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**Meeting Minutes**

**Call to Order and Introductions**: Chief Wendy Still called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m.

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

**Old Business**

Meeting minutes from May 14, 2019, were reviewed and approved as written.

**New Business**

**Community Advisory Board (CAB)-** Raymond Banks

1. **Request to fund a full-time consumer advocate/attorney**

Raymond discussed the idea of creating a Realignment Advocacy Project (RAP) or Re-Entry Consumer Advocacy Project (RECAP) in order to provide consumers an advocate/attorney that could assist them with navigating services and mediate disputes between clients and providers. The idea for this project stems from an HIV Consumer Advocacy Project (HCAP) program based out of San Francisco. HCAP assists clients with filing a grievance with service providers that are funded through Ryan White or Aids funding. Raymond referred to the [RECAP-Agenda Item Request](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=7&d=26&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:31:11.473), which provided greater background in support of their request.

Chief Still acknowledged the importance of these types of programs and services and advised that the County currently allocates over $2 million for this type of service, which can be viewed in the [Legal Services - Alameda County](https://www.acgov.org/calendar_app/DisplayDetailServlet?site=Internet&ag=PRO&ty=DEPT&m=7&d=26&y=2019&t=M&i=2018-12-21%2015:31:11.473) document. Chief Still advised that the current funding was adequate and did not believe that there was a need to invest additional funds towards this effort. Chief Still acknowledged that although there is a process in place to address client complaints, however, improvements could certainly be made as it pertains to communicating the process to clients and ensuring that resources are made available internally and externally. She stated that Probation is in the process of creating a process to file a formal complaint online. Additionally, she noted that part of her staffing pattern would include a client advocate for clients in the Juvenile and Adult Services divisions and that an informational packet would be developed advising the clients of all the avenues at their disposal in order to file a complaint against a provider. Raymond disagreed with her conclusion and stated that there was a disconnect because clients have approached him in the past advising that they had been unfairly targeted, removed from programs, and violated without due process. Chief Still advised Raymond that the County takes reports very seriously and they are investigated. She stated that the County is obligated as a part of various federal laws to investigate any and all claims made against providers, but it is possible that the individual simply didn’t know how to initiate the process.

District Attorney O’Malley also stated not only is it the law that you must follow up with complaints, but that notices advising clients “***What to do if”*** must also be posted. She said that that there should be postings throughout the County and within the provider’s networks to ensure that the information is widely available, digital postings should also be available and Probation should be listed as the first point of contact. Chief Still agreed and said that notices should be posted in all Probation lobbies, as well as the Probation website. She advised that the providers that receive AB109 funding will be given a letter directing them to post notifications in their facilities advising clients of their complaint processes. Raymond asked if there would be a dedicated individual to assist clients and Chief Still advised that there would be three dedicated client advocates (two for Juvenile and one for Adult Services). The job descriptions have been completed and testing for these positions will commence very soon.

Raymond raised concerns about individuals not wanting to report issues out of fear of potentially losing their housing. DA O’Malley noted that housing providers submit reports regarding enrollments and completions, as well as progress reports on the individuals that are participating. Abrupt terminations of participants from the program without explanation would certainly serve as a red flag for those monitoring the program. Chief Still also added that if there are providers who have received complaints, she would certainly like to know so that the appropriate follow-up can be done to address the issues and concerns. DA O’Malley referred to California law which requires sexual harassment/abusive conduct behavior training of all employees for companies with more than five employees. She advised that this standard/requirement should be included as a component of provider’s contracts with the County. Eric von Geldern advised Raymond to also look at the criteria that is being used in order to determine if someone is terminated from a program to see if it is realistic for the goal of rehabilitation or if it requires amendment.

Chief Still stated that the recommendation is not to approve a separate funding source, but to move forward with all the actions that were discussed. Raymond asked if there could be some sort of due process attached to the actionable items and Chief Still asked him to clarify what was meant by that request. Raymond advised that he’d like to see an administrative hearing before “putting people out” particularly in the middle of the night. Chief Still agreed that no one should be arbitrarily removed from their housing, however, there may be exigent circumstances that do not allow for an administrative hearing such as physical altercations, or when someone’s personal well-being is threatened. She did state that it would be prudent to look at what types of circumstances fit that criteria and detail, in writing, a prescribed policy and process that includes due process.

