****

**COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD**

**October 6, 2020**

**By Online Conference**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Raymond Banks, Kamarlo Spooner, Tanasha Stevens (left early), Damon Johnson (Shuja), Lou Rigali, Alexandra Kay, Barbara Medeiros, Karen Roye

**Not Present:** Taqwaa Bonner, James Rucker, Succatti Shaw, Jasmine Quinn (leave of absence)

* **Call to Order**: 6:15 p.m.
* **Review and Approve Minutes from September 1, 2020.**
	+ Kamarlo moves to remove “disrespect” from “CAB Recruitment and Retention"
		- Minutes stated, “Barbara: Feels we all, including the CAB, need to work together, must learn to communicate in a respectful manner. (Cites Butler being called out as law enforcement as an example of disrespectful behavior).”
	+ Barbara indicated that this was what she said. She does not mean any disrespect to Kamarlo.
	+ Kamarlo felt that by putting a disrespectful bent on it, was disrespectful to him as a black man. Kamarlo did not mean disrespect to Butler.
	+ Raymond believes that calling people “disrespectful” could inhibit persons from speaking.
	+ **Raymond moves to accept minutes** with a caveat (to look at above again). **Minutes unanimously approved**.
* **CAB – Open Seats and Recruitment Update (Raymond):**
	+ Two new members Alexandra Kay, James Rucker (admitted today)
	+ District 1 – 3 open seats, District 2 – 0 open seats, District 3 – 0 open seats, District 4 – 1 open seat, District 5 – 0 open seats.
	+ Jasmine on leave of absence.
* **Funding Recommendations**
	+ Housing
		- Last meeting, confusion whether the CAB’s housing funding motion had passed CCPEC. Raymond has an email from Neola that indicates the motion did not pass.
			* (Raymond unable to share email on screen, "will seek to be a host”)
			* Lou indicated being a host comes with other functions including muting ability and breakout rooms
			* Email from Neola Crosby, sent Thursday July 16, 2020 at 5:48 pm, noted by Raymond:

To: vet\_ontology@outlook.com <vet\_ontology@outlook.com>; Grigsby, Janene, Probation <jagrigsby@acgov.org>

Cc: Barbara Quintero <barbara.quintero@hsimail.org>; kamarlo <kamarlo30@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: Agenda Item Term Limits

Hello Raymond,

The CAB discussed this item at your May 12th meeting, but didn’t put forward a motion, which is required before the CCPEC takes action. Once the CAB takes action, I can move this forward t

* + - **Raymond moves** to recommend 1.5 million for housing for women/children and sex offender to be augmented by current providers/CBOs of housing for this population. **Lou seconds.**
			* **7 “Ayes”, 1 abstention (Alexandra abstained). Motion Passed.**
	+ Pilot Program
		- For relationship building between all branches of LE - LE, DA, Probation. Recommend $225,000 ($75,000 per consultant plus overhead) to hire 1 man and 1 woman
			* Recommend Pilot Program (from agenda): "Relationship building between all branches of Law Enforcement, District Attorney, Sheriff, Probation, Judicial Branch, and the Re-entry and Realignment Community and its allies. We recommend that $225,000 be redirected to: Hire two paid consultants, (1 Man & 1 Woman) to speak to, encourage, and motivate those that are mandated to supervised probation at places like the County Jail, TDRC and CBO’s. 1. These individuals can speak to and encourage those on probation at bi-weekly meetings. (The consultants must be able to prove rehabilitation and must be from Alameda County and look like US) For instance, (Black/LatinX/Woman/Man Motivators/Speakers from The Hood). We are not looking for the extension of probation, rather we are arguing for consultants to fulfill these positions because of potential conflict of interest."
		- Consultants should not be an extension of Probation, want from hood
		- Consultants should be independent (not with a CBO)
		- Barbara: 3 highest areas should be represented: West and East Oakland and Cherryland. (District 4, 2 and 5).
		- Kamarlo: $75,000 per consultant, so total should be adjusted to $300,000
		- Raymond suggests 1 consultant/county district, with less busy districts helping the busier districts. Suggests at least 4 consultants. Suggests passing tonight to talk to Probation as to their input.
		- Kamarlo agrees with 5 consultants: $375,000 plus administrative overhead of $50,000 for $425,000.
		- Lou seeks definition of “relationship building” to visualize goal and how to measure. Kamarlo indicates persons in the community distrust LE, so looking for consultants to go back into the community and do the work…to build the bridges between persons of color and LE.
			* Persons “who look like us” can inspire us.
		- Karen: Persons re-entering are not allowed in Crime-free zones. A consultant could be an advocate for such person.
		- Barbara: Consultant’s work could be measured by the rate of re-offending of persons with whom the consultant has worked.
			* Could be advocates
			* Lou doesn’t understand the word “relationship building” but understands the word advocate. Trying to understand the job of the consultant.
		- Consultants would build relationships and guide the reentry person, helping the person to transition successfully.
			* Tim Smith (BOSS): Consultants similar to BOSS FUBU - credible messengers, would create relationships with supervising DPO and others, including with service providers, to make transition from incarceration easier. Would help broker relationships…making returning persons more compliant.
		- Alexandra: Needs more info on “relationship building” - Tim indicates that the consultant would help with all relationships in all areas touched by the returning person - including child support and housing. The consultant would develop new relationships for the returning citizen, develop an "accountability reliance” …a wide circle of persons. Lived experience will create other relationships within the community.
		- **Kamarlo moves to recommend $425,000 for the pilot program for 5 consultants over 5 districts. Shuja seconds. Passed unanimously (7) with one abstention (Alexandra).**

