

# Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC)

## AGENDA

Public Packet Amended on 9/13/2020 @12:00pm v2

Wednesday, September 16, 2020  
1pm to 2pm

### **Join Zoom Meeting:**

- <https://zoom.us/j/97934518820?pwd=ZEphRjFYTEVPRkYpQdlJxS0FLUT09>
- Meeting ID: 979 3451 8820
- Passcode: 177490

### **Dial by your location**

- +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)
- Meeting ID: 979 3451 8820
- Passcode: 177490

## REMOTE MEETING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

**Watch via Zoom:** In accordance with Governor Gavin Newsom’s statewide order for all residents to “Stay at Home” – and with the numerous local and state proclamations, orders and supplemental directions – aggressive directives have been issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus.

Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC) meetings will be held through videoconferencing will allow remote public comment via the videoconference or through the (Dial by your location) number noted above. Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely by submitting written comments electronically to [destiny.pletsch@sfgov.org](mailto:destiny.pletsch@sfgov.org). These comments will be made part of the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the CCP/CCPEC. Explanatory and/or Supporting Documents, if any, will be posted at: the Community Corrections Partnership’s website at <http://sfgov.org/adultprobation>.

# Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC)

## AGENDA

Wednesday, September 16, 2020  
1pm to 2pm

Note: *Each member of the public may be allotted no more than 2 minutes to speak on each item.*

1. Call to Order and Introductions.
2. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of January 30, 2020 (discussion and action).
3. Realignment Evaluation Project discussion. Two Potential Options: 1) Evaluation of AB 109 funded services, or 2) Production of an updated Realignment report (akin to the report entitled “Three Years of Realignment in San Francisco”) (discussion and action).
4. AB109 Funding and Expenditures (discussion only).
5. Update: CCPEC Local Innovation Fund Housing Program (discussion only).
6. Adjournment.

SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the Community Corrections Partnership, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. These comments will be made a part of the official public record, and brought to the attention of the Community Corrections Partnership. Written comments should be submitted to: Victoria Westbrook, Adult Probation Department, 880 Bryant Street, Room 200, San Francisco, CA 94102, or via email: Victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org

MEETING MATERIALS

Copies of agendas, minutes, and explanatory documents are available through the Community Corrections Partnership's website at <http://sfgov.org/adultprobation> or by calling Victoria Westbrook at (415) 930-2202 during normal business hours. The material can be faxed or mailed to you upon request.

ACCOMMODATIONS

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Victoria Westbrook at [victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org](mailto:victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org) or (415) 930-2202 at least two business days before the meeting.

TRANSLATION

Interpreters for languages other than English are available on request. Sign language interpreters are also available on request. For either accommodation, please contact Victoria Westbrook at [victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org](mailto:victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org) or (415) 930-2202 at least two business days before the meeting.

CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES

To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: [www.sfgov.org/sunshine](http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine).

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE:

Administrator  
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683.  
Telephone: (415) 554-7724  
E-Mail: [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org)

CELL PHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and web site <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/>

# Special Meeting of the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC)

## Draft Minutes

Dates: Thursday, January 30, 2020  
11:00am to 12:00pm  
Hall of Justice  
850 Bryant Street,  
Adult Probation Department, Second Floor Conference  
San Francisco, CA 94103

**Members Present:** Chief Adult Probation Officer **Karen Fletcher** (Chair-Adult Probation Department), **Chief William Scott** (San Francisco Police Department), Danielle Harris (Public Defender's Office), Kathy Johnson (Sheriff's Department), Ches Boudin (District Attorney), Tara Anderson (District's Attorney Office)

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions.

This meeting was called to order by Chair, Chief Probation Officer, Karen Fletcher, at 11:08am.

### 2. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of December 18, 2019 (discussion and action).

Chief Fletcher gave members of the committee a couple of minutes to review the meeting minutes of December 18, 2019.

Motion to adopt the minutes by Chief Scott, seconded by Kathy Johnson. The motion passed.

There was no public comment.

Motion passes. Minutes are approved.

### 3. A Nine/Ten Years Evaluation of Realignment in San Francisco and Possible Evaluator questions (discussion and action).

The Chair, Chief Probation Officer Karen Fletcher, stated during the last Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee meeting held on December 18, 2019, the Executive Committee decided to go back to their respective agencies to evaluate a proposed scope of work for a nine-year evaluation of realignment in San Francisco. She then gave the members a couple of minutes to review the proposed scope of work based on the questions submitted to the Reentry Policy Planner, Geoffrea Morris.

The Chair yielded the floor to Geoffrea Morris, Reentry Policy Planner. Geoffrea informed the body regarding what format to use for the questions to submit to the evaluators. The body had been using the format from 2013 and 2014 report to write questions for evaluators to prepare a scope of work.

Kathy Johnson asked if the intent to hire an evaluator is to produce a new report on the allocation of funds from AB-109 funding, how those funds are used and the outcomes resulting from how the funds were used.

Geoffrea Morris responded, that is the plan, recognizing that AB-109 funds intertwine with other general funds which will also be mentioned. If the Executive Committee agrees, Geoffrea will work with Tara Agnese (APD Researcher) and Lauren Bell, Director of Reentry Division, Adult Probation to create a scope of work.

The Chief added some of the questions that were mentioned in the last meeting on December 18, 2019:

- 1.) How broad do we want the scope of work to be?
- 2.) Is it just going to be services from the realignment funds? Or should we include all services of the reentry population?

Kathy Johnson stated that she liked the format of the report and noted that it would be a very time intensive project. She also liked the idea of an outside evaluator if they are going to draft the report, but she would not want an outside evaluator coming into our jails and determining what programs are effective or not – especially by someone who is not part of programs or community services. She added that it is important that we include the budget and read from the packet; in FY-14/15, we allocated over 9.7 million dollars in AB-109, in FY-15/16 11.7 million dollars, in FY-16/17 10.8 million dollars, in FY-17/18 12 million dollars, in FY-18/19 12.7 million dollars, and noted there was a commensurate reduction in the general funding dollars. Although it appears we received quite a bit of money from AB-109, we received zero additional funds for programs and services, and she thinks it is important to know that information.

Chief Fletcher stated that the budget would be an important factor to include in the report. We in the Adult Probation Department know our break down of those funds and know exactly where we used those funds with regard to programs and services and staffing. This will be important for the public to know and all of us to be aware of how that money is spent and how we supplement money from the general fund or SB-678 to ensure that services are provided to the individuals we serve.

Tara Anderson, District Attorney's Office, agrees that it is important to emphasize budget. We need to zoom out and see the budget from a bigger lens, not only exclusive to the allocation of AB-109 but relative to how the general fund is being leaned on to enhance the work that is happening or how the funding has been absorbed into the funding structure to deliver services and programs. She thinks some components as we think about scope of work, of this as proposed may be a heavy lift on Tara Agnese, APD Researcher and the analyst team. The greatest level of external expertise could be the impact analysis. Also looking at different components, such as Community supervision effects of compliance and sanctions, but also recidivism because we did so much work around the recidivism work group unpacking that term. Tara went on to say that utilizing this logic honors the various ways different departments collaborate. From point of arrest, arraignment, and conviction, each contact point tells us something about the system that is important to a more holistic view that we could guide the evaluator towards. It helps us show we

are building off everything we are learning and how we are collaborating to tell the story. Another aspect she added is risk needs responsiveness and how we match those. This is important as we look how our populations are changing, we may need to change the programs and services we offer in the future.

Danielle stated that they would support and ask for an evaluation that is broader than just the realignment that looks at all the many other issues that Tara mentioned.

Kathy agrees with Danielle regarding the broader scope of work as it ties in with the budget because this was focused realignment and we are so much more expansive than just that issue. Our programs have expanded because of the addition of general fund dollars. All of our programs touch every individual whether or not they come to San Francisco because of issues that relates to realignment. She encourages the body to look more broadly at our expansive program curriculum to outline some of the accomplishments of our discharge planning offices and how different departments have been able to work cooperatively with our partners to address the needs of people who are high users. She would like to see a report that is more expansive than just the limits of AB-109 especially considering the budgetary constraints that have happened over the years.

The Chief clarified, in 2011, when the State Realignment went into effect, all of that money was to be spent on people impacted by realignment. As we have progressed over the years, most counties, the money becomes a general fund pot of money that could serve anybody because most of these individuals may be a PRCS client one day, the next day a formal probation client, or a pretrial client. They are interchangeable in terms of the label that we identified them with in terms of this funding. It is important to tell the whole story.

Chief Bill Scott pointed out from the Executive Summary from report that one of the goals was reducing the disproportion involvement of people of color and African Americans in particular in the criminal justice system. But then when you look at the outcomes, the report talks about completion of sanctions and recidivism which does not touch the issue stated in the Executive Summary at all. Chief Scott added, he would like to see something very specific in the evaluation that addresses that issue. What strategies do we all have in place to touch this issue because that is the strategy that under crawls all our departments in terms of the real challenges.

