

**ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Monday, July 20, 2020 · 1:00 p.m. – 3:57 p.m.  
via "Microsoft Teams"

**MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT**

**Present:**

Wendy Still, Chief Probation Officer (Chair)  
Judge Charles Smiley, Superior Court  
Jeff Tudor, San Leandro Chief of Police

Rich Lucia, Alameda County Undersheriff  
Brendon Woods, Alameda County Public Defender  
Nancy O'Malley, Alameda County District Attorney

**Absent:**

Colleen Chawla, Director, Health Care Services Agency

**Guests:**

Baker, Karen	Eddy, Charlie	McGrath, Kathryn	Stewart, Darryl
Banks, Raymond	Frazier, Donald	Miley, Chris	Tabernick, Tim
Brooks, Rodney	Furuzawa, Adriana	Mitchell, Kelly	Temporal, Gina
Cervelli, Bridget	Grigsby, Janene	Oliver, Ken	von Geldern, Eric
Conner, Shauna	Guillory, Stacey	Onek, David	Wise, Steve
Crosby, Neola	Hellums, Melissa	Ortiz, Robin	Additional Guests: 9
Curtis, Penn	Lee, Sarah	Shaw, Shakani	
Davaran, Ardavan	Leonard, Patrick	Smith, Tim	
Dawal, Marcus	Liner-Jigamian, Nicole	Spooner, Kamarlo	

**I. Call to Order and Introductions:** Meeting began at 1:00 PM

**II. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below for "Discussion Only":** None

**III. Review and Adoption of May 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes – Chief Still:** Meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as written

**IV. Community Advisory Board (CAB) Update – Raymond Banks**

A. Recommendation to Revise Operating Guidelines to Extend Maximum Term Limits Two Years: The CAB submitted an Agenda Item Request recommending the CCPEC amend Article 3, Section 2, "Members shall serve one (1) year terms with the possibility of one-year renewals, for a maximum term of four (4) years" to read "Members shall serve one (1) year terms with the possibility of one-year renewals, for a maximum term of six (6) years at the discretion of the CAB member"

**i. Discussion**

- District staff noted that not all districts have the same need; some districts have a problem filling seats and others have so many interested people that they have a waitlist – districts with people waiting for an opportunity to serve on the CAB would likely not extend member's terms to six years; others that have a difficult time filling seats would be interested in being able to have their appointees serve additional years
- Chief Still noted that the Board of Supervisors has appointing authority and each member has

the option to extend their appointees' terms up to six years rather than four years

- The CAB chair stated the recommendation is being made to provide consistency, institutional knowledge and to keep seats filled
- One of the original drafters of the CAB's bylaws, Brendon Woods, reiterated the fact that the Board of Supervisors has discretion to appoint individuals to serve on the CAB and appointments were designed to be one-year terms, renewable every year for a maximum of four years with Supervisors having the discretion within that year to reappoint someone else
- CAB members, Raymond Banks and Kamarlo Spooner, raised concern regarding the wording of the motion "at the discretion of the Supervisor"

**Motion: Brendon Woods moved to change the Operating Guidelines, Section 2: Members shall serve one (1) year terms with the possibility of one-year renewals, for a maximum term of six (6) years at the Board's discretion". The motion was seconded by Nancy O'Malley and was unanimously passed after a roll-call vote.**

