

# Community Corrections Partnership

## DRAFT MINUTES

Monday, June 24, 2013  
2:00pm - 4:00pm  
City Hall, Room 305  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Members in Attendance: Chief Wendy Still (chair), Public Defender Jeff Adachi, Sheriff Ross Mirkarimi, Paul Henderson (Mayor's Office), Craig Murdock (alternate for Barbara Garcia), Commander John Garrity (alternate for Chief Greg Suhr), Sharon Woo (alternate for District Attorney George Gascón), Joanna Hernandez (alternate for Greg Grellman, Goodwill Industries), Lupine Seran (alternate for Greg Asay) Joyce Crum (alternate for Steve Arcelona), Beverly Upton, San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium.

Members Absent:

Steve Good, Five Keys Charter School, Representative of Superior Court

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions.

Chief Wendy Still called the meeting to order at 2:01pm. She welcomed members and the public to the meeting. Those CCP members present introduced themselves. Asked the public to turn off cellphones to avoid distractions.

### 2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as for "Discussion Only".

Chief Still asked for public comment on any of the Agenda items listed for Discussion only. There was none. Chief Still explained that throughout the meeting, there will be ample time for public comment. Invited comment on #4, 6, and 7, items listed as "for discussion only". There was none.

### 3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of April 25, 2013 (discussion & possible action).

Chief Still asked members to review the draft meeting minutes, and then offer a motion. Jeff Adachi moved to approve the minutes; Paul Henderson seconded. Chief Still invited public comment. There was none. Chief Still called for a vote and the motion carried (11-0) at 2:05pm.

#### **4. Progress Report on Implementation of Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009 (SB678) (discussion only).**

SB678 was adopted in 2009 (Senator Mark Leno). Created the Performance Incentive Fund that encourages the adoption of evidence based practices (EBP) in community corrections. Chief Still explained that the journey started with EBP and SB678 three years ago at same time the Courts started CalRAPP (California Risk Assessment Pilot Project) to use evidence-based risk assessments in making sentencing recommendations. San Francisco is one of three CalRAPP counties. Three years later, Adult Probation has changed the landscape and now in 2013 received the APPA President's Award. A lot was learned along the way and have an incredible CCP and partners (public and non-profit) throughout the city. This award reflects the contribution of all staff and partners. It also demonstrates the high performing organization that has to be protected to ensure public safety, reducing victimization and breaking the intergenerational cycle of incarceration – which in fact is the mission of APD.

Chief Still pointed members' attention to information in the meeting packet – the SB678 status report. State prison revocations were reduced from 256 in 2009 (total annual revocations), to 65 in 2012. That is absolutely incredible from where things started and where they have ended up. Those reductions mean that on average there were 256 probation failures revoked to state prison, which is already a low number. San Francisco sends less than 1% of its population to State Prison and that number was reduced even more. Because of the collective efforts (SFPAC court – created to improve outcomes for those facing violation to state prison), the state prison revocation number was reduced to 65 and received \$2.187 million last year and a little under \$700,000 this year for these reductions. In terms of what it looked like in 2012, the total revocations were 221 and 91 of those were sentenced under PC 1170(h) to county jail, 65 to state prison and 65 to county jail. Only 173 felony probationers had new convictions – less than 1% of all probationers – this as a successful number. Looking at felony probation outcomes in 2012 – of the total number of completions of felony probation, 77% were successful and 23% were unsuccessful. This is compared to parole's 3 year felony recidivism rate of 77% and one year recidivism rate of 64%. The picture is being flipped, instead of having failures at that high rate we have successes at that rate. Now SFAPD can start doing some recidivism measures of one year post Realignment we can compare it to Parole's one year failure rate, so that there will be an apples to apples comparison.

Chief Still provided another opportunity for CCP members to comment on SB678 report and results.

Paul Henderson stated that this reflects a good job and that he thinks it's great that the State is paying us for our success. Let's keep up the good work.