Danielle added the evaluation should also look at racial and ethnic disparities.

The Chief announced that District Attorney Chesa Boudin has arrived and joined the meeting.

The Chief clarified with the body we would like to craft the parameters of what we are looking for, inputs from each member will certainly go into and send to the four qualified individuals or agencies on the list from the RFQ and the scope of work will be considered by each of those four and then they will come back with a proposal.

The Outline:

- Each of the firms will be given 45 days to produce a proposal.
- Receive copies of the proposal by March 16, 2020.

- CCPE then meeting on March 26, 2020 to vote on the evaluator that best meets the needs based on the proposal that the body have submitted based on all of the input.

Danielle asked if it would be possible for the proposal that is going to go to the four potential evaluators to be circulated for potential additions before it goes to the evaluators.

Geoffrea Morris answered that we would have to call for another meeting because the committee will be deciding about the questions and in order for the public to know those questions. She clarified that if the body would like to add more question, how could the public comment on the extra questions you are asking.

Danielle specify that she would like to see an evaluation that would include risk assessment tools that we are currently using and their efficacy and the evolution of the science and whether we are up to date in terms of current research.

Chief Fletcher answered that there is a motion pending, that alone is a huge list, she is not sure that body can go into it as much in detail in the evaluation, it would be a separate look that the Adult Probation have actually started to look at changing the tool and maybe incorporate it in some way. She also added that AB-109 does not fund our tool, its SB-678 funds that does which could be incorporated in this. There is a way to touch on this but would go a deeper dive in a separate analysis.

The motion to take all the suggestions and compile them into a scope of work to send to the four evaluators moved by Chief Scott, seconded by District Attorney Chesa Boudin.

No public comment.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4. Status of Local Innovation Fund- Housing Site Criteria (discussion and action)**

During the December 18, 2019 meeting, this body decided to use the local innovation funds to expand Recovery Survival Network (RSN) contract with Adult Probation in order to provide transitional housing to adults ages 18-35 who are released from jail preadjudication. The motion was passed with the understanding that we would continue to clarify the program design.

The Chief yielded the floor to Steve Adami, Interim Director of the Reentry Division, Adult Probation Department. Steve informed the body about the draft RSN contract with Adult Probation (page 10).

The Chief opened the floor for questions and comments.

Chief Scott asked from a day to day perspective, there's programming daily for the clients, what environmental challenges are there?

Steve Adami answered, when we took site control of the building, embrace the clients and the community meaning there's true wrap around services that there is on site staffing, everybody is

required to be connected to case management and coordinated services through our reentry center at the CASC, the day to day stuff reduced. We set parameters in place that help clients move along the continuum to self-sufficiency. We set curfews, although not everybody followed, when they didn't, we adjusted it. The goal is never to displace anybody, but to help people learn from the mistakes they make. Having to take site control of the building reduced the likelihood the craziness that happens in the building and we have had great success with RSN.

Chief Scott added, there is often times we hear stories that inside four walls everything is great, but outside those four walls is where we get involve and it becomes a different set of issue.

Steve stated the structure of the program and requiring people to be connected to case management has kind of mitigated those challenges. We have done things that keep clients center of the plan, but the plan is really driven in partnership with everybody else, case management and reentry centers.

Kathy Johnson asked if there will be case managers on site or will the participants be connected to case managers elsewhere.

Steve answered, RSN staff will have a program coordinator on site which will do some coordination and some light touch of case management. Men's Mentoring Movement (M3) will also be on site. If people are referred through ACM, they will have extra case managers.

Kathy Johnson clarified that the priority of these 7 beds would be given to ACM client who are released. There are two issues we are trying to address at the same time, which is success in pretrial and also the issue of homelessness.

Steve stated that the goal of the program through the fund is to provide 7 rooms or 14 beds for clients between who are released on pretrial and some of which will come from what Kathy Johnson had mentioned on this agenda item. If others come through from the Public Defender's Office, we will adjust the case management needs on site, so the challenges Chief Scott mentioned does not happen.

Kathy asked, "What is the mechanism in connecting people? How will pretrial be able to say that they have a client that is a pretrial failure because of homelessness issue and/or not meeting any of the requirements, how do you connect those pieces?"

Steve answered Andres Salas, Reentry Services Coordinator, Reentry Division, who is overseeing the contract will share a referral list with the partners and connect you directly with the program. The program coordinator would be the point of contact, there will be a CCP justice partner's referral list that can refer to the 7 beds. The other 21 rooms are broader referral period for a broader justice involved population.

The Chief added as a reminder the pot of money that is paying for the 7 beds which limits to 7 beds only is the local innovation sub account which is 10% of the growth amount. It only started in 2016 with \$613,000. That is why the limit is 7 beds and it is not just for pretrial diversion clients; it is open to any pretrial client.

Chief Scott asked if there is a community integration plan as a part of this.

Steve answered, what he and Lauren Bell had planned is similar to what they did at the Norma Hotel. We did a grand opening and invited the board of supervisors, and other folks to the event and launched the program to introduce the neighbors to it. Also, similar event happened at the Drake Hotel and had a working group around the neighbors.

Chief added that she liked the idea of the grand opening at the Norma Hotel where they invited justice partners, Sheriff's Department, District Attorney's Office, and board members. It would be great to have the executive committee of the CCP present to show that this is a unified approach to serving the population that we all serve.

Tara Anderson asked two questions:

- How many years this over \$600,000 would actually support our contract? Is it two years or three years?
- Status of those whose criminal justice circumstances change, does that preclude maintaining that housing.

Tara added, in the last meeting, the body talked about making sure that someone's ultimate disposition does not result into being expedited on what stabilize them.

Steve answered two years. The answer to the second question was no one has ever transitioned out of housing. Chief Fletcher has approved several plans for those that have terminated from probation and stayed at our housing until we could create a smooth transition.

Kathy Johnson added the Sheriff's Department could help to create a smooth transition for the client.

Danielle asked, "is the only eligibility requirement the age and released on pretrial for the 7 beds?"

Steve answered yes. There is a broader eligibility for the other beds that Adult Probation are funding which is 18-35 that have justice involvement priority given to Adult Probation clients but the beds we are talking about for the local innovation sub account, 18-35 will be for pretrial.

Lauren Bell, former Reentry Division Director, Adult Probation added there are not enough beds right now and what's important is for us to say to each other is what is the purpose of these beds because there's only 7 of them for now and hopefully as a community we can expand them out even forward. If purpose of these beds is really to help somebody address their pretrial needs that is one kind of the goal. She liked Kathy's suggestion to partner up to create an aftercare component. To keep those people in those 7 beds, then we kind of block anybody else from coming in. Every department and partners share the same desire to make sure somebody has a seamless set of services available. It is important that we all partner up together and leverage different resources.

District Attorney Chesa Boudin stated people's concern to make sure we have ways of transition. We don't want people whose case has not been resolved to be put back on the streets. He thinks the \$600,000 that would cover the 7 beds for two years, is a cost that's significantly less than half the daily cost of having someone in the jail. This should be a priority of us to expand, if it's working and if we could show judges and other stakeholders that this is an effective way to house people that are on pretrial and the safety of the community. He appreciates Chief Fletcher's suggestion that we involve the community.

Danielle added, we don't want to find ourselves in the position in places like behavioral health court or drug court where we are intentionally dragging out system involvement because of housing.

Chesa agrees with Kathy Johnson's suggestion, we just need to make sure we are communicating so that people can transition. The point is to have a more revolving doors on these beds so that judges have it available to send people at this housing.

The Chief acknowledged the excellent points the body shared, she wished there was more money to put in to expanding the number of beds, we are working very hard with our reentry programming to see how we can get people move into other stabilize housing and into permanent housing. There is no any intent of packing somebody up and moving them to the street because their case has been adjudicated. The Chief also added that the Governor has indicated in his proposed budget that ongoing funding for AB-109 is critical, he is committed to that as well as some other funding streams to criminal justice. Hopefully we could use some of those funds to accomplish this.

Lauren Bell added, if there are ways to understand how long the adjudication process might be for somebody that's in there that would also help us with our planning. Is it going to be two days or six months process? There's a lot of factors that go in there, when there is opportunity to timeline it a little bit better it would be great for RSN to get that information and to use that in our case planning or theirs.

Chesa added the District Attorney's office has a lot of data on average length of cases and different kinds of cases. The average length of cases varies tremendously depending on the housing situation of the individual. If they are in custody, they tend to move faster except for the most serious cases. If they are out of custody, they tend to go slower and have more flexibility in negotiating a resolution and so on. The median average of length of a case is 200 days.

Chief asked if someone is willing to make a motion to approve RSN scope of work as discussed during this meeting and as indicated this body work on having real defined guidelines about how we move folks through to other beds if we needed to, to make sure we are serving the population as appropriately and effectively as possible.

Chief Scott made the motion, seconded by Chesa Boudin. The motion was passed unanimously.

