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**Meeting Minutes**

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

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

**Old Business**

Meeting minutes from February 19, 2019, were reviewed and approved as written.

**New Business**

**AB 109 Funding Distribution Schedule – Chief Still**

The State provides an estimate of the AB 109 funding amount at the beginning of each fiscal year. However, the total estimated amount is not available to be expended at the beginning of the fiscal year because funds are received by the County on a monthly basis, in varying increments, and accumulate each month. When the County receives the funds, they are divided into two accounts - the government (50%) and CBO (50%), which is based upon the dollar amount from the previous fiscal year’s allocation, per Board policy. The final allocation from the State is received sometime in August or September. Chief Still explained that even if the County had identified the total amount allocated in programs and services for CBOs, the money would need to be received first before the Board of Supervisors could approve the expenditures.

Questions & Responses from Chief Still

* ***Question***: Is there ever a time when the expected allocation amount is more, or less, than the funds that are received? ***Response:*** So far this has not really been an issue. The only thing that really changes is growth dollars; these funds are received at the end of the year, for the prior year, after the amount is known. The allocation received by the County is partially funded through the States sales tax, which means that there is a possibility that the amount collected could be more, or less, than what has been anticipated.
* ***Question***: The sales tax supports AB109? ***Response:*** Yes, there is a constitutional AB109 realignment bill that guarantees the funding source and it determines the formula.

**Grants Update – Monica Uriarte**

Alameda County was very fortunate last fiscal year in the number of grants that were awarded, and the County is researching more funding opportunities. However, some grants through the Department of Justice have explicit language requiring compliance with Immigration Code Enforcement (ICE) as a qualifying grant condition. Chief Still indicated that Probation would not be applying for those grants. In cases where the language is vague, County Counsel is being consulted, prior to application.

Chief Still indicated that Probation applies for grants in partnership with CBOs. However, it is extremely important that any CBO applying for grant funds obtain a letter of support, if they want to partner with Probation. This process will ensure that Probation can support your organization and assist if there are any issues, problematic data, or if there are any conflicts in the proposal with what the County is currently doing. Monica clarified that Chief Still signs all letters of support and the processing time is minimally ten days.

Questions & Responses

* ***Question***: Often the budget and many of the details are still in flux ten days in advance of applying, and often the proposal or MOU requires specific numbers. How do you handle that? ***Response (Monica):*** We usually request as much information as possible. The County’s bare minimum is an abstract or some type of paragraph describing the partnership, and a draft of the letter that is being requested by your organization (which would need to entail all the information that is required.) MOUs are somewhat different because they are legally binding, contractual agreements. Probation does not normally include MOUs in applications, unless the agency provides significantly more time. Chief Still further explained that one of the main reasons for this is because she is unable to sign-off on an MOU without obtaining Board approval.

**RFP and Contracts Update – Karen Baker**

1. **Probation Update**
2. Higher Education – The County Selection Committee process has been completed and the recommended awards are being forwarded to Chief Still today for a final decision before submission to the Board of Supervisors for approval.
3. Family Reunification – The RFP for the second round for Family Reunification has been reviewed by GSA and has been returned to Probation contract staff for modification and edits. It is anticipated that the new RFP will be released sometime in June.
4. Transportation – Only one bid was received, and it is currently under review. Chief Still noted that the bid was extremely expensive and lacked flexibility. She discussed the possibility of holding a listening session to garner feedback from potential vendors, which would help the Department to identify possible modifications to the RFP to attract more bidders. Karen also suggested the possibility of trying to negotiate some of the terms with the proposed bidder so that a level of services could be provided, in the interim.

Questions & Responses

* ***Question***: Is the cost per trip the problem? ***Response:*** Partially, because the cost per trip exceeded $1,000, which is far beyond what is reasonably expected. It could be that their infrastructure is not sufficiently built to handle the requirements listed within the RFP. Karen believes that conducting a market survey would be beneficial because there were at least 4-6 other interested entities that attended the bidders conference but none of them placed a bid. Chief Still also suggested the idea of having categories of services.
1. Transitional Day Reporting Center (TDRC) - The draft RFP for the TDRC has been completed and is currently with Chief Still for review. The goal is to have a service provider contracted by September. One of the issues that has caused some delays is the decision regarding the move to the Arena Center or if there will be a north and south TDRC location. GSA will provide a presentation to the Board of Supervisors regarding space, after which the RFP will be released.