* + Other Funding: Lottery of $1,000,000 for formerly incarcerated.
		- FI let out before 2020 not eligible. Trump stimulus checks, most FI not eligible.
		- **Raymond moves** **to recommend $1,000,000 from remaining moneys for 2000 stimulus checks of $500 to be issued by lottery to persons on probation who were released from incarceration before 2020.** Shuja seconds. **Motion passes** with 4 “ayes” and 3 abstentions (Karen, Barbara and Alexandra abstain). Tanasha left the meeting before the vote.
			* Barbara: What is stimulus money for? Karen: Needs more dialog.
		- Raymond wonders if CAB should discuss where money will come from.
		- Karen said at Fiscal Procurement meeting Chief Still indicated $40 Million plus is being spent on current projects…cumulative amount with monies being added and subtracted…
			* To prevent challenges in future looking to create a secured fund so AB 109 money is tracked under one umbrella. The Chief indicated they are able to maintain the funds but not stagnant process.
			* A number of projects coming up with regards to housing. Looking to creating umbrella RFPs to meet population demands and to move more quickly.
			* Feels that the funds are now being monitored “in one pot, under one roof.”
		- Raymond wants detailed accounting of unspent funds for each year and what is cumulative amount. Raymond will send an email to Ms. Abernathy (Probation). Probation is preparing a presentation to Fiscal and Procurement.
		- Public comment:
			* Don Frazier, BOSS: CAB members discussed Probation comments, not the communities. Next month, the Chief will provide an accounting of unspent funds. Frazier believes the CAB can request an accounting quarterly or monthly of such funds.
* **CAB Recruitment and Retention Process**
	+ General
		- Cab Etiquette
			* Raymond: It doesn’t feel good to be cut off. He was cut off while making a motion. Wants to raise awareness as to how people might feel if cut-off. Feels there is a double standard…person’s advocating for fairness and etiquette are the same persons who disrupted me/cut him off. Wants conflict resolution process or grievance process …can’t be a double standard. Wants fairness and equity, everyone held to the same standard. The statement he read is below:

"I shall begin with the discussion of the minutes because considerable time was spent discussion a comment made by Barbara Quintero. According to the minutes, Barbara “*Feels we all, including the CAB, need to work together, must learn to communicate in a respectful manner. (Cites Butler being called out as law enforcement as an example of disrespectful behavior).*” I said to Barbara I have email in which she stated, when referring to another CAB member, Karen Roye, “*Raymond, I do not believe she violated the Brown Act, she made a comment about an email that had nothing to do with any CAB agenda items. The emails included everyone around the meeting recordings. I would hope that a CAB member can express their views. Barbara.” [See Attachment]* If I have been had able to share screen, I would be able to clearly illustrate to the CAB that that there seems to be a double standard, which can be defined as “a [rule](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/rule) or [standard](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/standard) of good [behavior](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/behaviour) that, [unfairly](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/unfair), some [people](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/people) are [expected](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/expected) to [follow](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/follow) or [achieve](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/achieve) but other [people](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/people) are not.”