## **5. Adjournment.**

Danielle Harris motioned to adjourn and District Attorney Chesa Boudin seconded. The body unanimously passed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:58 AM.

### SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the Community Corrections Partnership, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. These comments will be made a part of the official public record, and brought to the attention of the Community Corrections Partnership. Written comments should be submitted to: Geoffrea Morris, Adult Probation Department, 880 Bryant Street, Room 200, San Francisco, CA 94102, or via email: [geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org](mailto:geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org)

### MEETING MATERIALS

Copies of agendas, minutes, and explanatory documents are available through the Community Corrections Partnership's website at <http://sfgov.org/adultprobation> or by calling Geoffrea Morris at (415) 241-4241 during normal business hours. The material can be faxed or mailed to you upon request.

### ACCOMMODATIONS

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Geoffrea Morris at [geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org](mailto:geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org) or (415) 241-4241 at least two business days before the meeting.

### TRANSLATION

Interpreters for languages other than English are available on request. Sign language interpreters are also available on request. For either accommodation, please contact Geoffrea Morris at [geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org](mailto:geoffrea.morris@sfgov.org) or (415) 241-4241 at least two business days before the meeting.

### CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES

To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

### KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: [www.sfgov.org/sunshine](http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine).

### FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE:

Administrator  
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683.  
Telephone: (415) 554-7724  
E-Mail: [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org)

### CELL PHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

### LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and web site <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/>

**Adult Probation Department's AB109 Expenditures - Updated v2**

<b>FY 15/16</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$33,546,031	<b>34.8%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$11,670,000	
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	DPH-Work Order Mental Health Services	\$2,427,166	
AB 109	CASC Provider (LCA)	\$1,979,022	
AB 109	Housing Services	\$698,926	
AB 109	Education and Workforce Development Services	\$492,696	
AB 109	Sex Offender Treatment Services	\$195,812	
AB 109	Research and Evaluation	\$92,443	
AB 109	Parenting Services	\$57,787	
AB 109	Drug Testing services	\$3,869	
AB 109	Other Services - Compliance	\$3,745	
<b>Total AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$5,951,466</b>	

<b>FY 16/17</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$34,019,907	<b>41.0%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$13,950,000	
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	Personnel Costs (APD's staff sworn and non-sworn)	\$3,660,378	
AB 109	CASC Provider (LCA)	\$2,589,000	
AB 109	DPH-Work Order Mental Health Services	\$2,470,580	
AB 109	Housing Services	\$862,000	
AB 109	Clinical Case Management	\$500,000	
AB 109	Education and Workforce Development Services	\$455,000	
AB 109	Sex Offender Treatment Services	\$260,000	
AB 109	Parenting Services	\$50,000	
AB 109	Other Services - Compliance	\$25,000	
AB 109	Drug Testing services	\$3,500	
<b>Total AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$10,875,458</b>	

**Adult Probation Department's AB109 Expenditures - Updated v2**

<b>FY 17/18</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$35,174,674	<b>40.3%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$14,170,000	
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	Personnel Costs (APD's staff sworn and non-sworn)	\$4,554,612	
AB 109	CASC Provider - Citywide	\$2,900,000	
AB 109	DPH-Work Order Mental Health Services	\$2,201,327	
AB 109	Housing Services	\$1,999,314	
AB 109	Case Management System	\$1,200,000	
AB 109	Education and Workforce Development Services	\$455,000	
AB 109	Sex Offender Treatment Services	\$315,000	
AB 109	Parenting Services	\$58,815	
AB 109	Reentry Pod (Insight Prison Project)	\$48,294	
<b>Total AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$13,732,362</b>	

<b>FY 18/19</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$40,404,320	<b>31.7%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$12,820,000	
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	Personnel Costs (APD's staff sworn and non-sworn)	\$4,770,348	
AB 109	DPH-Work Order Mental Health Services	\$2,113,212	
AB 109	Housing Services	\$1,986,980	
AB 109	CASC Provider - Citywide	\$1,641,186	
AB 109	Sex Offender Treatment Services	\$372,032	
AB 109	Education and Workforce Development Services	\$302,103	
AB 109	Electronic Monitoring	\$100,000	
AB 109	Reentry Pod (Five Keys)	\$54,000	
AB 109	Other Services - Compliance and Operations	\$38,000	
AB 109	Drug Testing services	\$10,000	
<b>Total AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$11,387,861</b>	

### Adult Probation Department's AB109 Expenditures - Updated v2

FY 19/20			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$41,881,466	<b>33.7%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$14,110,000	
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Personnel Costs (APD's staff sworn and non-sworn)	\$5,083,333	
AB 109	Housing Services	\$3,204,994	
AB 109	DPH-Work Order Mental Health Services	\$1,957,626	
AB 109	CASC Provider - Citywide	\$1,330,791	
AB 109	Sex Offender Treatment Services	\$432,276	
AB 109	Education and Workforce Development Services	\$365,416	
AB 109	Reentry Pod (Five Keys)	\$323,652	
AB 109	Case Management and Mentoring	\$172,175	
AB 109	Case Management System	\$107,194	
AB 109	Electronic Monitoring	\$82,212	
AB 109	APD Staff Training (sworn and nonsworn)	\$31,000	
AB 109	Other Services - Compliance and Operations	\$20,648	
AB 109	Gender Responsive (does not include housing)	\$16,196	
<b>Total AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$13,127,512</b>	

**Author:**  
 first reported as \$2,280,370.8. this was an error.

FY 20/21		
Budgeted Amount		
Total Department Budget		\$41,818,109
Total AB109 Budget		\$12,711,891
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)
AB 109	Personnel Costs (APD's staff sworn and non-sworn)	\$4,965,957
AB 109	CASC Provider - Citywide	\$2,990,000
AB 109	Housing Services	\$2,000,000
AB 109	DPH-Work Order Mental Health Services	\$1,613,212
AB 109	Education and Workforce Development Services	\$350,000
AB 109	Sex Offender Treatment Services	\$340,000
AB 109	Case Management and Mentoring	\$320,000
AB 109	Electronic Monitoring	\$100,000
AB 109	APD Staff Training (sworn and nonsworn)	\$32,000
<b>Total AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$12,711,169</b>

## Sheriff's Office AB109 Expenditures

**FY 15/16 - Not Supplied**

<b>FY 16/17</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$221,236,892.00	<b>11.8%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$26,120,000.00	
<b>Source</b>			
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Court Security	\$12,910,000.00	
AB 109	Custody	\$12,370,000.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$25,280,000.00</b>	

<b>FY 17/18</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$231,834,969.00	<b>11.5%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$26,590,000.00	
<b>Source</b>			
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Court Security	\$12,620,000.00	
AB 109	Custody	\$13,970,000.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$26,590,000.00</b>	

<b>FY 18/19</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$248,593,015.00	<b>10.3%</b>
Total AB109 Budget		\$25,530,000.00	
<b>Source</b>			
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Court Security	\$12,910,000.00	
AB 109	Custody	\$12,620,000.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$25,530,000.00</b>	

### Sheriff's Office AB109 Expenditures

FY 19/20			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$255,480,296.00	10.6%
Total AB109 Budget		\$27,190,000.00	
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Court Security	\$13,290,000.00	
AB 109	Custody	\$13,650,000.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$26,940,000.00</b>	

FY 20/21			% of Total Budget
Budgeted Amount			
Total Department Budget		\$246,058,221.00	9.5%
Total AB109 Budget		\$23,486,000.00	
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Court Security	\$11,755,000.00	
AB 109	Custody	\$11,731,000.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$23,486,000.00</b>	

## Department of Public Health's AB109 Expenditures

FY 15/16			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget (DPH SUD)		\$64,654,920.00	
Total AB109 Budget (DPH SUD)		\$2,171,924.00	3.4%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential (APD WO)	\$830,992.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential Overnight/Partial Day (APD WO)	\$280,175.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Outpatient (APD WO)	\$25,202.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Drug Court Treatment Center	\$777,096.00	
AB 109	Superior Court Dependency Drug Court	\$258,459.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$2,171,924.00</b>	-

FY 16/17			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget (DPH SUD)		\$60,686,757.00	
Total AB109 Budget (DPH SUD)		\$2,171,924.00	3.6%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential (APD WO)	\$830,992.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential Overnight/Partial Day (APD WO)	\$280,175.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Outpatient (APD WO)	\$25,202.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Drug Court Treatment Center	\$777,096.00	
AB 109	Superior Court Family Treatment Court	\$258,459.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$2,171,924.00</b>	-

FY 17/18			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget (DPH SUD)		\$59,206,636.00	
Total AB109 Budget (DPH SUD)		\$2,120,572.00	3.6%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential (APD WO)	\$779,640.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential Step-Down (APD WO)	\$280,175.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Outpatient (APD WO)	\$25,202.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Drug Court Treatment Center	\$777,096.00	
AB 109	Superior Court Family Treatment Court	\$258,459.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$2,120,572.00</b>	-

