a couple of programs to get people across the finish line and successfully complete, and there's a large disparity between how much it costs per successful graduate from this field of programs. For the most expensive programs, how is Probation approaching the value that we're getting out of each program? Why is there such a strong disparity, what accounts for it, and how is Probation controlling for it so we're not wasting resources?*** Response: It depends on the program because some will be single occupancy and some double. It also depends on what type of program it is. We're trying to think of different phases and levels that we can have and some programs are like a house or duplex, and that will cost more than. Property type plays a huge role in some of the costs. There are also various staffing needs, so a women and children's program will be more expensive because there are children there. We are trying to make sure we're getting the most out of it and getting clients successfully through them, because some of these programs are very expensive. Most of these have come on within the last year and a half to two years, and a lot of clients can stay in these programs usually for a year, so for a successful completion, it will take a client a year to go through this program and really search for housing, save money, try to get a job, and address other potential barriers that they are facing. But that is something we're trying to collect more information on and then evaluate where we are getting the most successes and why that might be. In particular, I'm looking at programs that offer incentives and potential matching funds to help clients move into permanent housing, because that goes a long way in helping our clients find permanent housing and a lasting place to stay.
- (4) ***There were three buckets for transportation. I'd like to know how much money is going into each of these buckets so I can understand this community CORE location and what the division of the \$1 million would look like.*** Response: We haven't quite determined how the \$1 million will be split up and at what point. In the current iteration of Bonafide's contract, they do have ample funding so that we would be able to extend them for another year without funding. But their contract does expire at the end of this month, so we are extending them because they have those available funds. Because we are still standing up the CORE, we haven't decided what the transportation piece is going to look like. And with Pre-Release coming on as well, we are exploring different options. Our intent is, once we know who the CORE and Pre-Release providers are going to be and what that's going to look like, we would be able to say how much money would be needed. We know where some of the challenges are, but because those programs are not stood up, we don't know how to solve them yet. We want people to be able to go from the CORE to/from Santa Rita directly to the programs they will be participating in versus just one drop-off location in Oakland, because that's how it is right now; once a day the shuttle goes out to Oakland, and otherwise they're getting dropped off at BART. So, we want to be able to make arrangements for people to be transferred from where they are in custody or coming out custody to the program they're going to be connected to, including the new CORE. It's still too premature to be able to completely define it until those are setup and running, but also if we wait, then we would have to come here and that extends the process by about three months. ***What can you tell us about how the \$1 million makes sense to all of this? Safe Landing is my concern; we've got to keep that moving. I would be concerned vote today resulted in an interruption in that particular service. Same thing for Bonafide. But this other money you're talking about, I'm a little uncomfortable with, because I don't know who we're talking about and it's a big price tag.*** Response: We do have funding for Safe Landing through the end of this calendar year to continue their services, and I think because most of our programs are going to be stood up probably in the summertime towards Fall, if the best approach was maybe to have Safe Landing add a shuttle, that's where we would add the funding to that. What we know when we originally did an RFP for transportation, from prison and also from Santa Rita, the price



tag was well over \$1 million. And at that time, the allocation was \$1 million for transportation, and we didn't have enough money, and that's why they were split into two. Our intent is to have somebody at the courts when we stand up our Pre-Release program who is able to assess people right away; that's where we talk about Uber or Lyft, because we don't know which model is going to be best in helping clients access transportation. We still are in that research phase of trying to determine what would be best for that. We can come back to this body and let you know how we intend to spend the money once we have a better understanding. For context, the current contract amount for Bonafide is \$250,000, and go to December 31, 2023, with Safe Landing, the allocation is \$1,042,739, and they didn't really start services until October 2021. ***But you mentioned the \$1 million would potentially allow flexibility across all three?*** Response: Yes. ***\$1.4 million sounds like a lot. I know we're asking a lot, but why is it a million and a half dollars to transport people from Santa Rita to BART and to Oakland?*** Response: That is the question we have been going back-and-forth about. For Santa Rita specifically, it's a shuttle and there are a lot of costs – the gas, the maintenance. They also run twelve hours, so there are different personnel shifts that it's covering. They also have money built in there, similar to Bonafide, they provide clothing, hygiene kits and different things. While we appreciate the service at Santa Rita Jail, when we do the numbers, it doesn't make sense to us as well as to why we are paying so much for transportation just to BART and Oakland once. Our programs are not all at the same location, and with CORE, we are trying to co-locate more of our providers at the new CORE, but the reality is that they're going to be served throughout. We did utilize Bonafide and Roots' numbers as a base to inform this, and what we found is different clients require different needs and having those diverse options costs money. We've had clients who require a therapist or someone from a therapeutic team to accompany them somewhere, so we're trying to build in those options. Other people might benefit from Rideshare. Some might be okay with the shuttle and others need to go beyond Eastmont Mall. One of the things we talked about the last time we came to this group is we just want to make sure we have enough funding to provide different options and meet people where they live. ***The \$1 million is okay, but spreading it across all these different sets, including the Warm Handoff, which sounds terrific if we can get people from custody into treatment immediately. I'm just stuck on Roots, a program I really like, I like the work that they do, and they've been a terrific partner, but I don't understand the price tag because their mission doesn't require them to take people to these therapeutic programs. Are they buying more vehicles? Has the insurance gone through the roof? I'd like to know more. I'm a little concerned because some of the money is going to go into a program, in my mind, I can't justify the figure for.***