1. **Request for childcare at CCPEC-related meetings and; c. Request for transportation stipends for systems-impacted individuals to attend CCP/CCPEC-related meetings**

Raymond referred to the [Agenda Item Request](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/AgendaItemRequest_5-20-19.pdf) submitted by the CAB which requests that in an effort to promote civic and community engagement, the CCP and CCPEC hold at least one of its quarterly meetings after business hours so that justice impacted individuals that work and/or go to school can attend. Raymond advised that non-county employees and those that do not work for community partners are at a disadvantage because they are not compensated to attend as part of their job, and that they may even be forced with the unfortunate decision of losing pay in order to attend or miss the meeting. He also stated that the CAB was requesting that the workgroups (Programs and Services, Fiscal and Procurement, and Process and Evaluation) which meet monthly hold 25% of their meetings after hours. CAB believes that this will promote inclusiveness for those that are re-entry/justice impacted and allow them the opportunity to be in the spaces and provide input to help shape the policy that directly impacts them. Raymond then clarified that this request was amended at the last CCPEC meeting to reflect one CCP or CCPEC meeting to be held after hours per year and one meeting from each work group to be held after hours per year, for a total of four after-hour meetings per year. Chief Still confirmed that action was taken at the previous CCPEC meeting to approve the request. Raymond advised that CAB had not had an opportunity to meet since that action and they had not yet been updated on the approval.

It was also suggested by CAB that childcare be provided, and a transportation stipend be given to systems-impacted individuals to encourage participation in these meetings. Chief Still advised that there are concrete service dollars funded through AB109 available to any client supervised by Probation to assist with transportation to attend any of the meetings; the clients can contact their DPO to receive transportation assistance. Therefore, the funds are already available through concrete services. Chief Still also stated that it isn’t feasible to create a separate daycare. The alternative is to work with current family reunification contractors to identify a childcare provider for evening meetings. She stated that it would be a significant accounting challenge to compensate/reimburse individuals for childcare-related expenses. Additionally, it would set a precedent for the Board and currently this is not done for other meetings in the County. She did acknowledge that she sees and appreciates the value in having childcare access and reaffirmed the idea of working with current providers to identify a childcare provider that has the necessary licenses and provide them with a stipend for their services. We could also work with First Five to locate childcare vendors. DA O’Malley agreed with Chief Still regarding her position on funding childcare services and inquired about the transportation aspect. Chief Still stated that she would draft a notice to all DPOs advising them to provide transportation by way of BART and/or bus tickets in order to facilitate attendance at the meetings.

**Grants Update –** Chief Still

Chief Still does not believe that any new grants have been received during the month, however, there are the grants that were awarded from the BSCC for the reentry population. She stated that all the new BSCC-funded grantees will be invited to a future CCPEC meeting to provide an overview of their services. In terms of spreading the word to clients about these services, Chief Still noted that Probation’s website (currently under construction) should go live by late September or early October and there is a hand-held device currently being developed for clients that will allow them to see the various types of available services. She also noted that non-peace officer staff has been authorized to approve client referrals for services.

**RFP and Contracts Update –** Gina

1. **Probation Update**
2. Higher Education – Currently in the process of negotiating and finalizing the contracts with the vendors. They expect to go before the board by early October.
3. Family Reunification, the new Transition Day Reporting Center (TDRC), Education, Employment the and Adult Multi-Service Residential are in the final stages of RFP development and should be released sometime in September or October.
4. Transportation – The RFP is being revised and should be released by next quarter.
5. **Behavioral Health – Sophia Lai**

The RFP for Serious Mental Illness services closed on August 6th and there was one respondent. The selection committee is moving forward with review of the submitted proposal. There were two contractors awarded for Mild/Moderate Mental Health and Case Management services - Roots Community Health Center (North County) and The Felton Institute (South County).