Chief Still stated that, along those lines of getting money from the State, another thing that is being worked on with the State is the Reentry Pod to get PRCS clients here from state prison prior to their release date. She explained that she helped write legislation and pass legislation for a pilot program to fund allowing PRCS inmates to come to the county jail 60 days prior to their CDCR release date. This issue will formally be on the agenda in the future. Chief Still explained

that she worked with Senator Loni Hancock on a template for the Reentry Pod- starting 60 days earlier instead of waiting for people to be released from State Prison.

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that not only were we able to secure those resources, but San Francisco is the beta site for this type of program. Other counties are trying to follow our lead, including Marin, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Our template can materialize into an effective strategy to show how probation can work together with sheriffs within the jail systems.

### **5. Consideration of CCP Support for San Francisco's SB1022 Application to support the Hall of Justice Jail Replacement Facility (discussion and possible action).**

Chief Still called attention to the draft letter in the agenda packet. The letter is to express support for an application to the state for funding under SB1022. She explained for clarification, that this body has no authority over the jail replacement project. This agenda item is requesting a letter of support from the CCP for funding to replace the seismically challenged jails in the Hall Of Justice (HOJ). The HOJ will be torn down, it is not a question of if it will be torn down, it's a question of when . So this agenda item is about replacing those jail beds. The Sherriff will make a presentation and there will be an opportunity for public comment.

Sheriff Mirkarimi introduced his staff that was present and thanked Jim Buker of the Department of Public Works. He also thanked the CCP for providing this forum. He added that, as Chief Still said, they don't need to be here, but there hasn't been a forum to discuss jail replacement. There has been a flurry of communication about this that is misleading and not about the issue addressed here. Those who know Sheriff Mirkarimi know he wouldn't advocate for jail expansion. San Francisco is the only county in California advocating for reducing the number of jail beds. This discussion goes to answering the question of how to provide a safe, secure, and rehabilitative environment in jail, which is what we are tasked to do. The jails in HOJ have 903 beds. The proposal is to replace from 588 to 640 beds. That is almost an aggregate reduction of 30%. How we arrived at this is not new or recent. The Department of Public Works conducted an assessment in 2006 that SFSD would be on the City's 10 year Capital Plan for complete replacement of jails 3 and 4. We have a handout provided and will go over the highlights. We look forward to public comments after.

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that he would like to express the natural tension on the different ends of this subject. As County Supervisor, jail expansion was not part of his repertoire. There was some pressure when I came in as Sheriff for a one-for-one jail bed replacement. There is still that perspective in progressive San Francisco. We are at a critical juncture with all the good work done here around alternatives to incarceration, but still must ask, how do we forecast for future needs while accounting for safety? Why is this coming up now? Because SB1022 has created an opportunity for counties to apply for 80 million dollars worth of state funds. We know the HOJ jails have to be replaced, because the building is seismically unsafe. Also, the linear architecture of the jail is unsafe. Who here has been inside- Jails 3 and 4? (Some audience members raised their hands). A linear jail is unlike San Bruno or CJ 2 (womens facility),.In good conscience, this should have been torn down years ago but I am glad we are doing it now. The jail replacement process will help us insert programming, which is so important to San Francisco and the partners of the CCP and many of you. SFSD can't get programming into these jails now, unlike in San

Bruno or CJ2. Right now only 20% of inmates in jails 3 and 4 receive programming and that is unfair to the other 80% of inmates. If our goal is effective reentry and rehabilitation, our mission should be a safe and program-rich environment. Along these lines, this would be a 30% reduction in aggregate capacity. The archaic linear style will be replaced by more curved, rectangular shape that gives a warmer environment allowing more programs. The Board of State and Community Corrections is looking at us closely regarding what would be considered rated beds. There needs to be safe beds for our emerging needs population. San Francisco is seeing a significant trend of people suffering from mental illness coming into the jail system at higher rate than anticipated – 20% increase of people, requiring 20% increase in services. There is a more specialized population, requiring administrative segregation cells, and needing more protection. There is a COVER pod in San Bruno for military veterans. It might be an automatic deduction for some to assume because we have empty beds (and because we have the most under crowded jails), that we don't need these beds. But, it is incumbent upon us to meet the current reality and future needs. I'd like to stress current and future needs for more rehabilitation so that those in custody now don't come back again. Shifting people from CJ 3 and 4 and transferring them to other places where there are empty beds would violate their needs for special beds and/or special safety and classification needs, like gangs.

