

ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

October 1, 2012

Probation Center, 400 Broadway, Oakland (Room 405)

MINUTES

Present:	LaDonna Harris	Nancy O'Malley	Carla Kennedy
	Suzie Cohen	Karen Meredith	Brendon Woods
	Brian Richart	Junious Williams	John Keene
	Sonja Tofoya	Mia Bird	Adrienne Forshay
	Leah Wilson	Teresa LaSalle (recorder)	Alex Briscoe
	Allen Williams	George Galvis	Alex Boskovich
	Michael Noonan (teleconference)		

Chief LaDonna Harris called the meeting to order.

Introductions were made.

Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC)

- Sonya Tafoya and Mia Bird, representatives from PPIC, passed around brochures and copies of their slide presentation and explained the purpose of their visit to Alameda County. PPIC is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that informs and improves public policy in California through independent and objective research. Their research is state of the art and they have a demanding external and internal review process. All research is conducted with strict protocols to protect the confidentiality of individuals. They do fundraising and they are primarily funded through endowments. PPIC's goal is to identify best practices through the use of county variations in approaches to realignment.
- Ms. Bird stated that their intent is to partner with 5-7 counties statewide to figure out what everyone's desired outcomes are and what everyone is doing to achieve their outcomes. They want to know what counties are measuring and what kinds of data they are capturing to produce outcomes. Once the data is collected, PPIC will evaluate and analyze the data. Counties can learn what other counties are doing and what's working and not working for different populations. PPIC has already met with San Francisco and they would like to work with Alameda County due to our population and diversity.
- PPIC hopes to help counties to continue to evaluate themselves over time, keep the process going, make changes and determine if the changes were effective. They would also like to tell other counties throughout the state what is working and what the best practices are.

- PPIC would like to capture the three groups of PRCS clients; 1170H and parole violators, those incarcerated in local prison and those placed on probation. They want to follow all convictions and any form of recidivism after conviction. They want to follow-up at least 6 months to one year and possibly 2 years.
- PPIC is targeting San Francisco, Alameda, Fresno, Kern, King, Sacramento and San Bernardino Counties.
- PPIC has established an agreement with NCCD for their technical assistance and Joan Peterselia for her qualitative work. PPIC's contribution would be to do the quantitative portion of the research. PPIC is actively participating with CalForward and participating on some of their committees. They are meeting with the Board of State and Community Corrections for possible funding for data collection.
- PPIC's next steps are to bring in a subset of counties. If they do not have sufficient county participation, they cannot proceed with the project.
- The consensus of the Executive Committee was PPIC is new to corrections and this is the first time we are hearing about their study. The fact that they would provide this service for free is advantageous to Alameda County, however, Alameda County is not ready to make a commitment until we have a chance to do some research and see examples of past studies PPIC has done. CCP can come back together and have the discussions around these issues next month. Teresa LaSalle will send out an email with the next meeting date.
- PPIC encouraged everyone to go to their website and look at the range of publications on the site. Ms. Tafoya stated she could get the information on what they have done so far on realignment and the school district studies.
- Ms. Tafoya asked Junious Williams to send her or Ms. Bird an email if he knows of any offender groups that can be reached out to assist in their effort to gather realignment data.

Discussion of Year Two allocation; clarification and recommendation

- During the retreat we did not move a recommendation forward for the Board of Supervisors to act on. Chief Harris referred to CPOC on restrictions on voting and proxy votes being acceptable. CPOC said there is no impediment to proxy voting and County Counsel left it up to us to decide.
- Per Nancy O'Malley, everyone agreed that proxies would be present at the meetings in case voting members were not present and it was up to the organization to decide on proxy voting. There are a total of seven (7) voting members and five (5) are present today, along with Michael Noonan via teleconference. It was agreed that the Executive Committee will move forward with the discussion of the Year 2 allocation.

- There were funds set aside out of the Year 2 allocation by the Board and the recommendation needs to come from the Executive Committee. A copy of the expenses from Year One was distributed to the Executive Committee members.
- Alex Briscoe stated that the memo does not reflect HCSA's costs. Not all of the partners have a realignment account and HCSA's allocation is contained in Probation. HCSA spent \$1.3M on the providers and it should be shown on the document. Ms. O'Malley agreed that this is a historical document and it should be accurate and report what each entity really spent. We did have a plan for last year and it doesn't match what some of us said we were going to do. Some did it differently. The auditor took what each agency gave him and that's what is showing up on the memo.
- Mr. Briscoe recommended sending a memo on letterhead to the auditor indicating that there are significant costs not reflected in the memo. Leah Wilson said she could send everyone the breakdown of the \$16.8M from each department and we can make needed adjustments and send them back to her. Even though it will not align with what was journaled with the Auditor, we can articulate that we've identified costs based our actuals. A consensus was reached to draft a response to Patrick O'Connell with adjustments to our actual expenditures.
- For the Year 2 allocation, our state allocation was \$29.2M. \$18M was included in the MOE budget; \$4M was allocated to the Sheriff; \$1.7M to Probation and the remaining balance is \$5.1M. That doesn't include any of the planning and training monies.
- The original allocation was \$18M, not \$18.4M. The \$.4M was designated for HCSA and that leaves HCSA \$100,000 short of the agreed upon allocation. Ms. O'Malley recommended giving HCSA \$.1M from the \$5.1M to make HCSA whole, leaving a balance of \$5M.