- (5) ***As far as Probation Client Support, I was looking for more detail. Is this something that you all are providing or the CBOs you're working with? I didn't see anything about number of clients served or what success looks like. Any of the basics.*** Response: For Probation Client Support, this is the fourth fiscal year we've gotten this allocation as individuals meet different case plan goals, sometimes they're given gift cards as incentives. Many times, people come to us within the first few months of being on probation needing food, so we give gift cards to grocery stores. Or they need transportation to get to work, so we give gift cards for gas. 87% of it is tied to gift cards and the remainder of it is direct client support, e.g., someone coming to us saying I need help getting my PG&E bill paid and we pay that.
- (6) ***Have we done any comparative pricing to see how other counties and regions deal with the cost of some of these services? For housing, is there a security component to make sure these places are safe for the clients? Does housing include security in their contracts? And is there a chance to have a specific breakdown from the transportation providers?*** Response: For housing and security, it does vary by the property, and some

do allocate funding in their budget for security. And some choose to do it differently, whether it's a physical person or a security system. For transportation, we do have a budget of what we pay for and a lot of it is maintenance, personnel, gas, and various participant support such as clothing, food, and hygiene kits that they bill for. **Are the providers putting any funds into it themselves?** Response: No. . We don't allow vendors to purchase vehicles with the funds that are given to them for their contracts. They can lease a vehicle, or we pay for the maintenance of the vehicle, and also pay for the gas. For Bonafide specifically, they bill us for mileage, and the price in their mileage would include maintaining the vehicles. But we do not pay for the purchase of a vehicle.

- (7) **What does successfully completed mean in housing? Does that mean they're all in permanent housing and they're good, or do they just run out of money?** Response: We do consider successful completion meaning permanent housing, that's housing without an end date. It could be any housing and means no specific end date is in place, so that could be reconnecting with family and living with family, it could be finding an apartment, finding a room at a clean and sober house, etc. That's how we define successful completion in housing. **Could that relative then get the stipend that's in the Family Reunification plan?** Response: It depends. Yes, if they talk to their DPO to get a referral into Family Reunification and they're still on probation, then that's something they can still access.

### MOTIONS

- (8) A motion was made by Rodney Brooks to approve the CAB Notetaker for \$900, the CAB Web-Based Application for \$400, the Realignment Housing Programs for \$10,000,000, the Probation Client Support for \$300,000, and the Sex Offender Treatment in the amount of \$550,000; Seconded by Judge Smiley with a Friendly Amendment to increase the CAB Notetaker amount to \$1,200; Friendly Amendment accepted by EC majority; **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]
- (9) Motion made by Judge Smiley to table the Transportation request for \$1,000,000 until the next CCPEC meeting, seconded by Rodney Brooks; **Motion passed by unanimous vote** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]
- (2) Community Development Agency Managed Realignment Housing Programs \$2,923,938
- Emergency Shelter Program – Men of Valor Academy \$415,188
  - Rapid Rehousing Programs – Abode Services and East Oakland Community Project \$2,250,000
  - CDA Administrative Costs \$258,750

### Discussion:

- (1) **Where are the administrative costs going? What is that paying for?** Response: It's primarily to CDA, but it's also spread somewhat to the providers as well. **In what way?** Response: In their contracts. **So, who's doing what administratively? That's what I want to understand.** Response: Rapid Rehousing is like somewhat like Section 8 in that you're doing rental subsidies in an ongoing basis, so there's a lot of administrative work and costs that go into that (cutting checks to the landlords, rent rolls, etc.). **So, CDA is doing some of that as are these other two vendors, Abode and EOCP?** Response: Yes. **And the \$258,758 is split among the three entities? In what way is it split? How much does CDA get versus the two vendors?** Response: For the most part, CDA gets the major portion of that, but that's less than 10% of the overall project cost.
- (2) **Just a point of clarity: it was my understanding that the administrative costs went to the CDA HCD's Deputy Director, Manager, there was an HCD II position and an HMIS Staff Support. But are you saying it also goes to the programs?** Response: For this round, we're going to be looking at how it goes into next year's.