Sheriff Mirkarimi asked Undersheriff Brin and Kevin Lyons, Manager of Building Services to weigh in and added that he was happy to answer questions.

U/S Brin stated that she has worked in the Sheriff's Department for 27 years, working at CJ 3 and 4, and that in her heart she knows it is archaic not just for inmates but for staff. To see a replacement facility that provides more programs would be the highlight of her career.

Lyons added that the project has been in the City's 10 year Capital Plan for many years, and has been scrutinized and re-imagined. Originally it was planned for 900 beds, and then it was reduced to 640. The new facility will comply with current code, ADA accessibility, and will be able to provide programs to 80% of population (up from 20%). It will also provide better public access and visiting, including electronic visiting of inmates at San Bruno. All cells will be single or double cells with a better ability to house all classification of inmates in humane housing.

Chief Still asked Members of CCP if they had any questions.

Beverly Upton commented: I agree that there hasn't been a forum to discuss this and I'm glad to see the public here. We don't want San Francisco to be in business of building more jails. If efforts are so successful, jails should be torn down and not built back. We should build more community centers like the Community Assessment and Services Center. We were there at the opening last week talking about what \$2 million dollars could do in the community. We must do something different. We shouldn't take our success and build more jails. People at this table can do better. The domestic violence community wants to be part of the discussion. We have an opportunity, let's be innovative, let's do something different.

Jeff Adachi asked: Is this proposal for a completely stand-alone jail?

Chief Still answered Stand-alone, yes – behind McDonalds

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that it is that parcel, that the proposal would acquire for a stand-alone building. Relative to Beverly Upton's comment, the success of the system occurs not only when individuals leave jail but also due to what happens in the jail system too. The SFSD is home to 5 Keys Charter school that is a major success of San Francisco's jails. SFSD can't get it in CJ 3 and 4. Five Keys just graduated the largest class – 65 received GED's, diplomas, or certificates. This is not a sequential system, but as concentric circles. At the same time, as statute requires, if San Francisco wants to abolish the idea of not building jails, there has to be a reduction of police budget because crime is down, reduce the District Attorney's budget because there is less crime to prosecute, etc.. Systemically this is a courageous discussion needed. But for now an evidence based approach is needed to this. Through 10 years of discussion, this is what is needed. The Sheriff loves the idea of no new jails, or no replacement jails. But it is required to attend to this phased innovation of implementation to get to that place over the next 25 years.

Jeff Adachi asked: There are 1,500 in jail now? How many beds do all other facilities provide? Is the number of 588 - 640 replacement beds arrived at based on a projection? And if so based on what projection or formula?

U/S Brin answered that they used two consultants to do population projections. Also, CJ 1 is intake, not housing unit.

Lyons stated that two consultants and the Controller did population studies and came up with a conservative estimate of 2156 – 2370 jail population in 2014.

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that of the total jail population today, less than 40 are misdemeanants. While many counties incarcerate those with felonies and misdemeanors, this community is clear that those with misdemeanors should not be incarcerated. Realignment is also allowing us more authority for alternatives to incarceration, like electronic monitoring. San Francisco is sensitive to this and will continue to work in this direction.

U/S Brin added that CJ 2 is a women's facility. CJ5 today only has 92 available beds, CJ 3 and 4 are our highest maximum security inmates. It is hard to house them in the open dorms of CJ 6, which is currently being used for vocational training. There are approximately 125 187s in CJ 3 and 4. SFSD does not want these types of inmates in an open facility like CJ 5 or 6. The Sheriff's Department wants to get programs to these people, but the way CJ 3 and 4 are designed, they cannot do that.

