**ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

May 20, 2019 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
1111 Jackson Street, 2nd Floor, Rooms 226-228, Oakland

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Present:**

Wendy Still

Colleen Chawla

Nancy O’Malley

David Spiller

Brendon Woods

**Guests**:

Barbara Proctor

Bede Anunne

Charlie Eddy

Christy Henzi

Darryl Stewart

Donald Frazier

Eric Von Geldern

Hamaseh Kiafor

Jeannette Rodriguez

Jessica Redcliff

Joey Mason

Jon Fajardo

Karen Baker

Lisa Abernathy

Michael Katz

Nathan Hobbs

Neola Crosby

Rashad Eady

Rodney Brooks

Shahidah Lacy

Tim Smith

Twinisha Doyle

Youseef Elias

LaLisha Norton (Recorder)

**Call to Order and Introductions:** Chief Still called the meeting to order.

**Public Comment** **on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only”**: No public comment.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Meeting minutes from March 18, 2019, were reviewed and approved with the following corrections:

Page 3, Item C – Process and Evaluation Workgroup Update - It was clarified that Rodney Brooks made the report on behalf of the Chair, Brendon Woods. Page 4, Item D – Data and Information Management - Eric Von Geldern clarified that County ITD is identifying the 1170(h) population through County IT Data.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Workgroup Updates**

1. **Fiscal and Procurement – Wendy Still/Nancy O’Malley (Co-Chairs)**

Neola provided an update pertaining to the Programs and Services Workgroup recommendations. CAB held a special meeting on May 14, 2019 and signed the [Agenda Item Request](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/AgendaItemRequest.pdf) in order to move forward with the various outstanding funding recommendations. The complete Programs and Services Workgroup recommendations, including amounts, can be viewed by clicking on the following link [Programs and Services Brainstorming Ideas](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=5&d=6&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.587). Neola provided a brief rationale for all 11 items listed.

1. *Cognitive Behavior Intervention Services & Incentives* – The purpose is to have all clients that are supervised by Probation to have access to some level of cognitive services. Criminal thinking must be addressed to have improved outcomes.
2. *Employment (Subsidized*) – The current contract allows for 80 hours; however, the standard is 520 hours. This will give individuals more time to be acclimated with the hope that employers will hire them once the subsidy has been exhausted. Increased time will also allow employers to better evaluate the individual as a potential permanent employee. Nancy expressed concerns about employment outcomes not being good and putting more money into a system that is not working. Chief Still advised that the model would be changing and that there would be a different scope of services moving forward. Nancy suggested that if the additional funding of $1 million is approved, that it be put into a trust to ensure that expectations are being met. Chief Still noted that the new RFP will be based on best practices, which includes 520 hours of subsidized employment. We are also moving towards having several vendors, instead of one vendor.

Donald Frazier noted that there needs to be more conversation with the current provider. During an internal review of their program, BOSS found that participants that remained in the program past 30 days were more likely to complete it, however, the standard of 80 hours typically supports only one month of subsidized employment and there was a 50% drop-off in participation once the 80 hours were completed. One major challenge for providers is that they are expected to provide the clients with cognitive behavior therapy (CBT), rigorous job training and the workshops that they need to be successful with potential employers all within that limited 80-hour timeframe. Chief Still advised that there will be a listening session, prior to the release of the RFP.