Questions & Responses

* ***Question***: Would having two separate locations change the entire RFP? ***Response:*** No, the funding amounts would be different for the two locations because North County serves a much larger population, but the RFP itself would not need to be revised. Karen stated that the language in the RFP would need to be flexible to accommodate the possibility of having two locations versus one.
* ***Question***: Is the cost of the facilities factored in? ***Response:*** At this point it is not which is why we need to have a decision regarding the location(s) as soon as possible.
* ***Question***: Does the Arena Center need to be renovated? ***Response:*** Yes, it does, and there is a 12-month construction schedule. Regardless of the decision, services will inevitably restart at Broadway and subsequently move after everything has been solidified.
1. Adult Male Residential Multipurpose Center - There is a draft RFP for the Adult Male Residential Multipurpose Center. This proposal was previously approved for a site that would have up to 30 beds and provide comprehensive wrap-a-round services for the population being served. The scope is currently with GSA. Chief Still indicated that the County is on track with the different types of housing and residential multi-service centers that we are providing, in addition to the general depth and breadth of services to be provided in these environments. Individuals will be able to attend school, work, and have furloughs, etc.
2. Education – The Research Unit is conducting an evaluation of evidence-based practices and a national literature review relating to education. Additionally, the Unit is reviewing the County’s current education program model to determine whether adjustments are required before the RFP is released.

Chief Still reviewed a letter from the California Department of Health Care Services noting that Mental Health Services Act funds can used to support individuals who are on county probation, Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS), in a county jail, or on parole. ([DHCS Information](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/DHCSDOC.pdf))

1. **Behavioral Health RFP Update – Sophia Lia**

There are two RFPs – one for $2.5 million for Mild/Moderate services and one for Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI) for $1 million. The Mild/Moderate RFP has been released and there has been a great response. Unfortunately, two of the bidders exceeded the page limits and their bids were disqualified due to GSA rules. However, there remain multiple responses that meet the minimum qualifications. The remaining bids will be reviewed by the County Selection Committee on either May 21 or May 22. The budget is being finalized for the SMI RFP and it is anticipated that it will be released within the next 3-4 weeks. Mild/Moderate services are anticipated to start in September and SMI services should follow in January 2020. Chief Still noted that the County will soon have access to the CDCR database regarding mental health. The two onsite clinicians will have direct information to assist clients, once they are able to access CDCR’s database.

Sophia also provided a brief update on Innovations in Reentry. She stated that the anticipated start date for services is May. There are six recommended organizations:

1. Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth
2. Asian Pacific Support Committee
3. Serenity House
4. Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency
5. ROOTS Community Health Center
6. Root & Rebound, with East Bay Family Defenders

**FY 18/19 Funding**

1. **Programs and Services Workgroup Recommendations – Neola Crosby**

The Programs and Services Workgroup meeting was held on March 28, 2019. We were very intentional in making sure that there was representation of formerly incarcerated individuals present and the attendance was substantial. It is very important when discussing services to have the voices of those individuals impacted included in the conversation. The goal was to address gaps in the current service delivery model that funding could be utilized to solve. Neola provided a detailed overview of the “*Programs and Services Workgroup Recommendations*” document ([Programs & Services Recommendations](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=2&y=2019&t=M&i=2019-04-04%2016:30:09.783)) and the highlighted sections of the “*Realignment Allocations and Recommendations*” spreadsheet. ([Allocation Spreadsheet](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=4&d=2&y=2019&t=M&i=2019-04-04%2016:30:09.783))

Following are the recommendations:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ITEM | RECOMMENDED $ AMOUNT |
| 1. *Cognitive Behavior Intervention Services & Incentives*
 | $500,000 |
| 1. *Employment (Subsidized)*
 | $1,000,000 |
| 1. *Faith-Based Partnerships*
 | $1,000,000 |
| 1. *For Us By Us (FUBU)*
 | $1,000,000 |
| 1. *Indigent/Barrier Removal Fund – (Attached to service/engagement)*
 | $2,000,000 |
| 1. *Restorative Justice - Circles in the community*
 | $1,000,000  |

**Cognitive Behavior Intervention and Incentives**

Neola noted that this service would be provided to all individuals supervised by Probation to ensure better programming outcomes by addressing criminal thinking.