Chief Still stated that CJ 3 and 4 will be torn down. What is being discussed is replacing those with 588 – 640 capacity in line with 3 studies. Not adding new capacity. 472 beds will be lost and they will be housed in new jail with more programs. This is a good discussion and I now have a good picture of what is being talked about. Having been in many jails and CJ 3 and 4, I know that the linear style is concerning given staff and inmate safety. In addition, Sheriffs have to come in to compliance with new Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) standards. A linear style puts inmates at more risk of assault.

Chief Still opened the item to public comment. She stated that we want to hear from everyone and will limit all comments to no more than 90 seconds to allow everyone to speak. We will then take a vote. She asked the public to please state their name and organization, but doing so is not mandatory.

Comment: Manuel LaFontaine, Legal Prisoners with Children and All of Us or None. Father, formerly incarcerated. How many have been captive in 850 county jail? Were any of us asked about this proposal? Was anyone inside county jail asked about this proposal? Amnesia – emancipation proclamation prohibited slavery. LaFontaine became political through the Sheriff's Department, after being assaulted in court room. Made Sheriff look bad and they took a whipping to me. San Francisco has to look at alternatives. It produces mad, angry people. Need to look at real alternatives. Native American, Restorative Practices. Let's talk about real issues. Classism, racism.

Comment: Roger White, Critical Resistance. Against CCP support for application. There is a concern about seismic safety but that's not what this is about. The real reason why the Sheriff wants to build new jail is because they want to contract out to house other jurisdictions' inmates. In a memo Undersheriff Brin said the Sheriff should explore the ability to contract out beds to increase revenue for the City (plan found on One SF website). Plan seems clear to us. Build more beds to contract out. Urge San Francisco not to become part of for profit penal colony.

Comment; Dorsey Nunn, Executive Director of Legal Services for Prisoners with Children and All of Us or None. Not first time Nunn has stood here. Opposed new jail built at 850 Bryant, and San Bruno. Nothing done satisfies need for San Francisco to build new jails. Getting tired of opposing new jails. Would love to come in here and support new college, tuition, housing. Mostly he is showing up to oppose things he doesn't want. Urge you to offer something he can come and support. Jail is a new cage. Nothing serves my needs to be with family and community.

Comment: Calvin. He was in jail as a kid, and all the time, He is now 72. Do something about jail. Not another jail. Give them something else. A house. Just do something. Not a jail. That doesn't work.

Dante – Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights – Urges committee to oppose new jail construction. Three reasons: 1 – money issue. If Bay Bridge is any indication, \$290 million is starting point. Resources better spent if on rehabilitation strategies. 2 – projections are out of whack with what is going on. There was spike in jail need because of Realignment. 3 – public dialogue hasn't happened. Need open conversation with Mayor, Sheriff and public to discuss these strategies. Even with considering seismic issues. Too early to support. Urge the committee to oppose until further dialogue happens

Donnell Boyd – tenant organizer. HOJ looks like it can take a rocket, and survive earthquake. If crime down, take out some beds. Use at least \$20 million and fix jail up. The area behind McDonalds can be used as training center. Most people go back to jail cause don't have anything better to do. San Francisco needs to spend money wisely. There is no humane jail. Europe sends

prisoners to cooking schools. San Francisco has to be a city of second chances. It can't label people forever for a crime they committed.

Roberta Moore – Hospitality House. Jail will raise tax dollars. She opposes this. San Francisco needs alternative sentencing for nonviolent offenders. Need to tighten Probation Department. Moore has been a victim of one of your clients. Need alternative sentencing and education.

Rachel Hoerger, ACLU – Applauds SFSD for efforts to keep individuals here and expand alternatives. Want to be sure jail expansion is based on studies that are provided to public. To extent Sheriff is thinking of leasing to other counties, SB1022 does not allow this for 10 years.