- (3) ***Do you know the percentage of their FTE that is covered by administrative costs?*** Response: I don't have that in front of me, but again, it's less than 10% of the overall program budget which is well below the industry standard in terms of administrative costs and in terms of running programs at this size. This last fiscal year, what I was advised by CDA is that they time-studied their work on this project. They did not take all the administrative costs last year, but they do it based on the amount of work they actually produce, and if they give it back if they don't spend it.
- (4) ***A point of clarification: these are not new programs, correct? So, the 8.89-ish percent of the administrative costs has remained pretty stagnant or is this an increase?*** Response: Yes, they've been going on for many years. Response: No, it's stagnant. The same thing that we requested last year.
- (5) ***The disparity in the targeted goal versus served – it's close to ten times more than the target for Men of Valor, but how did that happen, what's going on here? But the full amount way exceeds the targeted goal. The targeted goal is 833 bed nights and it's 7,413 served is what the document says.*** Response: They redid their shelter, so they had a reduction in the number of beds available. But as soon as they were able to serve the full amount, they served the full amount, and we fully anticipate them to be able to do that again next year. ***But the full amount way exceeds the targeted goal. The targeted goal is 833 bed nights and it's 7,413 served is what the document says.*** Response: I think we have to look at that, because it's a combination of the money that Probation is giving to them, and there's a separate contract with the Social Services Agency to provide beds as well. Those two things we have to look at: what's getting billed to each. ***My question then becomes, it's so large, how are you able to remain within budget?*** I think we're underpaying them for the services they provide, and I want to look at that moving into the next contract, which we have not gone into yet.
- (6) ***For MOVA, how many beds do they have total? And are any of the clients in emergency shelter transitioned to permanent housing?*** Response: They have around 30 beds total, but we only contract for a subset of what they have total. Response: Absolutely. In fact, they work with our other two rapid rehousing programs to try to get people from emergency shelter into permanent housing. ***Do you have those numbers?*** Response: I don't. ***Do you have the racial breakdown for any of the housing?*** Response: No, I don't.
- (7) ***Is the rental assistance offered to people with jobs, or how are they going to maintain rent with just one-month of assistance?*** Response: It's not just one month. They do an assessment with someone and then they figure out: What is their current income? How much do they think they can earn in six months, twelve months, two years? Have they been employed in the past? Are there employment programs you can get involved in? Through that process, they match them to a market rate apartment.

**MOTION**

- (8) Motion made by Dr. Tribble to approve \$2,923,938 for CDA's Managed Realignment Housing Programs, seconded by Judge Smiley; ***Motion passed by unanimous vote*** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]

(3) Health Care Services Agency CBO Realignment Allocations \$8,179,885

- a. Recovery Residence Services – CURA, Inc. & Options Recovery Services \$408,997

**MOTION**

- (1) Motion made by Judge Smiley to approve \$408,997 for Recovery Residence Services; seconded by Rodney Brooks; ***Motion passed by unanimous vote*** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]
- b. Mild-to-Moderate Mental Health Services – Felton Institute & Roots Community Health Center

\$1,577,000

Discussion:

- (1) ***For the CBO training, what was the outcome of those and the objectives of the training?*** Response: Our CBOs have access to the trainings we do for Behavioral Health. I don't have the data, but I know our providers do a lot of training for their staff around support for vicarious trauma, engaging forensically involved clients, etc.
- (2) ***This applies to this item and the next two: Does CalAIM or would CalAIM help fund these requests such that we might not need to use this money for these services? I wonder if this has already been determined and this is the way we need to go?*** Response: There's still a lot of guidance needed from the state around how CalAIM is going to fund services for justice involved clients; that has not been made clear yet. We do know that if the county facilities meet specific criteria that the state is outlining, that there is an opportunity for us to tap into some pre-release Medi-Cal billing, but again, it's not clear yet. We do try to leverage other funding first (Medi-Cal funding, then look internally for other revenue sources, then use AB 109 as a last resort for AB 109 eligible clients).
- (3) ***For mild-to-moderate care, is this targeting a gap in services that currently exists?*** Response: I believe it has. Again, for many of our clients who are coming out and meet those criteria for specialty mental health services, they have had access to our forensic full-service partnerships, our treatment teams, and specialty mental health services provided by Alameda County Behavioral Health as the Medi-Cal Mental Health Plan.
- (4) ***Behavioral Health Court, our treatment court in our Collaborative Court Division, I don't know that we accept people who are not getting an FSP (Full-Service Partnership), is that accurate?*** Response: I believe that is accurate. A lot of it has to do with the timeframe, because the timeframe of Behavioral Health Court, and the timeframe specifically to Mild-to-Moderate don't align. This is a nine-month program, and they won't work with the client for the duration of Behavioral Court. We are currently exploring other options and looking at other opportunities.
- (5) ***The \$1.5 million to both Felton and Roots, what's the exact spread per contract?*** Response: I don't have it directly in front of me. I think we are looking at both contracts and reworking both contracts to look at different staffing models for next year.
- (6) ***You mentioned the impact of COVID. Do you all anticipate you will see more individuals served this coming fiscal year?*** Response: Correct. We have been working with our partners to extend and expand their outreach efforts so we can increase the referrals and increase the number of clients served.

**MOTION**

- (7) Motion made by Judge Smiley to approve \$1,577,000 for Mild-to-Moderate Mental Health Services provided by Felton Institute and Roots Community Health Center; seconded by Dr. Tribble; ***Motion passed by unanimous vote*** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]

c. Serious Mental Illness Mental Health Services – Felton Institute \$1,710,354

Discussion:

- (1) ***Is this a service that's going to be available through Probation for people who are on formal supervision, or is it something else you're contemplating?*** Response: Yes, the referrals Felton receives are directly from Probation. Last fiscal year, this program received 151 referrals from Probation to engage clients. ***Do you work with other vendors as well for this population?*** Response: We do have a variety of reentry programs. Felton does run a reentry engagement program. And we have some reentry

treatment teams; those teams are based geographically. ***So, all referrals occur at sentencing, or do they ever occur before?*** Response: We also get referrals from the Public Defender's office. Most likely, the majority of referrals are going to be coming post RNS series.

**MOTION**

(2) Motion made by Dr. Tribble to approve \$1,710,354 for Serious Mental Illness Mental Health Services provided by Felton Institute; seconded by Rodney Brooks; ***Motion passed by unanimous vote*** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley, Tribble]

d. Alameda County Behavioral Health Annual Allocation \$4,483,534

**MOTION**

(1) Motion made by Judge Smiley to approve \$4,483,534 for Alameda County Behavioral Health's annual allocation; seconded by Rodney Brooks; Dr. Tribble recused herself; ***Motion passed by majority vote*** [Yes: Dawal, Brooks, Smiley]

ii **Contracts Update** – Gina Temporal

(1) Item tabled for next meeting

iii **AB 109 CBO Designation Account Update** – Howard Chen

(1) Item tabled for next meeting

B. **Process and Evaluation** – Rodney Brooks

i Item tabled for next meeting

C. **Programs and Services Workgroup Update** – Janene Grigsby

i Item tabled for next meeting

D. **Data and Information Workgroup Update** – Janene Grigsby for Pamela Price

i Item tabled for next meeting

5. **Community Corrections Partnership Updates**

A. Item tabled for next meeting

6. **Announcements:**

A. **Current CAB Vacancies: District 1: (2), District 2: (2), District 3: (2), District 4: (2), and District 5: (0)** – Tanasha Stevens

B. **Next Meeting** – May 15, 2023, 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM

7. **Public Comment** – Judge Smiley made a request for Probation to look into where it would make a recommendation to set aside some of the AB 109 funds for eligible probationers who have been convicted of domestic violence and are indigent and cannot pay for their own domestic violence treatment. The Chief clarified that it would have to go through one of Probation's certified programs and something Probation can commit to doing.

A public comment was made that it would be good to see how the other 50% of the AB 109 funds are spent with the county agencies.

This was the last meeting for Shauna Conner who was promoted to Deputy Chief Probation Officer for Juvenile Facilities. The Chief recognized her work and how much progress has been made with Reentry under her leadership and thanked her. Adrienne Chambers, Deputy Chief Probation Officer, was introduced as Shauna's replacement.

8. **Meeting Adjourned at 4:55 PM**