**Indigent Barrier Removal Fund** – Charlie noted that there had been a robust conversation at the Programs and Services Workgroup asked what the next steps are in the process. Chief Still stated that they have been looking at the contracts that have indigent funding and barrier removal already built into their budget and the second part has been looking at what is an evidence-based program. Chief Still advised that they are not prepared to have the full conversation yet, as details are still being discussed. DA O’Malley added that $2 million is a significant amount of money to have a lack of accountability and that fiscal integrity is needed. Her recommendation was to put the funds into a trust and not hurry to make a decision. She believes that there are some very innovative things that can be done and it’s definitely worth having the conversation. Neola added that Programs and Services Workgroup spent a significant amount of time looking at this proposed fund. She reported that there were many clients/systems impacted individuals that were included in the conversation, and they will continue to synthesize the information and report back to this Workgroup.

It was noted that many conversations are occurring at different tables, and the goal is to reach a consensus on how to utilize these funds in a sensible and ethical way that would provide a great impact for the clients. Chief Still advised that Programs and Services need to continue their dialogue and report their ideas. Chief Still indicated that no action would be taken on this item until it has been fully discussed. Shahidah asked if Chief Still could provide a list that shows how much money is currently being spent in barrier removal services as part of the current contracts. Chief Still also mentioned that there are direct service dollars for barrier removal and that she would provide a breakdown similar to what was provided for legal services in today’s meeting.

Charlie asked for a status update of the $1 million for Restorative Justice that was to be placed in trust from the last meeting. Chief Still advised that the funds have not been released; more conversation needs to occur before moving forward. Shahidah asked if it was possible to change the COSA programing to fit Alameda County’s population demographics. Chief Still advised that this was something that she is currently looking reviewing.

**FY 19/20 Funding**

1. **Allotment**- Chief Still noted that when the Board made the decision to award 50% of the AB109 dollars based on the previous year’s base allocation, it was not taken into consideration the possibility of the amount decreasing. She advised that she made a recommendation to the Board for the formula to be either 50% the allocation, 50% of the prior year, or 50% of the current year because you can’t spend more than the funding you currently have.
2. **Approval of $9,341,847 for FY 19/20** - Chief Still reviewed the Realignment [Allocations 8-27-19 FPW](https://www.acgov.org/probation/documents/AgendaItemRequest_5-20-19.pdf) and Recommendation spreadsheet. Shahidah inquired as to the $9,000 recommendation for CAB and Neola advised that the $3,000 from FY 18/19 was completed depleted as most CAB members are formerly and receiving stipends and the previous amount was based upon one-third of the members being formerly incarcerated. Chief Still asked about the $370,000 for education and Neola advised that this line item was approved at the last CCPEC meeting. Chief Still added that this “odd” amount was needed to fund the current contractor while a bid process was being developed for a new vendor. The $3.375 million dedicated for housing will support projects such as the Dream Center which has robust wrap-a-round services. A site has been identified in Hayward that has 35 beds, and the site has been used for reentry beds previously. Chief Still advised that the Housing and Community Development Department will make a presentation at the next CCPEC meeting and provide a breakdown of the categories of housing that the funds were used for last year. Chief Still also mentioned that the demographics collected by 2-1-1 would be presented. **All the recommended items on the allocation’s spreadsheet were moved forward to the CAB for consideration.**
3. **CAB recommendation to increase funding for Father’s Services by $250,000 (total $500,00) and LGBTQ services by $100,000 (total $200,000**) – Item held until next meeting; no CAB representative was present.
4. **CAB transportation stipends to attend CAB meetings, not to exceed $9,000 per fiscal year** – The Item was discussed and approved above.

**Next Meeting –September 10, 2019, 3pm - 5pm, 1111 Jackson Street, 2nd Floor, Rooms 226 - 228**

**Public Comment –** Shahidah asked what would be done with the $1.7 million allocated for Pre-Trial services from AB109 since it was funded through the State. Chief Still indicated that this allocation was for Pre-Trial/Early Intervention Court services. This allocation is currently being used for early intervention court services and one of the actions to be discussed at the next CCPEC is determining who is eligible for accessing these service dollars. She asked Neola to place this item on the CCPEC agenda for the next meeting. Neola asked if the name should be changed on the spreadsheet from Pre-Trial to Early Intervention and Chief Still replied that it will need to remain as is since this is how the item was funded, but when it is time to renew, the change can be made.

**Adjournment 2:25 p.m.**