

Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

July 6, 2022

In attendance:

Rodney Brooks, Alameda County Public Defender's Office
Succatti Shaw, Alameda County Community Advisory Board (CAB)
Darryl Stewart, Office of Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley
Janene Grigsby, Alameda County Probation Department
Arion Chapman, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
Careen Conley, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
Ameeta Singh, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
Nancy French: Alameda County Probation Department
Shawn Rowland, Our Road Prison Project
Veronica Rios-Reddick, Alameda County District Attorney's Office
Charlie Eddy, Urban Strategies Council
Shauna Connor, Alameda County Probation Department
Gina Temporal, Alameda County Probation Department
Sara Oddie, Office of Alameda County Supervisor Dave Brown
Nathaniel Rouse, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
John Jones III, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
Michelle Williams, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
Holly Axe, Alameda County Probation Department
Alexa Young, Alameda County Probation Department
Virgil Holt, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
Alysia Lovett, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency

A summary of the meeting is below:

Succatti Shaw presented an update about the Community Advisory Board's (CAB) effort to develop a landing page independent of Alameda County's website and the CAB's current activities. A summary of the discussion is below:

- The purpose of the landing page is to provide an introduction to the CAB.
- There is a need for an independent landing page because finding basic information about the CAB is currently challenging.
- The proposed landing page needs to be user friendly, give a brief bio of CAB members, minutes, past agendas, etc.
- Initial identified challenges include the cost of developing and maintaining the landing page.
- Next steps include, looking for a community-based organization to host the landing page and eliminating the potential legal challenges that may arise due to the CAB's connection to Alameda County. It was suggested that a disclaimer could be placed on the landing page stating the views of CAB are not those of Alameda County.
- The landing page needs to be easy to utilize, especially for people who are returning to the community after incarceration.
- There was a request for volunteers to assist with the development.
- The question was raised can AB 109 funds be used to underwrite the cost; expense should not hinder the development.
- It was added that the funds have been approved, the outstanding issue is a process for deciding what gets posted, no guidelines have been given by The Alameda County Counsel's Office.
- When talking about CAB issues in general:
 - The need to avoid vacancies was identified.
 - The need for members to be respectful toward others was stated.
 - There is a need for a CAB member to have a vote on the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC); the perspective of systems impacted individuals is missing on the CCPEC.
- The question was raised, about the CAB's power; some suggested they don't have any influence. It was also noted the CCPEC has voted to approve funds and/or the implementation of an initiative when the CAB had previously voted in opposition.

Attendees engaged in an update and discussion regarding the merits of expanding the eligibility to receive AB 109 services or increasing utilization by current Probation clients. A summary is below:

- Some members who attend The Process and Evaluation Workgroup had heard other counties are providing AB 109 services to individuals outside of those outlined in the legislation. There is nothing in the law prohibiting expanding the access to services to a broader population.
- Housing and employment services have a waitlist in Alameda County; other services are often underutilized.

- There was discussion at the most recent Justice Reinvestment Coalition (JRC) meeting, about this issue, it was agreed to try and collect data/information about how AB 109 expansion is working in other counties.
- The question of who would be in the expanded eligibility group was raised. Some of the suggested populations included people on parole, or those who were previously under parole or probation supervision.
- It was noted that some people in the JRC want the services to be open to anyone in the general public, since numerous people face significant barriers, after being released from probation or parole.
- Contra Costa County has a tiered system, the JRC is deciding if they want to advocate for something similar to Contra Costa's approach. The JRC sees this as a "both and" which would not supplant the AB 109 population outlined in the legislation.
- There are other ways people can access county services, Alameda County has created the Road to Re-entry, which outlines a comprehensive process to assist formerly incarcerated individuals.
- It was agreed the JRC, and Process and Evaluation Workgroup members need to examine how expansion works in other counties; and it was suggested that expansion may be a good idea in the future.
- The way expansion is being discussed, over 500,000 people may be eligible, currently Probation has approximately 5,000 AB 109 clients. The number of services provided in Contra Costa County is vastly different. Contra Costa has five categories of services, Alameda County has over 50 contracted service providers.
- If a tiered system is adopted, there is still a need to address the issue of access to services.
- A question was raised, why make the distinction between parole and probation services, whichever system an individual comes from, they often need the same type of support.
- It was agreed to get a copy of Contra Costa County's policy of a tiered system.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25.