Lisa – Coalition on Homeless. Opposition of any replacement, or new jails. Slap in face to homeless children and families. In middle of budget process and not once has replacement jail been identified as priority. People are asking for investment in alternatives. General Fund money asked for this year could go towards health care, housing for homeless, etc. Mental health spike indicates need for spike in mental health services, not a jail that is fancier and prettier. Homeless count out today shows a rise in homelessness and need for housing.

Laura – American Friends Service Committee – They have been opposing jail expansion for a long time. Native San Franciscan – proud of how SF has handled Realignment so this was shock to hear. Cannot afford this. Not for people who are starving for services and attention. We can do what Beverly Upton suggests – do something completely different, not fall for trap because this pot of money is only for this. Encourage you not to sign letter.

Coalition on Homeless and Hospitality House – How many people in jail for quality of life crimes, like open containers, inability to pay fines? Can't these be addressed through housing, treatment? Thinks there are better places for money to be spent.

Mary Phoebe Vanderhorse – All of Us or None. Would like to encourage that money go to Second Chance, Project Rebound. College is a real alternative to being on streets. She has been in many county jails. Encourage education as alternative. \$240 million, are you crazy? Educate not incarcerate.

Jerry Elster –Formerly incarcerated. Product of the system, education-wise. Elster made up his mind to educate himself in CDC. I was proud when AB109 came that SF was at forefront of alternatives. Now SF is going the other way – using money to build prison. Education is shown to be success. Ashamed that SF is going in same direction as CDCR. CDCR under receivership now. Is SF going to go that direction too? There's a lot better San Francisco can do with this money.

Public Comment: Not with any organization, but pay property taxes and don't want a dime of their property taxes to go to a new jail. My son worked for 5 Keys Charter school and after hearing his complaints, they question what people are saying about building classrooms when there aren't adequate classes for current students. Build a training center. My son taught in

basically a broom closet at a satellite location. Students got message that their education wasn't worth a dime. If want to show commitment to people, put it into education not jails.

Project Rebound- formerly incarcerated. When they were locked up they wanted to change myself. Not because of environment. Those were archaic environments. Change has to do with individual not environment At Project Rebound we assist people with getting into SF State. That's important if you can help us we can build a pipeline from SFUSD to SF State not to jail. You have \$33,000 to education and \$33,000 to basic needs and \$188,000 to sex offenders. Why? Help us send folks to the college system.

Matthew – He has been in San Francisco since 1957. My observation is that this application is going for \$80 million to spend \$290million more. Seems premature. There hasn't been an opportunity to vet those reports. Never seen this kind of turnout at a CCP meeting. We need some sunshine in the process. He is proud of this city and of being member of All of Us or None, He too is formerly incarcerated. San Francisco can do better. This is public safety question. Out community needs to take better care of our own.

Critical Resistance – Close down HOJ and don't build new jail. Sheriff – outlined beautiful vision to decrease police force, decreased corrections budget. Need to go there, but that San Francisco is not there yet. Well, we are there. San Francisco can get there now. Don't need to build a new jail only to tear it down later. 75% of jail population is pre-trial. There are many ways to decrease jail population without building new jail.

Cole Park – Catalyst Project – studied restorative justice. Commend the CCP for work done and encourage it to stay on that track. No jail is a good jail. All are cages. Recognize need for more programs, but don't need to happen in cages. Don't sign letter. Provide programs outside of cages.

Noah Misca – Don't do it. It's a bad idea. The Sheriff said rehabilitation happens inside of jail. He is guessing that the Sheriff didn't spend time inside of jail. As long as someone is living in jail and talked to like an animal, living in those conditions, they can't rehabilitate.

Komal Walton, Critical Resistance – don't need new jail, should close down all unsafe beds in HOJ. Need more alternatives like treatment programs, scholarships, housing, instead of waiting for people to get into cages to provide them with services they needed before they got there. Need meaningful training with living wages. People have to take care of their families. Listen to all folks who have spoken and support programs that help people before they get locked up instead of waiting until they get locked up. Walton doesnt care if it is the highlight of a career.

Work at shelter and see my residents working every day to try to find housing. San Francisco should fund services and help people have a better life. Spending money on a new jail is a terrible idea.