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

**V. RDA's Final AB 109 Overview and Outcomes Report – Ardavan Davaran, Ph.D.**

- A. The County contracted with RDA to conduct an evaluation of AB109 Realignment. RDA gathered data from the following sources: Behavioral Health Care Services, contracted service providers, District Attorney's office, Housing and Community Development, Information Technology Department, Probation Department, Public Defender's Office and the Sheriff's Department
- B. Since the Court's conversion to the Odyssey Case Management System, the County has been unable to obtain reliable data on whether revocations are filed by Probation or the DA's Office, or whether they were filed for technical violations or in lieu of new criminal offenses
  - i. Questions regarding the reliability of sentencing information that can be extracted from the system, especially for historical information before July 2016 still remain
- C. Key Findings: The findings focused on jail population, probation populations and AB 109-funded services
  - i. The County tends to target the higher risk population for services – 38% of PRCS clients received one or more services between 2015 and 2019 versus 13% of the County Realigned population
  - ii. Revocations and Recidivism Outcomes were divided into two Cohorts: Cohort 1 (9,485 individuals): Those that started probation after realignment, between October 1, 2011 through December 31, 2014 and Cohort 2 (8,537 individuals): Those who started probation between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2018
    - Cohort 2 is broken down into people who started between 2015 and 2016 and had a full three years on probation (BSCC definition of recidivism is a misdemeanor or felony within three years of probation)
    - The criminal justice characteristics across the two cohorts are similar: approximately one quarter of individuals in each cohort have been diagnosed with a serious mental illness and/or substance use disorder
    - 19% of individuals in Cohort 2 received AB 109-funded services, compared to 4% in Cohort 1
  - iii. Recidivism Outcomes (new misdemeanor or felony offenses since starting probation):
    - Slight decrease over time – 38% of individuals in Cohort 2 recidivated, compared to 40% of Cohort 1
    - Between 2015 and 2018, one-year recidivism rates dropped significantly from 21% for individuals who started probation in 2015 compared to 14% for individuals who started in 2018

- Younger individuals recidivate at a higher rate than those who are older
- Men and woman recidivate at similar rates
- Individuals of difference races/ethnicities recidivate at similar rates – there is a slightly higher rate in Cohort 2 for Blacks and Asian/Pacific Islanders under probation supervision
- Individuals with a serious mental illness (SMI), substance abuse disorder (SUD) or co-occurring disorders recidivated at a higher rate than other individuals under probation supervision

iv. Predictive Probability of Recidivating

- Individuals who received AB 109-funded services were less likely to recidivate than individuals who did not receive these services, all else equal; 31% recidivism rate for those who received AB 109-funded services versus 40% recidivism rate for those who did not receive services
- Individuals who received AB 109-funded services recidivated at a slower rate than individuals who did not receive these services, all else equal

v. Mental Health Services and Recidivism

- Individuals diagnosed with SMI who received ACBH mental health services were less likely to recidivate than individuals who did not receive services and recidivated at a slower rate than individuals who did not receive services
- Those engaged in mental health treatment services recidivate at a rate of 37% compared to 61% for those that did not receive mental health services.

vi. Substance Use Services and Recidivism

- Individuals diagnosed with SUD who received ACBH substance services were less likely to recidivate than individuals who did not receive services and recidivated at a slower rate than individuals who did not receive services
- Those engaged in SUD services recidivated at a rate of 39% compared to 56% for those that did not receive SUD services.

vii. There were Operational Utility of Key Findings focused on Targeted Interventions, Engagement in Services, COMPASS, and Tyler Supervision

D. Areas for Further Inquiry:

- Several sub-groups on probation recidivated at a higher rate than others – recommend exploring opportunities to gain a better understanding of the factors that might influence their success (e.g., caseload sizes, case management practices, targeted service intervention, etc.)
- Woman who enrolled in AB 109-funded services were much less likely to recidivate – recommend learning more about why and using what is learned to inform service delivery for others under probation supervision
- Individuals starting probation recently have a substantially lower one-year recidivism rate – recommend continuing to engage newly implemented practices and measure their impacts to support data-driven decision making to continue to reduce recidivism rates
- The Court's conversion to Odyssey has impacted the County's ability to obtain reliable sentencing data pre-June 2016; also on whether revocations are filed for technical violations or in lieu of a new criminal offense – recommend the continued exploration of data issues to reliably assess revocation and sentencing outcomes and better understand how AB 109 Realignment has impacted filing and sentencing practices, if at all

E. Discussion:

- A significantly larger number of people were booked and arrested in custody on misdemeanors then they were for felonies, especially in recent years

**Motion:** *Nancy O'Malley moved to accept the AB 109 Overview and Outcomes Report. The motion was seconded by Brendon Woods and unanimously passed after a roll-call vote.*