1. *Faith-Based & Local Community Partnerships* – There are many faith-based organizations that provide supportive services to clients on probation who do not receive any funds from the County. This line item is intended to acknowledge and provide support to those smaller organizations that are already doing the work, not for organizations to start a service. Rodney asked about reporting requirements, acknowledging that there are many small church organizations that do the work but do not have the infrastructure necessary to perform on a County contract. He also mentioned that there are larger churches that do have the infrastructure, and these organizations sometimes monopolize the funding that could be distributed to some of the smaller churches, if they were capable of managing a County contract. Neola stated that there has been a lengthy discussion around this issue at the last Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup meeting and that additional discussion will need to take place on how to effectively include these smaller organizations in the process. Chief Still advised that $9 million in funding was previously distributed to 89 community-based organizations ranging in allocations of $5,000-$250,000 as a part of the Community Capacity Fund. The County has an RFP to hire a researcher to determine the results of that funding. Chief Still stated that although many organizations received funding, there were a number of smaller organizations that did not, and those are the types of organizations that are being targeted with this funding. Instead of a regular contract, the funding may need to be set up as a grant, but at this time the County has not yet begun to work on what the RFP or grant request would look like. Brendon asked if there was any idea of what types of services these organizations would be asked to provide and Chief Still stated that it would be centered around the work that they are currently doing such as housing support and services to the homeless/re-entry population. The providers would need to demonstrate who, out of the re-entry population, they are providing services to and identify those individuals for accountability purposes, but not have the same performance measures as the multi-million-dollar contracts.
2. *Father Services* – Neola stated that this item is to address the areas where custodial fathers need support. Chief Still also mentioned that CAB supported the actions that have been recommended for today, but they also had a recommendation to increase the funding for father’s services by $250,000 and increase the amount for LGBTQ services by $100,000. In order to stay within the prescribed funding process, both items would be sent back to the Programs and Services Workgroup and then to Fiscal and Procurement for recommendation to the CCPEC. Today’s action would account for FY 18-19 funds; the additional recommendations by CAB would need to be addressed for FY 19-20.
3. *For Us By Us (FUBU)* – This is a contract that was recommended to be extended for two years and increased by $1 million. This contract is to hire individuals who are systems impacted to provide services to individuals who are systems impacted. Chief Still stated that the progress since implementation can be seen every month from the providers and more time is warranted in terms of validating the overall viability of the program.
4. *Indigent/Barrier Removal Fund* – This item is to develop a fund that will address some major gaps while individuals are waiting for services to begin. This is temporary assistance, not long-term support. All assistance will be attached to service engagement, so that individuals can get the support they need while waiting for additional services to occur. It was determined in the Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup that existing contracts would be reviewed to determine how much, if anything at all, was placed into barrier removal and, if no amounts were included, how much should be added to the contracts so that when issues arise people can get the assistance they need. Chief Still also mentioned that additional work needed to be done on this item and that there was agreement that additional funding was needed to support this area, however, the specifics would need to be determined. Accordingly, it was decided that the funds would be placed in trust until more clarity could be obtained and a concrete plan was developed. Colleen added that it might be beneficial to look at the Social Services and Health Care Services Agency models and create a single portal to address the individual’s need. If the funding is centralized, barrier removal funds may be expanded to provide additional resources for more people. Neola mentioned that the original thought was to have one agency oversee the administration of the funds but after subsequent conversations, it was thought that the administration and management of the fund by one vendor, only, might create additional barriers.
5. *LGBTQ Resources & Services* – This line item is to develop services and a list of resources for the LGBTQ community. As mentioned previously, the CAB is suggesting an increase in the recommended amount, which would need to go back through the approval process to the Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup.
6. *Parole and Community Team (PACT)/Collaborations Services* – These funds would be used to establish CBO-operated PACT meetings. Currently PACT meetings are held by Parole, and it is a very successful way of bringing in providers and acquainting clients with various services and allowing them to network with one another. This recommendation is to establish something similar to the Parole model. Chief Still added that part of this effort will be to explore the possibility of partnering with Parole as Probation implements its warm hand-off project with CDCR.
7. *Recovery Residence/Transitional Housing Facility* – This item is to address the needs of individuals that are being released from state prison or Santa Rita Jail who do not have access to a substance use treatment bed. This allocation would develop bed space throughout Alameda County while individuals are waiting for permanent bed space to become available. Nancy asked if the capacity already existed to house individuals. Nathan stated that he was unclear as to whether there is immediate housing available or if the housing will need to be purchased, built, etc. Nathan also recommended that an RFP be released to determine the availability of housing amongst potential providers.
8. *Restorative Justice Circles for Adults* – This would be an opportunity to have a model like the Fresno Pacific University’s Center for Peacemaking COSA program. These circles provide a lifeline or network of support for individuals that are being released.
9. *Transition-Age Youth (TAY) Services* – These funds will be used to develop a system of support for individuals 18-25 years of age. One specific example that was mentioned at the Programs and Services Workgroup was regarding young adults with substance abuse problems who are placed with older adults in treatment because there are no substance use programs for TAY.