Critical Resistance and Licensed Clinical Social Worker – work done with Behavioral Health Court with clients 62 and over. People wait so long for services. Had a client who waited 7

months to get out of jail to get into a treatment program (only Spanish speaking provider). People can immediately transfer to treatment and can reduce jail population. Don't want to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a jail, when we can fund programs. People wait 2 – 3 months. This is how to reduce jail population, long term solutions.

Adrienne Roberts – Coalition for Women Prisoners. Usually proud of SF, not now. Break up myth that changing the structure of a jail will somehow rehabilitate people. A jail is a jail. Working in CJ 2, She see people re-traumatized, they are away from their families, and programming doesn't change that. Not given the opportunity to heal. Changing the linear structure does not change that. Roberts sees the same people coming back over and over because when they get out they don't have a job or support and they come out into a system that wants to incarcerate them not help them.

Critical Resistance – Don't want, don't need, can't afford this jail. Point out irony of building a jail to decrease jail capacity. If concerned with programs, spend money on services. If concerned that not earthquake safe, close it down immediately. Building a system where only place poor people of color can get services is in jail and only place they can afford to live is there.

Student of Stanford law school – CCP supposed to support evidence based programs. Jail is not an evidence based project. Jails breed crime, more likely to recidivate. This is opportunity to say no to program that is not evidence based. And use on tangible programs that are evidence based. Mental health services cannot really be provided in jail. This board should be transparent. Not vote on something with little information.

Ariella – LCPS, All of Us or None- Ask you to reconsider supporting this new jail. As someone affected by caging people up, reconsider. Services should start before incarceration not just during and after. San Francisco needs to fix broken system that causes our brothers and sisters to be eaten up by the system. There should be programs for young people. \$290 million dollars? What can San Francisco do productive with that?

Emily Harris – Statewide organizer with CURB – working to reduce number of people in jails and prisons and shift resources. 32 counties have proposed new jails. Learned about this on Friday. Seems like it has been in the works secretly. Asked people to please stand if you don't support this. Only found out about this on Friday and look how many people are here. Would like to have more transparency. Echo sentiment to be the model for the state. Why not be first city to close a jail and not replace it. Think creatively about how to use space.

Chief Still asked if there was any more public comment. There was none.  
Chief Still asked if there was a motion on the table?

Sheriff Mirkarimi asked to respond to comments.

Mirkarimi stated: First, thank you everyone. It's a little hard to hear, but he gets it, about this not being transparent because Mirkarimi was an author of the Sunshine Laws. This process has been ongoing years before he became Sheriff. There have been articles and media reports. Now that this question is on the CCP's plate, he wants to speak to concerns here. They speak to his ethos.

This is not an either or. SFSD are not other Departments. People are sentenced and SFSD does not have the ability to not incarcerate them. If there are changes, which Mirkarimi supports, of changing bail, looking at how to not incarcerate pre-trial population, he would follow it. But he is the Sheriff. Rehabilitation is about if someone is in jail SFSD makes the time as effective as possible with evidence based programming so they don't return. But in a linear corridor SFSD can't get in.

He is proud of achievements of 5 Keys Charter School that has proven to half the recidivism rates. No vocational training in jails for decades in San Francisco so space for vocational training is needed, he is for that. This is not about creating cages, but about creating an open environment so there is more access. If people are not sent to jail, San Francisco doesn't need a jail. But for those that are, San Francisco cannot turn its back on people in an unsafe environment. It is foolhardy to think SFSD can close a jail and not replace it. In terms of leasing out the beds, we are not looking to lease beds out. Mirkarimi will listen when his peers ask about it but it hasn't been done and likely won't be. These are same people against Realignment and San Francisco is for Realignment. People coming back to their own community is more successful. There are already successes. And there is the recent stalemate with Gov. Brown, when he has to further reduce prison population by 10,000 more, San Francisco has to respond. They are still coming back. When efforts go to San Quentin like with this Reentry Pod that we just started, I hope that the concern and criticism today goes with the pride that San Francisco is the first in putting forward alternatives and that it isn't all or nothing.