## Department of Public Health's AB109 Expenditures

FY 18/19			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget (DPH SUD)		\$64,757,123.00	
Total AB109 Budget (DPH SUD)		\$3,123,429.00	4.8%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential (APD WO)	\$1,039,722.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential Step-Down (APD WO)	\$280,175.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Outpatient (APD WO)	\$25,202.00	
AB 109	DPH SUD Drug Court Treatment Center	\$777,096.00	
AB 109	Superior Court Family Treatment Court	\$258,459.00	
AB 109	Salvation Army Residential (APD WO)	\$542,025.00	
AB 109	Salvation Army Residential Detox (APD WO)	\$200,750.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$3,123,429.00</b>	-

FY 19/20			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget (DPH SUD)		\$65,980,429.00	
Total AB109 Budget (DPH SUD)		\$3,123,429.00	4.7%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential (APD WO)	\$1,039,722.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential Step-Down (APD WO)	\$280,175.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Outpatient (APD WO)	\$25,202.00	
AB 109	DPH SUD Drug Court Treatment Center	\$777,096.00	
AB 109	Superior Court Family Treatment Court	\$258,459.00	
AB 109	Salvation Army Residential (APD WO)	\$542,025.00	
AB 109	Salvation Army Residential Detox (APD WO)	\$200,750.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$3,123,429.00</b>	-

## Department of Public Health's AB109 Expenditures

FY 20/21			% of Total Budget
Budgeted Amount (Estimate)			
Total Department Budget (DPH SUD)		\$65,980,429.00	
Total AB109 Budget (DPH SUD)		\$3,123,429.00	4.7%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential (APD WO)	\$1,039,722.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Residential Step-Down (APD WO)	\$280,175.00	
AB 109	HealthRIGHT 360 Outpatient (APD WO)	\$25,202.00	
AB 109	DPH SUD Drug Court Treatment Center	\$777,096.00	
AB 109	Superior Court Family Treatment Court	\$258,459.00	
AB 109	Salvation Army Residential (APD WO)	\$542,025.00	
AB 109	Salvation Army Residential Detox (APD WO)	\$200,750.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$3,123,429.00</b>	-

**Public Defender's Office AB109 Expenditures**

**FY 15/16 - Not Supplied**

**FY 16/17 - Not Supplied**

**FY 17/18 - Not Supplied**

<b>FY 18/19</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$38,806,309.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$320,000.00	<b>0.8%</b>
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	Salary and fringe benefits for staff handling parole court, providing Post Release Community Supervision and all other AB 109 litigation and support.	\$320,207.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		\$320,207.00	

<b>FY 19/20</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$41,273,445.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$383,000.00	<b>0.9%</b>
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	Salary and fringe benefits for staff handling parole court, providing Post Release Community Supervision and all other AB 109 litigation and support.	\$307,162.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		\$307,162.00	

<b>FY 20/21</b>			<b>% of Total Budget</b>
Budgeted Amount			
Total Department Budget		\$41,537,449.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$350,000.00	<b>0.8%</b>
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
AB 109	Salary and fringe benefits for staff handling parole court, providing Post Release Community Supervision and all other AB 109 litigation and support.	\$350,000.00	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		\$350,000.00	

### District Attorney's Office AB109 Expenditures

FY 15/16			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$51,844,781.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$250,000.00	0.5%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Sentencing Planner Annual salary and fringe	\$132,955.03	
AB 109	Parole Court Annual salary and fringe	\$114,248.97	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$247,204.00</b>	

FY 16/17			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$58,255,036.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$222,000.00	0.4%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Sentencing Planner Annual salary and fringe	\$81,701.81	
AB 109	Parole Court Annual salary and fringe	\$155,500.19	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$237,202.00</b>	

FY 17/18			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$62,861,009.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$280,000.00	0.4%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Sentencing Planner Annual salary and fringe	\$132,008.51	
AB 109	Parole Court Annual salary and fringe	\$157,720.49	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$289,729.00</b>	

FY 18/19			% of Total Budget
Actual Expenditures			
Total Department Budget		\$68,444,312.00	
Total AB109 Budget		\$320,000.00	0.5%
Source	Expenditure Type	Amount (\$)	
AB 109	Sentencing Planner Annual salary and fringe	\$143,299.20	
AB 109	Parole Court Annual salary and fringe	\$176,907.80	
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$320,207.00</b>	

**District Attorney's Office AB109 Expenditures**

<b>FY 19/20</b>		<b>% of Total Budget</b>
<b>Actual Expenditures</b>		
Total Department Budget		\$73,590,411.00
Total AB109 Budget		\$383,000.00
		<b>0.5%</b>
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>
AB 109	Sentencing Planner Annual salary and fringe	\$157,645.29
AB 109	Parole Court Annual salary and fringe	\$149,516.71
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$307,162.00</b>

<b>FY 20/21*** FY 20/21 Serves as an Estimate***</b>		<b>% of Total Budget</b>
<b>Budgeted Amount</b>		
Total Department Budget		\$73,699,841.00
Total AB109 Budget		\$350,000.00
		<b>0.5%</b>
<b>Source</b>	<b>Expenditure Type</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>
AB 109	Sentencing Planner Annual salary and fringe	\$162,049.25
AB 109	Parole Court Annual salary and fringe	\$187,950.00
<b>Totl AB109 Expenditures</b>		<b>\$349,999.25</b>

---

# Three Years of Realignment in San Francisco

FEBRUARY 2015

---

*Presented by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee:*

Wendy Still, Chief Adult Probation Officer (Chair)

Jeff Adachi, Public Defender

Barbara Garcia, Director of Health

George Gascón, District Attorney

Ross Mirkarimi, Sheriff

Gregory Suhr, Chief of Police

San Francisco Superior Court





---

*Graduation Day at Five Keys Charter School*



---

*Checking in at Five Keys Charter School Learning Center,  
Adult Probation Department*



---

*Student earns his GED at Five Keys Charter School*



---

*Five Keys Charter School Student of the Month*

---

*Thank you to Community Corrections Partnership member Steve Good,  
Executive Director of Five Keys Charter School, for providing these pictures.*

---

## CCPEC Members

---

**Wendy Still**

Chief Adult Probation Officer  
(Chair)

**Jeff Adachi**

Public Defender

**Barbara Garcia**

Director of Health

**George Gascón**

District Attorney

**Ross Mirkarimi**

Sheriff

**Gregory Suhr**

Chief of Police

### **San Francisco Superior Court**

*The Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee would like to thank its members and the Human Services Agency, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and Mayor Edwin Lee for their commitment to the successful implementation of Realignment and for their contributions to this report. This report was a collaboration of CCPEC partners and was authored by the the Adult Probation Department's Reentry Division.*

For more information, please visit:  
<http://sfgov.org/adultprobation>

# Contents

Executive Summary	5
Introduction	7
Impacts Across San Francisco and Associated Strategies	9
Interagency Collaborations	21
Individual Department Responses	33
Outcomes from the First Three Years	43
Appendix A	53
Appendix B	55
Appendix C	59
Chart & Table Index	67



---

# Executive Summary

The City and County of San Francisco faces unique opportunities and challenges in responding to the Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 (Assembly Bill 109, or Realignment). A politically progressive community located in a national center for innovation provides the ideal climate for testing new approaches to criminal justice problems. The County's justice, public safety, human services, health, and workforce leaders collaborate regularly and effectively to bring about the operational and policy changes that strengthen communities for all San Franciscans. This robust collaboration has led to high rates of successful probation completion, a substantially reduced jail population, and crime rates that remain among the lowest in decades. However, as the income gap continues to widen and housing costs soar ever higher, individuals leaving jail and prison – and particularly those affected by Realignment, who have longer criminal histories and more criminogenic needs than others involved in the criminal justice system – face extreme and mounting barriers to reintegration. In many cases, the individuals served under Realignment are those who have chronic medical conditions and complex behavioral health problems, who have long been disconnected from the labor market, who have experienced homelessness or at the very least housing instability, and who do not possess strong networks of social or familial support.

How does a city so rich in ideas and resources best serve these members of our community?

This report, which presents San Francisco's response to Realignment over the last three years, offers answers to this question. Each agency included here has embraced groundbreaking approaches to implementation of the mandates and the spirit of Realignment. In addition to these efforts, in 2014 the County saw the passage and implementation of the Fair Chance Ordinance, which prohibits employers and housing providers from considering conviction histories that are not substantially related to the job or housing for which an individual applies. Criminal justice partners continued to pursue the strategies approved by the Bureau of Justice Assistance under the Justice Reinvestment Initiative: expanding alternatives to pretrial detention, shortening probation terms from a standard three years to a graduated scheme based on criminogenic risk, and reducing the disproportionate involvement of people of color and African Americans in particular in the criminal justice system. As part of the City's response to the Affordable Care Act, the Human Services Agency partnered with the Sheriff's Department to conduct a pilot enrollment of jail inmates into Medi-Cal, and partnered with the Adult Probation Department to outstation an eligibility worker at the Community Assessment and Services Center to enroll individuals on community supervision in Medi-Cal and CalFresh benefits. In these extraordinary examples of once-in-a-lifetime reforms, the City and County of San Francisco is working to change the tide of overreliance on the criminal justice system in favor of a freer, fairer, and healthier society.