\$23.3M (Goal 1) Protect the public

\$ 2.6M (Goal 2) Ensure effective and supportive transitions from detention to the community

\$ 1.8M (Goal 3) Develop innovative and therapeutic support

\$ 1.0M (Goal 4) Ensure sustainable and effective realignment infrastructure

\$28.7M

- **Alex Briscoe motioned to approve the following recommendation to the Board. "Consistent with the Year Two goals adopted by the CCP Executive Committee, we move that the Board of Supervisors approve the Year 2's expenditure plan of \$29.2M." Nancy O'Malley seconded the motion. 6 – Ayes; 1 – Abstention; The motion was carried.**
- The second item is the allocation strategy for the remaining \$5.1M. The Procurement Committee had a strategy recommendation.

- For Year 2 we have 3 goals. Education is in the top 3 identified needs. We also talked about having housing and employment as one initiative to maximize use of money.
- We will have the option to modify and amend the numbers. If we do a pooled procurement and we have 29 vendors that can do the work, we can pay each of them individually, based on clients served.
- We will have \$29.2M for Year 3 so the share will be larger for each category. We will go to the Board with our Year 2 plan. Immediately thereafter, we should start developing our Year 3 plan. We will have more data and more clearly align funding with assessed needs.
- Operation My Hometown was presented by Rich Lucia and they are asking for \$.5M. This is a program similar to a transition center and was not addressed in the \$.5M.
- According to Chief Harris, we have not engaged in business as usual. For our realignment population, we are doing IAPs on all PRCS clients and our staff is trained on the rewards and sanctions grid. We are implementing the strategies being discussed. We are assessing every PRCS client. We are working together in new ways and hope to see recognition for this. CeaseFire is an expense that's not captured in the money we spent on realignment. We attend all the meetings and conduct every home visit and are present for all call ins. We're not billing that to realignment; it's our fundamental work.
- Santa Rita Jail started the reentry based incarceration housing unit and brings programs to the inmates that qualify. The money spent was to house the inmates that were given to them under realignment. They also started an OSHA certification program.
- We have a marketing problem. If we look at what other counties are doing, we are doing better things. Our Year 1 report should reflect what's worked, what we're doing and what we're striving for.
- **Alex Briscoe motioned for the CCP Executive Committee to adopt the 3 goals:**
 - 1) To protect the public through transparent and accountable administration and service;**
 - 2) To ensure effective and supportive transitions from detention to the community;**
 - 3) Develop innovative and therapeutic supports for clients focused on health, housing, and improving access to family sustaining employment.**

Nancy O'Malley seconded the motion. 7 – Ayes. The motion was carried.

- Reducing recidivism is an overarching goal, contained in the Year 1 plan and embedded in the 3 newly adopted goals.

- A motion to approve \$29.2M in the 3 broad categories was discussed:
 - 1) \$23.85M to protect the public through transparent and accountable administration and service
 - 2) \$2.85M to ensure effective and supportive transitions from detention to the community
 - 3) \$2.5M to develop innovative and therapeutic supports for clients focused on health, housing, and improving access to family sustaining employment
- **Alex Briscoe motioned to approve \$29.2M AB109 funding for FY12/13 in alignment with the 3 goals for Year 2: \$23.85M for Goal 1; \$2.85M for Goal 2; and \$2.5M for Goal 3. Nancy O'Malley seconded the motion. 7 – Ayes. The motion was carried.**
- The discussion of two Urban Strategy letters and response to the Board is tabled for the next meeting.
- The formulation of the CCP according to 1290 PC is tabled for the next meeting.
- Chief Harris will reach out personally to each of the CCP participants that have not been actively participating.
- According to Suzie Cohen, we are close to having a draft of Year One's Evaluation Report. Ms. Cohen will forward the draft to Teresa LaSalle and she will send it out to everyone to review.
- Chief Harris recommended having a community advisor at the table. Her recommendation was to have Bishop Jerry Maklin from Glad Tidings Church sit at the table.
- We can do a pool procurement for employment, housing and education and use the Fastrak Model for the Innovations portion. We also need to have a conversation about giving the Innovations money to a foundation and have a plan administrator make the calls.
- Brian will write the Board letter for the Year 2 allocation.
- The motion to adjourn was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 5:33 pm.

**Next CCP Executive Committee meeting will be held at 3:00PM
November 19, 2012 at the Probation Center, Room 405.**