

ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday, May 17, 2021· 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM
via “Microsoft Teams”

MEETING MINUTES

Present:

Dawal, Marcus Interim Chief (Chair)	Tribble, Dr. Karyn, Alameda County Behavioral Health
Lucia, Richard T., Undersheriff (Sheriff’s Designee)	von Geldern, Eric (District Attorney’s Designee)
Torres, Luis, Chief of Police, San Leandro	Woods, Brendon, Public Defender
Smiley, Judge Charles, Superior Court	

Attendees:

Abernathy, Lisa	Cao, Binh	Hardamon, Bob	Parran, Monica
Adams, Lisa	Chen, Howard	Ibalio, Fidencio	Smith, Tim
Ai, Peejay	Conner, Shauna	Klein, Meryl	Temporal, Gina
Baker, Karen	Eddy, Charles	Lai, Sophia	Uriarte, Monica
Britton, Bob	French, Nancy	Mason, Joey	Zatcoff, Tyler
Brooks, Rodney	Grigsby, Janene	Mitchell, Kelly	Additional Guests: 4
Butler, Douglas	Guerry, Danielle	Oddie, Sarah	

1. **Call to Order and Introductions:** The meeting was called to order at 1:10 PM; Marcus Dawal announced that he will be the Interim Chief until Chief Wendy Still’s replacement has been decided by the Board of Supervisors (BOS).
2. **Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below for "Discussion Only":** None
3. **Review and Adoption of 3/15/2021 and 4/1/2021 Meeting Minutes:** The 4/1/2021 meeting minutes will be resubmitted for review and adoption at the next regular meeting to allow reviewing of section V. Restorative Justice Opportunities for the Realigned Population and to correct spelling of Chief Torres’ first name.
4. **California State Auditor [Public Safety Realignment Report](#) – Karen Baker**
 - A. Karen spoke about recommendation from the Bureau of State Auditing’s Public Safety Realignment report that pertain to this group.
 - B. The state auditor recommended that, “...to ensure that [the counties] prudently and appropriately spend realignment funds, the Partnership Committees, should, starting with their next annual budgets, review and make budget recommendations to their boards of supervisors for all realignment accounts, including the accounts that fund non-law enforcement departments and community-based organizations. Further, [the counties] should ensure they budget all realignment funds to eliminate excessive surpluses in realignment accounts and prevent future surpluses...” (Chapter Two, pg. 45); Alameda County’s (AC) official response, in part: “...Absent Legislative clarification, the County does not believe the Partnership Committee is required to review and make recommendations for all realignment accounts including those that fund non-law enforcement departments such as child welfare and behavioral health care services.”
 - C. AC does agree with the recommendation that, “To ensure the programs and services funded by public safety realignment funds are effective, beginning immediately, Alameda County should conduct evaluations of the effectiveness of their programs and services at least every three years” (Chapter Two, pg. 45); AC responded that an evaluation was done around AB-109 funds through Resource Development Associates (RDA); the Probation Department also pointed out the performance measures that are incorporated into all of the AB-109 Community-Based Organization (CBO) contracts
 - D. Probation will begin implementing at the Programs and Services level: (1) on the front-end, a logic model will be

prepared for services to provide CCPEC with a clear definition of the service category being proposed, the intended target population, and the specific improvements the service will make; and, (2) on the backend, Probation will begin reviewing performance measures on the CBO contracts; Probation will also incorporate a suggestion from Charlie Eddy to do this for Probation-funded programs, as well;

E. Karen and her research team will go through Programs and Services to create recommendations CCPEC can use for prioritizing what should be evaluated; Chief Dawal noted that all three counties (Alameda, Los Angeles, and Fresno) received similar recommendations about oversight of the realignment funds and gave similar responses.

5. **Community Advisory Board (CAB) Update – Kamarlo Spooner**

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

B. **CAB Web-Based Membership Application:** The current CAB application process has numerous problems due to it being PDF based; the CAB requested approval to replace it with an ITD created web-based form on the Probation website; Cost: \$950 one-time fee up front / \$300 annually (\$25 a month); this will meet the CAB's needs and allow both the applicant's district and the CAB leadership to access the application; ***motion passed unanimously to move forward.***

6. **Community Correction Partnership (CCP) Update – Lisa Abernathy**

A. ACPD has been contacting other jurisdictions for their CCP information to draft a profile comparison between AC and other counties for a potential guide in moving forward.

B. Two new Reentry Coordinators have been onboarded: Tyler Zatcoff, assigned to Housing, and Corrine Lee, supporting Mental Health Services and Substance Use Disorder Services; the intent is to assign them to specific Strategic Planning subcommittees.

C. An email was sent to the CCP, Subcommittee Chairs, Co-Chairs, and the Designees asking for confirmation of the Chairs, Co-Chairs and Designees in case of staffing changes; there have been some preliminary housing (subcommittee) meetings taking place, with the intent of having the subcommittees reconvene and begin working on the identified items in the Strategic Plan.