---

# Introduction

During the first year of Public Safety Realignment, San Francisco's Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) focused on building collaborative partnerships between agencies and designing programs and initiatives to respond to the changes mandated by AB109. During the second year, CCP partner agencies were busy implementing these collaborative initiatives and launching new programs. During the past year, the third year of Realignment implementation, San Francisco saw the institutionalization of the City and County's Realignment programs and initiatives. No longer a new responsibility, the mandate that San Francisco County supervise people with non-serious, non-violent, non-sex offenses has become the new normal, and these clients have been integrated into the existing populations served by the County's criminal justice, health and human services partners. While the County has historically sent fewer people to state prison than most other California counties, the impact of Realignment on San Francisco has nonetheless been significant. In response, the close collaboration among all of the County agencies that make up the CCP has continued to strengthen over the last three years. This report shows the progress that the County has made.

This last year has been devoted to strengthening and institutionalizing initiatives that were implemented the year before. The Community Assessment and Service Center (CASC) and the Reentry Pod both completed a full year of operation and Cameo House, the alternative sentencing program for pregnant and parenting women, opened its doors. While there have been expected challenges, each represents innovation by the City and County and each has brought new opportunities to individuals impacted by Realignment in San Francisco.

This year's report shows that the number of people being held in San Francisco County Jail as well as those being supervised by the Adult Probation Department have continued to decline. After the initial influx of realigned individuals and the challenges of Realignment implementation, the populations are plateauing and the trends are becoming consistent.

In 2015, there will be a continuing focus on evaluation and quality assurance. Performance measurements and outcome analyses of reentry service providers, an evaluation of the County's service delivery system for reentry populations, as well as the validation of the COMPAS risk and needs assessment tool will allow the County to identify gaps in services, respond to reentering clients' needs, and ensure the tools used and programs offered are effective.

The Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee is pleased to present information on these trends and programs as well as the innovations and continuing services created by the partners that make up the CCP.




# Impacts across San Francisco and Associated Strategies

## Criminal Justice Trends <sup>1</sup>

At the end of September 2014, San Francisco's County Jail population was 1,352, or 57 percent of the jails' total capacity of 2,360 and 87 percent of the jails' capacity with the currently open facilities.<sup>2</sup> This represents a **31 percent decrease** in the jail population since 2009. The population supervised by the Adult Probation Department has also **reduced dramatically**, dropping by 35 percent since 2009. As of the writing of this report and following the passage of Proposition 47 in November 2014, the jail population decreased by another 15 percent to 1,152.<sup>3</sup> With new Proposition 47-eligible cases no longer receiving jail sentences, the jail population will likely remain low. The probation population will also decrease even further in the coming year as those eligible for Proposition 47 relief are released from probation supervision.

Chart 1. San Francisco Criminal Justice Trends, 2009 - September 2014




Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department and Sheriff's Department

1 Many thanks to James Austin, JFA Institute for his contributions to this section of the report. A more detailed analysis of crime trends in San Francisco in the post-Realignment era is forthcoming.

2 Jail capacity excluding County Jails #3 and #6, which are closed, is 1,562.

3 Jail population as of December 30, 2014. Proposition 47 was passed by California's voters and went into effect in November 2014. The proposition reduces charges for six low-level felonies from felonies to misdemeanors. This had an immediate impact on jail and prison populations across the state.

**Chart 2. Average Daily Jail Population, by Type of Commitment, October 2011 - September 2014**




Notes: Average Daily Population (ADP) by month represents the total amount of custody days served by inmates that month divided by the number of days in that month. Custody days for the AB109 population are calculated from the date that local charges were adjudicated to the individual's release date, such that only custody days served for AB109-related sentences are counted for the AB109 population's ADP.

Source: San Francisco Sheriff's Department

It is clear, then, that Realignment has not had the effect some expected of causing a dramatic increase in San Francisco's criminal justice-involved population. However, the question of whether and to what extent Realignment has impacted crime rates in the County remains.

In general, crime rates, as measured by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report (UCR), have been declining for some time in virtually all jurisdictions in the United States and California, including San Francisco. As illustrated in Chart 3 below, the County's crime rate began to decrease in the early 1990s and has since dropped by approximately half, consistent with national and statewide trends.

**Chart 3. Crime Rates, California and San Francisco, 1986 - 2014\***




\* Statewide crime rates for 2014 were not available at the time of this report

Source: California Attorney General, Department of Justice

Both the state and San Francisco saw an uptick in crime rates in 2011, when Realignment was implemented. This trend lasted two years and, as shown above, in 2014 San Francisco's crime rate decreased again (statewide crime rate data for 2014 was not yet available at the time of this report). While some have attributed the 2011 to 2013 crime rate increase to Realignment, the uptick was well within the normal fluctuations for year-to-year crime rate changes.

Crime rates are defined as crimes reported per 100,000 people in a metropolitan area. Given this metric, it becomes clear that the percentage of the population involved in serious crimes each year is quite low. For example, San Francisco's crime rate in 2011 was 4,835 crimes per 100,000 population, or only 4.8 percent of the population. The uptick in crime seen in 2012 increased the rate to 5,574 per 100,000, or 5.5 percent of the population – an increase of less than one percent. Another metric to consider for putting crime rates into context is the percentage of the population not reporting a crime. In San Francisco, this has remained above 90 percent since the 1980s and has been above 95 percent since 2011. Therefore, the vast majority of San Francisco residents are not experiencing crime.

**Chart 4. Percentage of San Francisco Residents Not Reporting a Crime  
1986 -2014**



Source: James Austin, JFA Institute

Of the crimes reported in San Francisco in 2014, a vast majority (87 percent) were property crimes, with larceny/theft comprising 66 percent of all reported crimes. By definition, these types of crimes are not assaultive or violent and are often misdemeanors. In 2014, 91 percent of the larceny/theft crimes reported involved a value loss of under \$50.

Therefore, crime impacts a relatively small proportion of the population in San Francisco, even given recent slight upticks in the crime rate, and most of the crimes reported in these rates are non-violent thefts with the majority being relatively minor crimes. However, the question of Realignment's effect on crime rates remains.

To answer this question requires an understanding of who is impacted by Realignment. The primary way Realignment could have an impact on crime rates is through those sentenced to split sentences under PC

§ 1170(h), as those given a split sentence could have their length of incarceration reduced and be given a Mandatory Supervision portion of the sentence to be served in the community. The other populations impacted by Realignment are not spending less time incarcerated than they would have prior to Realignment, but are just spending this time in county jail rather than state prison and are supervised locally rather than by state parole when they are released.

In San Francisco, the number of individuals sentenced to a split sentence under PC § 1170h has been quite small: 349 individuals have received a split sentence between October 2011 and September 2014 or an average of 10 per month or 120 a year. Given the County's population and the number of crimes reported per year, it is not possible for the impact of this population on crime rates to be significant.

If Realignment is not the cause of the increase in the crime rate then we must consider the other more viable factors that could explain the crime rate increase since 2011. San Francisco is one of the fastest growing cities in California. Given that it is geographically constrained to seven square miles, this means that its already high level of density is only increasing. In addition, employment has increased in San Francisco over the last several years, leading to a large number of daytime commuters that serve to further swell the daytime population by an estimated 162,455 people during the work week.<sup>4</sup> This large influx of people increases the crime rate as a simple function of population size. If San Francisco's crime rate were based on the estimated daytime population of 951,627 people (rather than its resident population of 843,003), the 2014 crime rate would fall by another 11%.

In addition, the San Francisco Bay Area, and especially the City and County of San Francisco, is one of the urban areas with the nation's highest levels of income inequality.<sup>5</sup> Income inequality over a sustained period of time has been linked to crime rates by several studies although the strength of such a relationship has varied.<sup>6</sup>

There is also the possibility of simple random fluctuations in crime rates that have existed since crime rates have been computed. Just as crime rates went up for two years, they have once again declined this past year, even while any effect Realignment has on crime has remained unchanged over those three years.

Crime rates are much lower in San Francisco than they have been for some time, the vast majority (95 percent) of residents is not victimized by serious crimes, and it seems the recent implementation of Realignment has not had a significant impact on these low crime rates.

## ***Impacted Populations***

### **POPULATIONS IMPACTED BY REALIGNMENT**

Along with the overall number of individuals involved in the criminal justice system in San Francisco, the number of individuals sentenced, supervised, or jailed in San Francisco due to Realignment has been steadily declining since its implementation in October 2011. Because the population in state prison that is eligible for release to Post Release Community Supervision was largely fixed at the start of Realignment implementation and most individuals sentenced to non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offense charges are now sentenced to County Jail under PC § 1170(h), it was expected that there would be a large number of releases to PRCS

.....  
4 U.S Census, American Community <http://www.census.gov/acs/www>.