In this case, Karen can express herself freely but Kamarlo cannot without being negatively characterized. If I have been able to present this information to CAB members, I contend that this would have changed the outcome of this particular issue. Furthermore, I have reviewed the tape, at approximately 1:15:50 seconds into the September meeting; I listened to Barbara’s comments. According the tape, Barbara did not actually use Kamarlo’s name; in fact, it seems that Karen Meredith added Kamarlo’s name even though Barbara did not actually mention Kamarlo’s name at the September meeting. If leadership had access to the ZOOM or administrative privileges, the leadership could have presented this evidence to the CAB and member could have made the appropriate decision regarding the notes based solely on the facts or evidence. [See Attached]

Another reason to support the idea of giving leadership administrative privileges over the ZOOM, is that it could have used to clarify a recommendation for housing. According to Neola Crosby, the CCPEC already voted for at 30% set aside approximately 2:09:00 at the September meeting. I informed Neola that the measure was not passed by the CCPEC because it said that the recommendation was too general and was told make it more specific and bring it back. In order to vindicate myself, I brought an email; it is titled CAB Housing Request, please review it.

Next, I will argue that the having administrative privileges could have been used to illustrate other example of a double standard or the idea people apply one standard or set of rules to other but apply a different set of rules to themselves. To demonstrate this point, I shall use to excerpts from Barbara and Karen. At approximately, 1:55:30 seconds, Barbara talked about CAB etiquette and professionalism at the September meeting. In fact, she talked about, “not cutting people off or making people feel less than.” Karen said, “[we should] respect one another.” However, at approximately 2:25:38 at the September meeting I started to make a motion and was abruptly interrupted by Karen who “I make the motion.” And then Barbara enters the conversation without being recognized and says, “Go ahead Karen.” If Barbara had really believed in respecting others, she would have said, “Karen you interrupted Raymond and you should not do that because it is disruptive and unprofessional. However, Barbara cosigned her actions. Again, if I had access to the screen or administrative privileges at the October meeting, I could have shared this “double standard” with CAB. To summarize, prima facie the seems to be a double standard."