D. A quarterly CCP meeting will be held on July 21, 2021; subcommittees will provide updates; the Reentry team, their area of duties, and their contact information will be posted on the ACPD website.

7. **Workgroup Updates**

A. **Fiscal and Procurement – Interim Chief Marcus Dawal**

I. **Grants Update – Monica Uriarte**

A. **Pathways Home Initiative:** (1) **Vergil Mobile Application Pilot:** Vergil is a client service navigation app that will be piloted on Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) clients to indicate whether it has positive outcomes on their ability to successfully complete probation; this is close to being implemented; (2) **Institute For The Future (IFTF) Virtual Reality Pilot:** IFTF is a series of virtual reality simulations to help clients practice responses to challenging situations; the project is in the design process.

B. **George Mason University's AB-109 Assessment:** George Mason is working internally on completing the organizational survey and beginning a community-based assessment around the effectiveness of client service programs.

II. **Probation RFPs, Contracts Update, and Active Programs – Gina Temporal**

A. **Employment Vender Pool** – Bids were due May 5 (none received); next round of bids due in August;

B. **Reentry Housing Pool** – Negotiating 4 vendor contracts; will likely go to the BOS in June for contract execution; second round of bids due June 10;

C. **Adult Residential Multi-Service Center** – Currently working on the RFP (Request for Proposal) to

match the grant funding; RFP expected to be released soon;

- D. Education Re-bid – Currently in the funding approval process; RFP expected to be released in June;
- E. Family Reunification: Legal & Therapy Services – RFP being drafted; will release late May/early June;
- F. Sex Offender Treatment / Cognitive Behavior Intervention Services – Bids received; currently under County Selection Committee review and evaluation;
- G. Client Resource Forum Coordinator – RFP being finalized; to be released in May/early June;
- H. Leadership & Entrepreneurship – RFP in the final approval process; expected to be released soon;
- I. Kinship Reentry Workforce – RFP is being drafted; scope of work has already been developed;
- J. Karen Baker indicated some service categories will be referred to the Programs and Services Workgroup to flesh out utilizing the Logic Model exercise.

B. Process and Evaluation – Rodney Brooks (for Public Defender Brendon Woods)

- I. The group did not meet in May; there was a Social Services staff presentation in April for planning how to respond to the CalAIM requirement that AC develop a plan for connecting people leaving Santa Rita jail to Medi-Cal; these meetings were delayed due to COVID-19.

C. Programs and Services Workgroup Update – Janene Grigsby

- I. At the last meeting on April 22, 2021: (1) the use of Logic Models, and the Program Design and Development Unit was introduced; (2) there was an update on the Santa Rita Jail Tablet Project, the Roots Trailer, and the Community Corrections Partnership; (3) there was an open discussion and feedback session on the workgroup’s format, the current [Active AB-109 Programs](#), and Programs In Development; and (4) moving forward, the workgroup will focus on utilizing Logic Models, being data driven, and addressing gaps and barriers in client services.

D. Data and Information Management Workgroup – Eric von Geldern (for DA Nancy O’Malley)

- I. The workgroup is working with Probation and other entities to ensure the Alameda County Justice Restorative Project (ACJRP) data sharing agreement is in place as deadlines approach for completion of the project.

8. Public Comment

- A. A question was raised on what the response will be to the auditor’s report; Karen Baker answered: (1) AC has provided a response to the initial report and will prepare a 60-day updated response; (2) Probation specifically is responding to the recommendation to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and services; (3) the large disconnect is between the auditor’s view that the CCPEC should be managing the entire \$385-million AB-109 account and making recommendations, which involves a number of accounts CCPEC and Probation have never been involved in; (4) the CCPEC always managed the funds specifically for Reentry clients and the CBOs; (5) if the auditor believes the CCPEC should have responsibility for the entire AB-109 funds, then it should be addressed to the Legislature to make that change. It was noted that responses from the County are publicly posted: [State Audit Report 2020-102: Public Safety Realignment](#).
- B. A question was raised if AC will respond to other recommendations in the auditor’s report; Karen Baker answered: The protocol for audits is to periodically provide follow-ups; AC is currently preparing a 60-day follow-up response.
- C. An agenda oversight: [AB-109 Designation Account](#) and [AB-109 Allocations](#); attachments were provided and changes reflect the actions taken at the April 1 Special CCPEC meeting; they will be on the agenda going forward
- D. It was questioned why the government side of AB-109 spending is never discussed in the meetings, with the suggestion to report at least once a year on their use of AB-109 funds; Interim Chief Dawal suggested adding this to a future Fiscal and Procurement agenda to discuss further.

9. Next Meeting – Special CCPEC Meeting June 2, 2021

A. Items to be discussed before fiscal year-end: Education, For Us By Us contracts, and Early Intervention Court.

10. Meeting Adjourned at 1:57 PM