5 Florida, Richard, Zara Matheson, Patrick Adler & Taylor Brydges. September 2014. [The Divided City: And the Shape of the New Metropolis. Toronto, Canada: The University of Toronto, Martin Prosperity Institute.](#)

6 For a summary of these studies see [financesonline.com/how-income-inequality-affects-crime-rates](http://financesonline.com/how-income-inequality-affects-crime-rates).

at the beginning of Realignment implementation and that the number would then decline over time. This trend is clear in the average number of PRCS releases per month over the three years of Realignment: 37 in the first year, 16 in the second, and 12 in the third. However, while it was expected that the number of individuals sentenced under PC § 1170(h) would increase as the PRCS numbers declined, San Francisco has also experienced a steady decline in PC § 1170(h) sentences from an average of 19 per month in the first year of Realignment to 15 in the second and 13 in the third. This reflects an overall drop in felony sentencing in the County since 2008: the average felony arraignments per month has decreased 50 percent since 2008, including an 11 percent decrease since the onset of Realignment.<sup>7</sup>

From the beginning of Realignment implementation, the overwhelming majority of individuals impacted by AB109 changes were state parole violators, although these numbers have also been declining steadily over the last three years. An average of 156 individuals began a state parole violation sentence per month during the first year of Realignment, 131 per month in the second, and 109 per month in the third. In July 2013, state parole violation hearings were transferred from the State’s Board of Parole Hearings to Superior Courts in the counties in which the parolee was released, increasing the burden of proof for conviction, as well as the defense resources available to defendants. This development, along with Parole’s implementation of graduated sanctions, rewards, and responses and greater latitude by the supervising Parole Unit to make sanctioning decisions, contributed to the overall downward trend in the number of individuals awaiting parole violation proceedings in County Jail.

**Chart 5. Individuals Newly Processed Under AB109 Countywide, October 2011 - September 2014**



Notes: PC § 1170(h) individuals are counted in the month in which they receive an 1170h sentence; PRCS individuals are counted in the month of their release to PRCS from CDCR custody; State Parole Violators are counted in the month in which their local charges are adjudicated, such that they are only in custody for state parole violations.  
Sources: San Francisco Superior Court, Adult Probation Department, and Sheriff’s Department

**AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION**

While the discussion above summarizes the number of individuals impacted by Realignment, a discussion of the impacts of Realignment on CCSF’s criminal justice agencies requires accounting for the length of sentences these individuals serve. A calculation of each agency’s Average Daily Population (ADP) takes into


.....  
7 San Francisco Superior Court

account the average number of individuals served over a period of time, given the number of individuals starting a sentence during that time period and the lengths of their sentences.

Not surprisingly, the Adult Probation Department’s ADP of AB109 individuals increased in the first two years of Realignment, as new PRCS and Mandatory Supervision clients started sentences that range from several months to several years. In the third year of Realignment, the AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department leveled off, as many completed their supervision terms and fewer individuals began new PRCS or Mandatory Supervision sentences, as discussed above. The total AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department grew from 284 in the first year of Realignment to 523 in the second and remained constant at 524 in the third.

The Sheriff’s Department’s ADP of AB109 individuals remained relatively stable for the first two years of Realignment and then declined in year three, due to the overall decrease in the number of individuals serving state parole violation sentences. The Sheriff’s Department’s AB109 ADP dropped slightly from 262 in year one to 234 in year two and then dropped more dramatically in year three to 140. As is clear in the chart below, the composition of the Sheriff’s Department ADP of AB109 individuals has changed as the proportion of state parole violators has decreased and the proportion of those sentenced under PC § 1170(h) has increased.


**Chart 6. Average Daily AB109 Population, Adult Probation and Sheriff’s Departments, October 2011 - September 2014**



Notes: Each department has a unique role in managing individuals newly processed under AB109; measuring the Average Daily Population (ADP) of AB109 clients by department does not account for differing service needs. Custody days for PRCS, Mandatory Supervision, and parole violators are calculated from the date that local charges were adjudicated to the individual’s release date, such that only custody days served for AB109-related sentences are counted for the AB109 population’s ADP.  
Sources: San Francisco Adult Probation Department and Sheriff’s Department

While the impact of AB109 on CCSF’s criminal justice system has been significant, AB109 clients represent a fraction of the total population served by this system, as illustrated below. However, as indicated by the COMPAS risk and needs assessments conducted, and discussed below, the AB109 population is, on average, a higher risk and higher need population than the non-AB109 clients served in San Francisco.

**Chart 7. AB109 Population Caseload by Adult Probation and Sheriff's Departments, October 2011 - September 2014**




Notes: For each department, the AB109 Population by month is the cumulative total for each of the AB109 population types under that department's supervision (i.e., PC § 1170(h), PRCS, and State Parole Violators). The Non-AB109 Population is the average monthly client population for the department, less the AB109 population. Counts do not account for varying service needs, service duration or associated department workload.

Sources: San Francisco Adult Probation Department and Sheriff's Department

**PC § 1170(H) SENTENCES IMPOSED**

Consistent with the downward trend in felony arraignments in the County over the last several years, the number of PC § 1170(h) sentences imposed has been declining since the beginning of AB109 implementation, from 264 sentences in the first year of Realignment to 162 in the third. While the total number of PC § 1170(h) sentences has decreased, the proportion that are split sentences has steadily increased, from 39 percent of all PC § 1170(h) sentences in the first quarter of AB109 implementation to 72 percent in the third quarter of 2014. Of all PC § 1170(h) sentences imposed in San Francisco since October 2011, 55 percent have been split sentences, which is almost twice the statewide average of 28 percent. The District Attorney, Public Defender, and Chief Adult Probation Officer have been working with the Court to increase the proportion of split sentences in San Francisco and expand criteria in the collaborative courts to include the PC § 1170(h) population.

**Chart 8. PC § 1170(h) Straight and Split Sentences Imposed by Quarter, Q4 2011 - Q3 2014**



Source: San Francisco Superior Court

**Table 1. PC § 1170(h) Sentence Lengths**


	Straight Jail Sentences (279 sentences)	Split Sentences (349 sentences)	
		Jail Time	Mandatory Supervision
Average Sentence Length	28 months	12 months	26 months
Average Jail Time Served with Credits (if not released at sentencing)	7 months	5 months	N/A
Low Sentence Length	3 months	0 months	1 month
High Sentence Length	144 months	55 months	78 months

**AB109 CLIENTS' RISKS AND NEEDS**

San Francisco has a long-standing commitment to collaborative court models which provide alternatives to eligible individuals involved in the criminal justice system. Individuals sentenced to state prison in San Francisco tend to be those who have exhausted or are not eligible for these programs because they have been convicted of more serious crimes or have a longer criminal history than individuals who have historically been on probation or in County Jail. Thus, the AB109 population is a significantly higher-risk and higher-need population than the non-AB109 populations served.

San Francisco's PRCS clients have had an average of eight prior felony convictions and a quarter of PRCS clients have had 11 or more prior felony convictions. Furthermore, while PRCS eligibility requires individuals' current offense to be a non-serious, non-violent, or non-sex offense, over two-thirds of PRCS clients have a serious, violent, or sex offense in their past. These characteristics of the San Francisco PRCS population have been unchanged since the onset of Realignment.

**Chart 9. Risk Level of Adult Probation Department AB109 and non-AB109 Clients**




Notes: Risk Level is calculated by the COMPAS Risk and Needs Assessment instrument and refers to a client's risk of recidivating. Includes all clients who were active on PRCS or Mandatory Supervision (AB109 Clients) or probation (non-AB109 clients) on October 2, 2014.

Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

APD Deputy Probation Officers conduct a COMPAS assessment with clients to determine their risk of recidivating and to identify their criminogenic needs. A vast majority (80 percent) of APD's clients have significant needs, with most assessed as having one or more of the following: vocational/education, substance abuse, cognitive behavioral, criminal personality, criminal opportunity, social environment, residential instability, and criminal thinking self-report. A large proportion of AB109 clients have needs in every category.

APD has used this information to target AB109 funding to those services that meet the most prevalent needs, including vocational/education programs, substance abuse treatment, cognitive behavioral programming, mental health treatment, and housing, as discussed in more detail below.

**Chart 10. Assessed Needs of APD's AB109 and Non-AB109 Clients**



Notes: Needs shown here are those identified through the COMPAS Risk and Needs Assessment as "Highly Probable" or "Probable." Data includes all needs assessments completed for active APD clients as of June 13, 2014.

Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

In 2014 APD partnered with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence! (ACE!) to conduct an analysis of the County's reentry service delivery system. ACE! examined the criminogenic needs of APD's clients as well as the services provided by APD-funded and community-based reentry service providers. Service providers completed online assessments and met with ACE! researchers to discuss strategies for adjusting services and programs to better align with evidence based practices. It is expected that APD will receive the results of this study in early 2015.

ACE! is also using its Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) tool to conduct an analysis that will identify any gaps between APD's clients' needs and the reentry services provided in the County. APD will then adjust its reentry services funding strategies accordingly. This project is one of the County's continuous quality improvement efforts, to ensure that resources are targeted to the most critical needs of clients and that the services offered are high quality and adhere to best practices.

## **RESEARCH AND EVALUATION**

A key component of San Francisco's Realignment implementation strategy has been collaboration across departments to collect and share data. Prior to October 1, 2011, San Francisco's criminal justice partner agencies began weekly working group meetings to share information, report on data and trends, and develop collaborative strategies for Realignment implementation. A data working group later formed that met regularly to identify data elements to collect regarding Realignment populations, identify the data systems and points of contact to track these elements, and troubleshoot challenges regarding information sharing and tracking AB109-related events and individuals.

The Controller's Office of the City and County of San Francisco convened the data sharing working group and collected data from the Adult Probation Department, Sheriff's Department, and Department of Public Health to develop the data elements in the report *Public Safety Realignment in San Francisco: The First 12 Months*, released in December 2012. The Adult Probation Department then assumed responsibility for collecting data and updating these charts for subsequent reports, including *Realignment in San Francisco: Two Years in Review*, released in January 2014. Throughout the three years of Realignment implementation, San Francisco's criminal justice partners have maintained open and consistent communication and information sharing regarding Realignment clients, programs, trends, and strategies.

Over the past year, several research projects were implemented or advanced that will assist in ensuring that the programs and policies San Francisco has implemented over the last several years are being implemented with fidelity and will enable CCSF criminal justice partners to measure the impacts of these programs and policies.

First, in 2014 the Adult Probation Department began a validation study of the COMPAS risk and needs assessment instrument, to ensure that its risk level calculations are predictive for San Francisco's probation population. The analysis will measure and compare the predictive ability of the COMPAS tool for probationers and AB109 clients as well as subgroups of these populations based on gender, race, age, and other factors. The results of this analysis will be presented in early 2015 with recommended adjustments to the COMPAS risk level cut points to ensure that when APD measures a client's risk of recidivating, and bases supervision and sentencing recommendations on this risk level, that the measurement itself is valid and reliable.

Second, as a part of San Francisco's participation in the California Risk Assessment Pilot Project (CalRAPP), APD began an inter-rater reliability study of the COMPAS assessment tool in 2014. This study will measure the extent to which COMPAS assessments are conducted consistently across the department and will present recommendations, as needed, for strategies to address any inconsistencies identified. This study will also

conclude in early 2015. Together, these two studies will ensure that the COMPAS risk assessment is being implemented with fidelity and that its risk level outputs are reliable.

Also in the last year, San Francisco began working with the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) as one of twelve counties participating in PPIC's collaborative project with the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) to measure the performance and outcomes of California's Public Safety Realignment. As stated by PPIC, "[t]he ultimate goals of the project are to identify the sanctions, interventions, and services that are most effective for reducing recidivism and to provide the necessary information for counties to plan further steps to reduce criminal justice costs while maintaining public safety." San Francisco began by providing data to PPIC on demographic and criminogenic characteristics of its AB109 clients, and in the coming year will provide incarceration, sanctions, and recidivism information. PPIC will then analyze the relationship between San Francisco's reentry strategies and public safety outcomes, and compare these relationships and outcomes with other counties throughout the State. This analysis will provide valuable information for San Francisco to assess the Realignment services and strategies put into place thus far, as well as to ensure that future funding is directed to those services and strategies that have delivered positive outcomes.

In the coming year, San Francisco will continue to set up performance measurement systems for its reentry service providers. This, along with the Risk Need Responsivity project begun in 2014 with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence!, will allow the County to assess the efficacy and outcomes of its programs and strategies, as well as use data and information to adjust programs, target them to those clients most likely to benefit, and identify CCSF's gaps between available services and clients' needs.

A continuing focus on research and evaluation in 2015 will allow San Francisco criminal justice partners to further refine and tailor their Realignment strategies to be more effective, cost-efficient, and evidence-based.



---

# Interagency Collaborations

## *Shared Values*

Evidence-based practice is grounded in specific service approaches that are strength-based, trauma-informed, and gender-responsive. The CCPEC signaled its commitment to these approaches in prior Realignment plans, and recommits to them through this report. Deputy Probation Officers and service providers that receive Realignment funding to serve AB109 clients employ the following approaches to working with this population:

### Strength-based Practices

- > Build upon the strengths of individuals in order to raise their motivation for treatment,
- > Empower individuals to recognize personal responsibility and accountability,
- > Provide positive reinforcements, and
- > Provide positive behavior support through peers or mentors.

### Trauma-informed Practices

- > Take the trauma into account,
- > Avoid activities or behaviors that trigger trauma reactions,
- > Adjust the behavior of counselors, staff, and the organization to support the individual, and
- > Allow survivors to manage their trauma symptoms.

### Family-focused Practices

- > Provide services to strengthen family systems,
- > Promote healthy family functioning,
- > Encourage families to become self-reliant,
- > Provide a course specific to developing effective parenting skills, and
- > Develop strategies to support children of incarcerated and supervised parents to break the intergenerational cycle of crime and incarceration.

### Gender-responsive Practices

- > Acknowledge that gender makes a difference,
- > Understand that there are different pathways into the criminal justice system based on gender, and
- > Design gender-responsive programming with consideration of site, staff selection, curricula, and training that reflects an understanding of the realities of women's lives and addresses their pathways.

## ***Interagency Collaboration: San Francisco Reentry Pod***

The San Francisco Sheriff's Department, in partnership with the Adult Probation Department, opened the Reentry Pod in County Jail 2 in February 2013. The Reentry Pod houses up to 56 men who will be released to Mandatory Supervision, PRCS, or felony probation who have 30 to 120 days left of a sentence to serve and have been assessed as medium, medium-high, or high risk for recidivism. In April 2014, as part of a three-year pilot project authorized by the Budget Act of 2013 (Assembly Bill 110), the City of San Francisco entered into a contract with California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). The contract allows individuals who will be released to PRCS in San Francisco to enter the Reentry Pod for the last 60 days of their prison sentence to allow APD and other partner agencies to begin providing necessary services and interventions prior to their release. As of September 4, 2014, four individuals had been transferred from CDCR custody to the Reentry Pod.

The Reentry Pod represents a unique and unprecedented collaboration between the Sheriff's Department and the Adult Probation Department to develop a continuum of services from county jail to the community for individuals who will be released to community supervision. A working group of Sheriff's Department and APD staff meets weekly to identify clients for the Reentry Pod through a collaborative review of individuals currently in jail custody and those who are serving time in state prison and will be released to PRCS in San Francisco. Eligibility criteria include length of sentence, criminal justice status upon release (individuals must be under the supervision of APD), and classification as medium to high risk (according to a COMPAS assessment). Furthermore, clients must also be found eligible for housing in the Reentry Pod, per the San Francisco Sheriff's Department classification and housing criteria. Clients meeting the eligibility criteria are transferred to the Reentry Pod where they meet with a Pre-Release Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) and develop an Individual Treatment and Rehabilitation Plan (ITRP). If the client is already on probation, the Pre-Release DPO works with the client's supervising DPO to adjust the ITRP according to the client's current needs and the programs offered in the Reentry Pod.

Reentry Pod clients engage in both individualized and group interventions and are able to continue these interventions throughout their supervision in the community and at the Community Assessment and Services Center. These interventions are designed to address clients' criminogenic risks. Classes in the Reentry Pod include: Relapse Prevention Groups, Thinking for a Change, Seeking Safety, Five Keys Charter School, Job Readiness Training, Anger Management, Computer Training, Parenting, Restorative Justice, Manalive (a certified Batterer's Intervention Program), and Fitness. In addition to these services, clients are educated and trained by HIV and Integrated Services (formerly Forensic AIDS Project) staff on how to identify an overdose and how to administer Naloxone (Narcan), which can counter the effects of an opiate overdose. This year, the Reentry Pod became one of just a few custodial housing units in the country to use tablets to access educational and cognitive behavioral content and bridge the digital divide. This initiative was spearheaded by Five Keys Charter School, which now staffs the Reentry Pod with a Program Monitor who supports educational and reentry activities in custody.

Two DPOs are assigned to the Reentry Pod to facilitate programming, refer clients to services, and coordinate supervision goals. DPOs who will supervise these individuals in the community meet with their clients in custody to develop individualized treatment and rehabilitation plans and build rapport. Clients work with a case manager who serves as the liaison between in and out of custody goals and objectives and meets clients at release and accompanies them to the CASC. At that point, case plans are reviewed in coordination with the case-carrying DPO and implemented.