**Subsidized Employment**:

Neola noted that the increase in subsidized employment hours from 80 to 520 is in alignment with industry standards. Chief Still indicated that the increased time will allow employers to consider the individuals as potential permanent employees. However, one important restriction to be included is that subsidized employment cannot occur within the provider’s operation. The County wants to motivate vendors to have a relationship with outside employers where there is a permanent opportunity for employment.

Questions & Responses from Chief Still:

* ***Question***: With the change of using employers outside of the vendor, is there an issue pertaining to insurance, workers compensation and other costs? Will we absorb the cost or is this something that would be handled by the outside employer? ***Response:*** This would be handled by the outside employer.
* ***Question***: With the increase to 520 hours of subsidized employment, how many clients will the increased budget of $1 million over two-years serve? ***Response:*** We will need to determine how many individuals will be served initially and calculate accordingly.
* ***Question***: If an individual loses their job and subsequently returns, what happens with the 520 hours? Does the employer start over with a new 520 hours, or does it start the hours from where the employee left off? ***Response:*** The employer would only receive 520 hours, per employee. If that employer was no longer willing to rehire that individual for whatever the reason, the remaining balance would be available for the individual to use with another prospective employer.
* ***Question***: The current funding is $3 million for 80 hours and you are suggesting 520 hours (about six times the amount). Is $1 million in additional funding adequate? ***Response:*** The proposed allocation takes into consideration drop-outs, etc. The calculation is not 1 to 1. If needed, additional funds can be allocated.

**Faith-Based Partnerships**:

Neola indicated that there are many faith-based organizations providing services for our clients (such as: shelter, food, clothing) and not receiving funding to support their programs. Neola and Chief Still both expressed their commitment to support the efforts of faith-based organizations.

Questions & Responses from Chief Still:

* ***Question***: Is there any thought around building support for smaller, more grass-roots organizations around navigating through the grant application process? ***Response:*** It would be helpful to include more capacity building and construct the RFPs in a way that has more flexibility but still adhere to County standards. Subcontracting can also be a valuable way to address the deficit.
* ***Question***: How long have we been doing this kind of work in Alameda County to determine if we have developed a culture where people are more aware of funding opportunities to ensure that funds are dispersed throughout the community? ***Response (Shahidah):*** The County has been doing RFPs since entering into contracts with organizations. The disconnect comes when smaller organizations, specifically, do not possess the technical aptitude needed to effectively engage in the bidding process.
* ***Question***: In order to effectively partner with faith-based organizations we need to know: 1) If faith-based organizations are aware of the RFPs; 2) If they are aware, do they know how to navigate the process; and 3) How to assist with the disparity in technical skills; someone must walk them through the process and provide technical assistance. ***Response:*** Listening sessions can assist with helping to navigate through these issues. Developing grants directed towards these organizations would also be a great benefit. Additionally, the County allocated $9 million through the Community Capacity Fund, specifically to target smaller organizations.
* ***Question***: Is this financial commitment specifically for faith-based organizations or does this apply to small community-based organizations as well? What is the gap? ***Response (Neola):*** This is specifically targeted for faith-based organizations; smaller organizations would be a subset of faith-based, but faith-based is the qualifier. The gap is being able to support faith-based organizations that are already working with the County’s clients.
* ***Question***: What are the differences in services between a small community organization and a small faith-based organization? Are small faith-based organizations and small community organizations doing similar work? ***Response:*** We are starting to contract with some smaller organizations in terms of providing specific types of services. Historically, there has been a deficit as it pertains to how the County has cultivated its partnerships with small faith-based organizations. Neola noted that faith-based organizations provide spiritually, which has been mentioned by many clients as the reason for not recidivating, which is very different from other smaller organizations. Chief Still noted that the item could be modified to state faith-based and local partnerships, leaving the item a little more open, until further dialogue occurs.