If anyone wants to come visit him, I'm on 4<sup>th</sup> floor of City Hall. Sheriff Mirkarimi encourages further conversation and encourage people to tour jails and see the Sheriff's school. SFSD is making progress where other counties are not. Has anyone seen the Garden ZProject? It is the largest project where people are growing their own food in jail. The Sheriff's Department also just launched a vocational program for bike repair.

This is not a new jail but a replacement. Arrived at 640 because of a Controller's office study. Some people wanted one for one replacement, SFSD would fight that.

Chief Still stated: She spent three decades working and trying to reform state prison system. Still is an advocate for a balanced approach – San Francisco needs to invest in services and it has. In our Realignment Plan, a third of APD's realignment allocation went to services. The plan was the first in the State, and the fabric of the plan was alternatives to incarceration. Chief Still doesn't want to create a system where people have to go to jail to get services but the truth is that some people will be sentenced to prison or jail by the judges. The obligation is to create the balance of the right number of beds to have and to invest in services. At same time there is a legal and moral obligation to create space in which people are safe. She is not an advocate for leasing beds or building it so they will come. Working at HOJ Chief Still has experienced the challenges of that building. It has to be torn down. It will be torn down. A challenge for the CCP in considering whether to support this is about replacing those beds. The call here is an open debate about whether it is needed or not. That is not a question for the CCP. The challenge is does the CCP support a project where there is a dangerous jail that cannot provide programming. As this goes to a vote, she is as committed as anyone here to creating alternatives and programs

in the community. Still does not think people have to go to jail to get help. There is a moral obligation to help people. But San Francisco cannot turn its back on the fact that safe jail space is needed. What exists now is not safe for staff or people housed there. Still doesn't want to spend money on building beds, but there is a moral obligation to build safe beds.

Jeff Adachi stated: as Public Defender, they provides representation to 20,000 people per year. Most are in jail because they cannot afford bail. San Francisco has a bail based system. The amount of money you have determines if you are released on bail. San Francisco does a good job of reducing sentenced population, but not pre-trial. San Francisco does need a new facility. Have been talking about it for 20 years. Haven't done it because financing has not been there. Question now is whether or not it should be done. Adachi has two concerns. He hasn't seen the Controller's Office report. Sounds like it was done and they will be updating it. His feeling is that San Francisco needs to replace the facility if there will be a facility outside of San Bruno. Adachi's question is whether the math adds up. If there are only 1500 in jail now and the projections are over 2000. Is the capacity envisioned in the rebuild too much? When is the update going to be completed? He understands this is simply a letter. If San Francisco got the grant, is the city obligated to spend the grant money on a jail?

Sheriff Mirkarimi answered: That is a decision that has been made by the Board of Supervisors. This would help defray some of the costs. \$290 million is the maximum that the City can spend and there were some that wanted a bigger jail that would exceed those costs.

Jim Buker, DPW added: the Controller's study was completed four months ago. It will be updated at the end of 2013 to update per Realignment. If grant is awarded, the Board of Supervisors would decide whether to accept the award on the conditions the state is offering or change the project. The grant does not require the city to go through with the project. The Controller's report is not finalized so it is not available yet. It should be available in the next couple of weeks.

Jeff Adachi: Would it create a problem in the grant application if wait for the report to be made public? Is it available online?

Jim Buker answered: The State will release the RFP in July or August. The submittal will be in October and the letter will be required then. The report should be available online.

Chief Still stated: Jeff, you indicated needing more information and waiting for report to be made public.

Jeff Adachi made a Motion at 3:37pm to wait until the Controller's office report is available to the public to vote on this letter. Adachi's understanding is that this won't impact grant application.

Chief Still – When is our next meeting – August 29<sup>th</sup>.

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that the State has been adjusting the RFP timeline. The deadline was supposed to be now. He did not know the updated deadline.

Jim Buker stated: As far as he knows, a late August meeting would meet the requirements for an October submittal.