#### **VI. Voting Eligibility – Natasha Middleton**

- A. Identified problem with reentry clients who are eligible to vote being told by the Registrar of Voters that they are not eligible; to correct the problem with eligibility, a voter may re-register, however there is a delay and each individual voter would have to know (1) that they are actually eligible, and (2) they need to re-register
- B. Register of Voter information regarding eligibility comes from the Secretary of State and CDCR sends two lists to the Secretary of State on a monthly basis indicating who is and is not eligible; the Secretary of State uses that information to update a database (Cal Voter) that the County uses to establish eligibility
- C. Need to reconcile the disconnect between the Secretary of State and voter rolls
- D. Discussion:
  - i. Brendon Woods suggested a possible fix which is the Secretary of State should only send one list that includes people who are ineligible – those on parole, in prison or sentenced to prison
  - ii. Natasha added that the Secretary of State assumes the County makes corrections and the counties presume the list received from the Secretary of State has already been corrected and there is nothing they can do on their end unless the individual presents to the County proof that their information is incorrect
  - iii. The disconnect between the Secretary of State and CDCR may be due to mismatching fields in their databases
  - iv. Need to educate our community members through signage, videos, informational/educational brochures, and ensuring organizations working with reentry voters are aware of the problem, e.g. Oakland League of Women Voters

#### **VII. Early Releases – Chief Still**

- A. Due to prison system over-crowding and the pandemic there has been a series of early prison releases and will continue: the goal is to reduce the population so that those in the institutions can be safely housed
- B. In addition to trying to decrease the population, the Governor closed several prisons in his budget
- C. Probation is partnering with Public Health to bring back PRCS individuals safely through a quarantine process called Operation Comfort, which offers incentives: phone for communication, a tablet after seven days and when they transition out on their 14<sup>th</sup> day, food stipends and two weeks off of the back end of their supervision sentence
- D. The parole reentry population does not have the same type of system in place as PRCS which has caused a strain on housing and an impact on providers attempting to provide services to parolees

#### **VIII. Adult Reentry Strategic Plan Update – Neola Crosby**

- A. CCPEC delegated the update of the Adult Reentry Strategic Plan, Roadmap to Reentry to the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)
- B. The updated plan was approved by the CCP and after CCPEC approval, it will be forward to the Board for approval and then widely distributed
- C. The planning process began April 4, 2018 and was completed in November 2019

- D. The CCP held quarterly meetings throughout the County in all five districts – Neola Crosby publicly acknowledged the community partners that hosted each CCP meeting
- E. The Plan was developed using Results-Based Accountability and included a population and systems statement, guiding principles, four themes, goals, performance measures, strategies, and defined population data; the Alameda County reentry population is estimated to be 528,000 (based on national data)
- F. Process to update the plan included assigning the CCP members along with various County department heads as subject matter experts to Chair the sub-committees; a total of 35 sub-committee meetings were held
- G. Next steps (as noted in the Plan) – Implement the Plan, monitor and evaluate progress (after establishing base-line data) and provide reports to the Public Protection Committee annually and to the Board of Supervisors
- H. Acknowledgements and thanks to the following:
  - i. The 90 agencies and over 370 individuals that participated in updating the Plan, along with the sub-committee chairs and co-chairs; special thanks to Rodney Brooks, Lazandra Dial and Sophia Lai who all served on the planning committee
  - ii. Chief Still thanked all the partners, workgroups, stakeholders, community and the departments, involved in preparing the Roadmap, acknowledging the tremendous amount of work to complete the Plan and the diverse voices that made the project possible.
  - iii. Chief Still acknowledged Neola's retirement, and thanked Neola for her leadership on the project and stated two big projects are complete: RDA and updated Roadmap, with an outstanding project being the Year 8 Report, which should be completed soon

**Motion: Nancy O'Malley moved to accept the 2019 Roadmap to Reentry. The motion was seconded by Judge Smiley and unanimously passed after a roll-call vote.**

## **IX. Workgroup Updates**

### **A. Fiscal and Procurement – Wendy Still / Nancy O'Malley**

- i. **Recommendation to approve allocation increase of \$1,200,000 for Career Technical Education**
  - Two CTE providers (Lao Family and Center for Employment Opportunities) need their contracts augmented
  - Contracts will be extended through 20/21; requested funding will come out of FY 20/21 funding, not the trust
- ii. **Approve allocation increase of \$1,966,766 for CORE**
  - LCA had the prior contract for the TDRC, renamed CORE; Felton Institute is the current contractor
  - Extensive research project done in partnership with George Mason University to develop a new scope of service that is more therapeutic in nature and has different engagements and milestones; Felton/CORE, utilizing this new model, has had 203 referrals and 196 engagements to CORE in the first two months of operation, compared to 213 referrals to LCA/TDRC for an entire year with significantly less engagement
  - While Felton's contract was being finalized, there were several extensions to LCA's contract; Felton's contract to operate CORE was \$4 million through 1/1/22 -- The money recommended for approval makes the CORE contract whole at \$4 million