**Indigent/Barrier Removal Fund**:

The Indigent/Barrier Removal Fund can be used by the client to pay for a myriad of personal expenses, including, but not limited to: phone bills (to keep clients connected); medical coverage; return to work documents; housing needs; childcare, etc. To utilize this fund, clients must be engaged in programming.

Questions & Responses

* ***Question***: Would the funding go through a CBO? ***Response:*** Yes, it would go through a CBO and there would be a referral process for accessing funds.
* ***Question***: Is there a defined list as it pertains to barrier needs because nearly anything could be considered a barrier? ***Response:*** We are in the beginning stages and will need to define the different types of barriers; the list will need to be well-defined in terms of what constitutes a barrier for the purposes of utilizing these funds.
* ***Question:*** Who will decide what services are essential? ***Response:*** In terms of the priority of services, we can determine that based on assessments. We will also need to develop a process as it pertains to the denial of services. It was suggested that this item be included in a listening session because it is such an innovative idea.

**Kinship Reentry Workforce – Charlie Eddy & Valerie Edwards**

Neola noted that this recommendation was initially made at a Programs and Services Workgroup meeting last year and required follow-up. She thanked Charlie and Valerie for taking the lead to collect and present additional information for this recommendation.

Charlie provided the most current draft of the proposal. The basic concept is to bring the loved-ones of returning individuals into the reentry workforce. These individuals have a vested interest, as well as personal lived experiences, and are culturally sensitive to this population. Valerie further discussed the rationale for being able to have the funds needed to hire this workforce. Valerie stressed the importance of culturally affirmative practices that welcome culture as a key resource in every aspect of care instead of treating it as an obstacle to be overcome. In order to build a culturally affirmative environment, the community must initiate and effectively engage across social divides. There needs to be a cultivation of respectful engagement and a learning community that recognizes that inequalities of race, gender identity, sexual expression and class continue to exist.

Valeria noted that focus groups were conducted with the Alameda County Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership (ACCIPP) and the Transition Day Reporting Center to obtain feedback from family members and clients.

The purpose of the Kinship Reentry Workforce Pilot Project Proposal is: “*To significantly increase successful reentry experiences and reduce recidivism, this project will pilot a reentry workforce model for the kinship networks of currently and formerly incarcerated community members to work as credentialed paraprofessionals in the county’s reentry services system of care.”*

The proposed outcomes for the pilot are as follows:

1. Access the wisdom, passion and cultural competence of the kinship reentry community to reduce mass incarceration.
2. Create and implement a national model for training and credentialing kinship reentry paraprofessionals
3. Create and implement a successful direct service model employing kinship paraprofessionals as reentry mentors, coaches, navigators and family group facilitators to increase successful reentry experiences, empower returning community members to not only survive but to thrive.

Questions & Responses:

***Question***: Has there been any thought about including credit/units from higher education or community colleges? ***Response:*** Yes, this has been a conversation, and hopefully this is something that will materialize in some way as we continue to network and partner with colleges.

**It was unanimously agreed that the recommendations from the Programs and Services Workgroup move forward to the CAB, except for the Indigent/Barrier Removal Fund, which will be discussed further at the next meeting.**

Charlie inquired about the amount that has been allocated for the Kinship Pilot and wanted to know how it would be built out to support costs over the next two-years. Chief Still advised that the $250,000 would remain for now with the understanding that expenses related to a full release and programmatic growth may require additional funding.

1. **Community Advisory Board (CAB) Funding Request**

Chief Still noted that the CAB has put forward a funding request that will require more discussion. The item is a policy issue and will need to be presented to the CCPEC because the CAB is requesting additional/increased stipends for those that are attending non-CAB related meetings. Chief Still stated that there are political nuances related to this discussion and the final decision can have a far-reaching impact on other boards or commissions throughout the County.

**Next Meeting –May 14, 2019, 3pm - 5pm, 1111 Jackson Street, 2nd Floor, Rooms 226 - 228**

**Public Comment -** None