Chief Still stated that there was a Motion on the table to have the report available to public, so the CCP could review it, and then take a vote on the letter.

Jeff Adachi said he'd like to invite the Controller's office to give a presentation on their report.

Sheriff Mirkarimi seconded the motion.

Chief Still asked for public comment on this motion to postpone vote until August meeting and have presentation by the Controller's office about what is contained in their updated report.

Public Comment – Thank you for listening to us and taking us seriously. Hope you continue to ask the hard questions, and include the voices of the public in this decision.

Public Comment – Will Controller's presentation be made public in advance?

Chief Still said: The CCP will request that. Chief Still called for a vote.

Vote at 3:41pm: (11 – yes, 0 – no). Motion passes.

Chief Still thanked the public for their attendance.

**6. Update on the Implementation of the *San Francisco Women's Community Justice Blueprint* (discussion only).**

Chief Still stated that the Women's Community Justice Blueprint (the Blueprint) is available here and on APD's website. She asked the CCP members to refer to agenda item 6 regarding the steps taken on this item. APD submitted a Second Chance Act Planning and Implementation grant application (see annotated agenda). APD should hear about the grant award by October.

Chief Still explained that we plan for expanded services at Cameo House. The Blueprint recommended converting Cameo House into an 11 bed alternative sentencing program for women with children. That program is alive and well. The grant is for resources for APD and the Sheriff to support these activities.

The next steps before the August CCP meeting is to name two department coordinators. APD is working on identifying their coordinator. Will the Sheriff have done that by the August meeting? Sheriff Mirkarimi said he didn't see why not. Chief Still added that she hopes the Cameo House program is the first of many. She asked if there were any other comments from CCP members.

Beverly Upton stated: She is excited about this. This is the model we should be looking at. Is there a dollar figure for converting Cameo House?

Chief Still answered that the cost is \$340,000. This is one of the items we have not come to agreement on with the Board's budget analyst. They are recommending cutting, we will be talking about that at this Wednesday's Board of Supervisor's Budget Committee meeting.

Beverly Upton asked the Board of Supervisors is discussing cutting \$95,000 to support alternatives for women with children and there is no discussion for \$290million to build a new jail? This is a wakeup call. These are the kinds of programs that are important.

Chief Still stated that these programs are important and we will continue to fight for them. Still encourages anyone who wants to come out on Wednesday to support this to do so. She is very excited about this Blueprint. San Francisco is providing resources. Most counties are looking at this in a gender neutral way which means it is gender biased towards men. Thanks to the Zellerbach Foundation for supporting work by Drs. Bloom and Owen.

Public question: What is the ongoing cost of Cameo House?

Chief Still answered: it is \$340,000 per year (annual cost). The site is owned by the City so there is no leasing cost.

## **7. Members' comments, questions, and requests for future agenda items (discussion only).**

Sharon Woo asked: Can there be an update on parole coming to our system in July?

Sheriff Mirkarimi: Who should give a report on that?

Chief Still answered that it should be a combination of the Public Defender and the District Attorney

Jeff Adachi stated that there is a committee about how to deal with this. The thought is there will be three days a week for this and all hearings on Fridays. They are estimating 2,200 people and 300 parole hearings. Departments do not have a staffing plan put together.

Chief Still asked the Public Defender and District Attorney to report in August on the hearings expected and the Sheriff to report on the number of parole bed days they are seeing as a result of the new process (compare before July and after).

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that he is surprised there are no stories or news about this with a July 1<sup>st</sup> start date.

Jeff Adachi agreed and added that there is no service component set up.

Sheriff Mirkarimi stated he is curious how other counties are dealing with this.

Materials References in Minutes are available at <http://sfgov.org/adultprobation>

Chief Still said it sounds like a good item for our August agenda.

**8. Public comment on any item listed above, as well as items not listed on the Agenda .**

None

**9. Adjournment.**

Beverly Upton moved to adjourn. Sharon Woo seconded. All voted in favor at 3:54pm