Summary: The total amount recommended by the Programs and Services Workgroup is $8,508,997. In addition, there is $370,000 recommended for education in FY 19/20.

Questions and Responses

* ***Question (Brendon)***: Are the restorative circles true restorative justice circles in that work is done with the victim? Also, do they apply to the people pre-sentence or post sentence? ***Response (Chief Still):*** Yes, the restorative model would include the standard/traditional components where the victims are involved. This is being recommended as post-sentence strategy.
* ***Question (Brendon):*** What exactly is meant by TAY services? ***Response (Chief Still)***: This will allow Probation to provide contracts for services to providers that work with this specific population. Providers would also work with youth in the SB1004 program (18 and under 21 years of age). There is pending legislation to increase the age from 21 to 25 years old.
* ***Question (Rodney)***: What will be the process for informing the CCPEC members before they are asked to vote in terms of the specifics of these line items once the details have been determined? ***Response (Chief Still):*** The funds are being held in trust for the items that have not been fully outlined and ultimately there is only so much that can be disclosed in a public forum relating to an RFP, and in some cases listening sessions will need to occur.
* ***Comment (Rodney):*** Rodney stated that there is a difference between true restorative justice and circles, and he did not believe that individuals who work in the restorative justice field would necessarily consider circles alone as the complete range of restorative justice programming.

***Action Item –* Nancy O’Malley made the motion to approve the recommendations with the caveat that the funds allocated for restorative justice, barrier removal and subsidized employment be held in trust. Additional discussion should occur between the Public Defender, the District Attorney and Probation to discuss the restorative justice model. In order to remove the items from trust, they must go back through the approval process. The motion was second by David Spiller and passed unanimously.**

1. **Data and Information Management – Nancy O’Malley**

Nancy noted that RDA has gone through some leadership changes and they are continuing to work on the evaluation report. They understand some of the challenges that have been identified for them and Nancy believes that RDA is now on the right track for providing the evaluation.

**Community Advisory Board (CAB) Update**

Chief Still indicated that the CAB submitted an [agenda item request](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/AgendaItemRequest.pdf) pertaining to the allocation recommendations and a second [Agenda Item Request](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/ReentryRealignmentMeetings.pdf) regarding childcare and transportation stipends, along with requesting that a certain percentage of the CCP/CCPEC and related meetings take place in the evening. Chief Still noted that a CAB representative needed to be present to discuss these requests. She also noted that the Board typically does not allow stipends to attend voluntary meetings, however, an allowance was made for CAB to receive funds out of the AB109 budget for transportation. In regards to changing meetings to the evenings, Chief Still noted that many of the County employees are civil servants and are therefore covered by union contracts and the County does not have the ability to change their hours; it would need to be negotiated with the union and County labor would need to be involved. This item was held for the next meeting.

**Adult Reentry Strategic Plan – Recidivism Sub-Committee**

Neola reviewed the [Strategic Plan At-a Glance-Recidivism Document](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=5&d=6&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:40:16.587). Chief Still asked that this item be placed on hold until the next CCPEC meeting. Chief Still noted that she will meet with the DA and RDA (if needed) to make sure that nothing proposed regarding the definition of recidivism conflicts with the Alameda County Justice Restoration Project.

**Next Meeting – July’s meeting is cancelled. A doodle pole will be sent regarding August dates.**

**Public comment on any item not listed on the Agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Committee**

Neola- Probation is hosting a 3-day provider/ staff meet and greet at three different locations throughout the County. Providers are expected to be at all three locations. It’s an opportunity for providers to showcase their services and meet personally with Probation staff. She requested that providers register for the event to reserve a table.

Darryl- District 4 has vacancies for CAB appointees. Supervisor Miley and Darryl will be conducting interviews in the next few weeks and there should be some appointees soon.