- iii. If both recommendations are approved, FY 20/21 will have a remaining balance of approximately \$6.8 million
- iv. The Trust from FY 18/19 has not been used – the entire \$2 million is still available
- v. Chief Still noted that Probation has been progressively increasing the amount of services available, as noted in the RDA report, with limited staff
- vi. Due to lack of quorum, the CAB could not act on these recommendations; the BOS letter will stipulate the submission of the recommendation to CAB and CAB's lack of quorum
- vii. Discussion
  - Brendon Woods noted that when recommendations like this are presented, it would be helpful to have background information made available about the services being provided, in writing, for the Committee's review
    - a. The Agenda Item Request can be added to the GovDelivery notice and our website to give the public additional information about recommendations

***Motion: Nancy O'Malley moved to adopt both recommendations. The motion was seconded by Brendon Woods and unanimously passed after a roll-call vote.***

#### **B. Process and Evaluation – Brendon Woods**

- i. No report; Rodney, who convenes the meetings on behalf of the Public Defender, was on vacation for the July meeting

#### **C. Programs and Services – Neola Crosby**

- i. Programs and Services held two meetings:
  - May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting: Contracted providers indicated how they are providing services in this COVID-19 environment; also, heard from clients regarding their ability to access services
    - a. Each vendor provided a program overview and shared challenges and successes during the pandemic
    - b. 65 individuals were on the call; 15 CBO's and 9 clients presented
    - c. Felton staff provided a comprehensive overview of CORE and their services
    - d. Other Organizations that shared at the meeting: East Oakland Community Project; Cypress Mandela; Community Youth Outreach; BOSS; Asian Prison Support; Five Keys; Center Force; Bay Area Legal Aid; La Familia; Serenity House; Community Works West; Alameda County Social Services Agency and Intercity Services
    - e. Services are being provided via Instagram, Snap Chat, Zoom, YouTube, FaceTime and DocuSign is being used for information releases. Intakes are being done over the phone or virtually
    - f. Need to work on ways to connect the BSCC grantees to the Probation Officers to increase referrals through Tyler; many BSCC providers indicated they are willing to work with ACPD clients – need to get them in Tyler and work on connecting them
    - g. During the pandemic, it has been difficult to convince landlords to rent; and inspecting properties to ensure the housing meets their criteria is also a challenge – more transitional housing being used
    - h. Struggle with internet access when living in overcrowded housing and language access can be a barrier when utilizing technology.
    - i. Increased need for mental health services during the pandemic
    - j. Services are continuing; one client was grateful for having help to increase his credit

score and now being in a position to purchase a home

- ii. June 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting – Three service provider presentations: Merritt College's East Bay Interagency Council, bringing together agencies and individuals to prepare underrepresented students, including reentry clients, to enter the world of Cybersecurity and IT; A Safe Place, a BSCC grantee that provides domestic violence wrap-around services that include transitional housing; and Community Works West, a BSCC grantee that provides restorative justice services; recently, their approaches have been used to help build relationships between police and communities of color
- iii. The Program and Services Workgroup has been taking a systemic approach to service delivery – connecting AB 109 providers to BSCC grantees
- iv. Next meeting is this Thursday, July 23<sup>rd</sup> from 10 AM to 12 PM – will have a follow-up discussion from the last two meetings
- v. Discussion
  - Neola was acknowledged by Charlie Eddy for taking this Workgroup from a very small group five or six years ago to a very active, robust and impactful workgroup today

**D. Data and Information Management – Eric von Geldern**

- i. Nothing to report; Workgroup has not met

**X. Public Comment**

- A. Charlie Eddy acknowledged Neola; he has had the pleasure of working with her in numerous capacities including in the community, particularly with Bay Area Systems Impacted Consortium (BASIC) - on campus support programs that support retention, persistence and completion of CTE's and AA degrees on community college campuses. Neola has been involved from the very beginning – about 3.5 years now – and she has greatly supported the student's success and building of the network. Neola has been very valuable in numerous capacities to this work and has been extremely helpful in the success of these efforts
- B. Chief Still is committed to finding someone to fill Neola's position that is independent and community-focused; Neola's voice at Probation's table is always a reminder about the community and the work we are here to do
- C. Next Meeting will be on September 21, 2020

**XI. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.**