* + - * Lou: Are you (Raymond) asking for better facilitation of the meeting? Zoom calls can get totally out of hand if more than 1 person speaks at the same time. Lou doesn’t think the CAB needs a grievance process at this time, but better facilitation.
				+ Lou indicates that the cutting of “sound” is in the hand of the host.
				+ Kamarlo re-emphasizes the need for the CAB to be the host of the platform.
				+ Scott Dicky, Assistant County Counsel, said the matter should be agendized. The agenda item, “CAB recruitment and retention” is too vague.
		- CCPEC Update (Raymond): CAB Recruitment and Equity recommendations shot down. Language considered too forceful and/or infringement on the powers of the BOS.
			* Raymond: Goal of CCPEC is to protect the powers of BOS while the CAB is to protect the persons re-entering. That is why the CAB wanted the rights of the individual applicant to be protected.
				+ We could reformulate and send it back out. Raymond emailed Darryl Stewart but hasn’t received a response.
				+ Lou: We could ask the EECEC the reasons for the denial. Raymond said, they said it was too demanding/aggressive. Raymond disagrees with this characterization. Two options: rewrite or drop it.
				+ Kamarlo: Thought we made a recommendation, so he is not sure what else the CAB can do.
				+ Raymond suggests tabling until next week.
* **CAB transition to community support and resources**
	+ Raymond wants to request CBO support for the CAB to include food, website, notetaker. Transition from LE to community. CAB belongs in the community and not as a subsidiary of law enforcement.
	+ Karen Meredith indicates she has no issue stepping down as note-taker and does so. She will help with the transition when a replacement is made. Karen notes that she isn’t getting paid for the notetaking and is not a member of the DA’s office. She reminded the CAB that Kamarlo is the CAB secretary and can fill in until a replacement notetaker is found.
	+ Karen Roye: Thanked Karen Meredith for her service and said there is no budget to fund a note-taker. Has concerns about how the meeting will get recorded because there are no funds. Kamarlo said they can record the CAB meeting and that AB 109 monies can pay for notetaking.
	+ Raymond said he is talking about more than a note-taker…he is looking for CBO support…looking for more CAB control, for example a website that the CAB puts up, not Probation.
		- Looking for a motion
	+ Scott Dickey: The CAB doesn’t have a separate legal entity distinct from the County. The CAB cannot enter into contracts nor does it have a budget. The Guidelines/Bylaws don’t give authority to do what is being discussed. Can ask the BOS for funding, but such would require going thru CCPEC and probably a change in the bylaws.
		- Raymond believes there is room within AB 109, may not be a legal solution but a political solution. Destiny determined by others for so long (Jim Crowe), time for the CAB, a unique board, to establish a deeper community connection.
		- Kamarlo: Some persons believe we are “demanding” to CCPEC, but we are recommending. Hoping the CCPEC will pass the CAB’s recommendations.
	+ Dickey believes using AB 109 monies in the manner previously described - Contract and budget and RFP - is not in the CAB’s power. Doesn’t mean that the CAB can’t go to the BOS and request such. The CAB can request, and the BOS doesn’t have to comply. Can request of CCPEC….
	+ Lou is supportive of request being made and is supportive of a formerly incarcerated person being in the position and request funding for such. The process is for us to present the request to the CCPEC and see if they will support us. We can talk individually or together with Supervisors.
		- Alexandra: Requests a copy of the bylaws. Thinks it important to have good notes. Wants to know who can be the notetaker.
		- Raymond says Zoom records and does transcription. Kamarlo agrees.
	+ **Kamarlo makes a motion** to take AB 109 monies to pay a stenographer who is previously incarcerated. **Raymond seconds.**
		- Public comment: Donald Frazier (BOSS) - never the intent of the CAB to be a rubber stamp of the BOS, but the voice of the formerly incarcerated, the community. (Does not believe the CAB is a rubber stamp). Donald believes, contrary to what the County Counsel said, that the CAB was meant to be more… CAB must make the change since they need to be more connected with the community; making the change would be building relationships within the community.
	+ Raymond asks if CAB should vote on the whole package or the note taker.
		- Donald Frazier said the CAB needs a strong person who can do more than take notes. Such a person could be a voice for the CAB, could go to meetings, could provide the “intelligence” they need to do their work.
		- Public Comment: Tim Smith: Look at CAB website - it needs better marketing to reach those with Twitter and other social media. Would open up the communication.
		- Karen Meredith - believes that the position described by Donald is what the CAB should do…don’t need one person to do such.
	+ Karen Roye: Another consideration. A lot of new members on board, we don’t know who the next officers are so we don’t know how these people will want to manage the work. We don’t have a transition plan in place. Voting next month for new leadership.
		- Since Karen (Meredith) indicates this is her last meeting, she (Karen Roye) believes that a justice impacted person would be good.
		- Since the CAB doesn’t have contracting ability, she’s reluctant to move the motion forward.
		- Raymond said he’d put up his $50 to pay for a notetaker.
	+ **Vote taken**: Only Ray, Marlo, Shuja, Lou and Alexandra present. 4 “Ayes”, 1 abstained (Alexandra). **No quorum, so vote does not count.**
* **Agenda Building**: Transition to CBO, Equity Program, Redirecting funds, Elections, CAB voting member of CCPEC, CAB Recruitment and Retention, Discussion of Minutes
* **Public Comment:**
	+ Shauna Conner, Probation: Chief Still committed to taking and discussing with each County Supervisor the CABs recruitment guidelines and timelines. The Chief will report back about such at the next meeting.
	+ Raphael: Spooner has the best interest of the community. In discussing the comment in last month’s meeting related to a CAB member being “law enforcement,” he (Spooner) was just pointing out a potential conflict of interest…one that anyone listening to the discussion might believe. Raphael believes that the discussion related to the comment was an unjust attack on Spooner’s character and wants Spooner’s character “to be exonerated.” Raphael suggests a liaison between the CAB and probation.
* **Adjournment: 9:09**

**Next Meeting**

**November 3, 2020**

**6:15 – 8:15**