As of the end of September 2014, 247 individuals had served sentences in the Reentry Pod, with a majority (63 percent) serving sentences for a probation violation. Two percent of Reentry Pod participants were PRCS clients serving the end of their state prison sentence in the Reentry Pod, 18 percent were PRCS violators, 13

percent were serving the jail portion of their PC § 1170(h) split sentence, and four percent were Mandatory Supervision violators. As of the end of September 2014, 29 individuals were housed in the Reentry Pod. Overall, individuals have had an average length of stay in the Reentry Pod of 41 days.

**Table 2. Reentry Pod Summary**  
**As of September 30, 2014**

<b>Cumulative no. of individuals in the Reentry Pod:</b>	247
<b>No. of individuals who have exited the Reentry Pod:</b>	218
<b>Average no. of days in the Reentry Pod:</b>	41
<b>Type of sentence served in the Reentry Pod:</b>	
Probation violation	154 (63%)
PC § 1170(h) split sentence	33 (13%)
PC § 1170(h) Mandatory Supervision violation	9 (4%)
Final 60 days of a state prison sentence (from CDCR)	4 (2%)
PRCS violation	44 (18%)



# *Client Profile: Dwayne Grayson*

Dwayne Grayson first became involved in the criminal justice system at a young age. Both of his parents were addicted to drugs and at the age of 13, he began selling drugs in order to feed his family and to support his mother's addiction. At 15, the housing projects where Dwayne lived were demolished and he and his family moved to the Alice Griffith Housing Projects, where his parents' addiction grew deeper. His parents split up, his family was evicted, Child Protective Services became involved, and his mother lost guardianship of him and his brother. In the 11th grade, Dwayne was caught with a gun and was expelled from all San Francisco Schools. This would begin his involvement in the criminal justice system that would continue for the next twenty years.


Dwayne is currently a client of APD on Post Release Community Supervision and has recently completed his second term in state prison. In prison, he was given the option of returning to San Francisco in order to serve the last 60 days of his prison sentence in the Reentry Pod. "I know that the Reentry Pod could help me with resources that I need to be legit. I want a job, a real job that isn't selling drugs. I did that from the age of 13 to 30. Once I am caught for something, I leave it alone. Plus, I missed my daughter's graduation when I was in prison. I told her I am done."

Dwayne took various classes when he was in the Reentry Pod, including working to complete his high school education, and has since transitioned to the CASC to continue receiving these services. He is currently receiving housing assistance and has signed up to attend the Job Training Program at the CASC.

Dwayne acknowledges that if he can change, anyone can. He expresses that these experiences have taught him a lot about life and wants others to know the importance of staying humble and doing whatever it takes. "Before I went to prison, I had seven cars; now I take the bus. But that's ok. I am committed to doing whatever it takes." He still admits that he worries about things, such as finding a job, caring for his family, and securing stable housing. But at this point, he knows that he is on the right track.

## Interagency Collaboration: Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC)

### The CASC's Pathway to Success



### Overview

The Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC) is a one-stop community corrections and reentry services center that provides probation supervision and self-sufficiency skills-building services for clients of the San Francisco Adult Probation Department. Leaders In Community Alternatives Inc. (LCA) oversees all CASC services operations and coordinates the efforts of other community-based providers including America Works, the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, Community Works West, Five Keys Charter School, Senior Ex Offender Program, Occupational Therapy Training Program, the Public Defender's Office Clean Slate Program, and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, Second Chance Clinic. Through these collective efforts, the CASC offers an array of transformational service opportunities including intensive case management, barrier removal, substance abuse and relapse prevention, cognitive restructuring services, education, employment, vocational, personal development, parenting services, and a monthly legal clinic. The CASC integrates evidence-based criminal justice practices, restorative justice principles, and individualized service delivery.

In addition to private partnerships, the CASC is proud to have strong partnerships with key public agencies including the San Francisco Department of Public Health, Human Services Agency, and Department of Child Support Services.

***San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH)*** – This partnership brings licensed psychiatric social workers, and care coordinator staff to the CASC. The social workers conduct mental health assessments and provide traditional 50-minute therapy for high needs clients who may not be ready to fully engage in other CASC self-sufficiency services. The care coordinators assess substance dependency needs of CASC clients, and triage clients into outpatient or residential treatment services. The care coordinators and social workers collaborate closely with APD and partner agencies, and participate in a bi-weekly multi-disciplinary case review.

***Human Services Agency (HSA)*** – An HSA generalist eligibility worker who is stationed on site at the CASC conducts CalFresh (food stamps), Medi-Cal, and CAAP/GA enrollment on a weekly basis.

***Department of Child Support Services (DCSS)*** – To fully and responsibly integrate back into their communities and their families' lives, non-custodial parents with outstanding child support payments must become current.

Together DCSS and CASC clients review living expenses and back payments, and create a plan for addressing all of the top priorities.

Through closely pairing probation supervision with services that build self-sufficiency, the APD expects to make a long-term positive impact on recidivism, public safety, the inter-generational cycle of crime and violence, and community vitality.

**Table 3. APD Referrals to CASC,  
July 2013 through September 2014**

***Breakdown of APD Referrals:***

<b>AB109 clients</b>	354
<b>Non-AB109 clients</b>	622
<b>Total</b>	976

***Breakdown of APD Referrals by service type:***

<b>Standalone Services</b>	379
<b>Full Case Management</b>	597
<b>Total</b>	976

# *Client Profile: Antonio Johnson*

Antonio Johnson was born in Alabama, and moved to San Francisco when he was ten years old. He was always athletic and musically inclined. His demeanor is upbeat. He sometimes rides a skateboard around the City. He shares a constant smile and speaks about the details of his life, including his history of incarceration and addiction, with honesty and forthrightness.

Antonio's musical abilities and gregarious character helped to open doors. With a family member, he started a successful DJ, events, and music production company when he was in his early teens. He was a promoter in the community, talking to people, making connections, and building interest in the company. At a young age, he learned about the relationship between drugs and the music and event business. He started off selling marijuana, and moved on to cocaine and then meth. He started using drugs.

Over the years, he got caught and convicted of possession for sales or sales charges, and spent some time in jail and prison. He remained on the music, DJ, and production scene, and fell into the role of care taker when his partner and mother-in-law both suffered serious illnesses. It was important for him to be there for them, and he dedicated his time to caring for them.

Antonio went to jail for a short time in 2014. While in custody, he landed in the Reentry Pod. While inside, and in a clear and sober state of mind, he was able to think holistically about where he was in life and what he wanted for his future. He participated in cognitive restructuring, process and mentoring groups, and started to lay his own personal foundation towards a lifetime of transformation. Once released, he immediately connected with the CASC where he engages with case management staff and attends Five Keys Charter School. He is focused on not just getting his GED, but on completing his high school diploma. He has his eyes set on attending the University of San Francisco and obtaining a bachelor's degree. He works part-time with a clean and sober friend who DJs parties in San Francisco. He also gives back to the community by being a peer mentor to others.

When asked what he wanted others to know about him he responded, "I'm not perfect, but inside myself I know I can be a better human being." Antonio's successes and commitment are a testament to a person's ability to change.

# Client Profile: Corey Lafayette

Corey Lafayette has spent over two decades in and out of the criminal justice system and addressing addiction issues. Despite the barriers of criminal history and addiction, he presents proof that rehabilitation and recovery are possible. In Corey's early 20's he started using drugs; crystal meth was his drug of choice. Along the way, he was convicted of felony conspiracy and intent to sell narcotics, and served time in jail as a result.

While in custody, Corey participated in substance abuse prevention and transgender process groups. In the presence of professional facilitators and others who have faced similar struggles, his mind became clear about the impact of drugs and crime on his life. During this time, he thought about how much he loved his family, his mom and dad, siblings, and extended family whom he describes as rock solid and accomplished, and he wondered how, with so much love and support, he made the decisions that he made. He talks about the intersection between companionship and drug use –seeking a way to connect with people, to ease loneliness.

While in jail, Corey made a clear commitment to change. He wanted permanent freedom, the opportunity to make his own choices, and a chance to demonstrate that he could become his greatest self. Upon exit from jail, he connected with his DPO, and was clear about his intentions and goals. His DPO connected him with the CASC where, through engagement with service providers like Leaders In Community Alternatives, Five Keys Charter School, and America Works, he has started to chip away at his goals. He continues to engage in cognitive restructuring classes so he can control impulses and make better decisions. While he already had his high school diploma, he stayed connected with Five Keys Charter School to brush up on math and literacy skills. This service connection helped him get into the Drug and Alcohol Certificate Program at San Francisco City College, and he worked tenaciously with America Works which opened a door to a job at CVS, a company starting to look at applicants with criminal histories on a case-by-case basis. Corey has been the #1 District Customer Services Person several times, and CVS leadership knows him by name. He is also in CVS's management training program.

When asked to provide some words of wisdom and final thoughts, Corey said, "You have to become tired [of the street lifestyle], you have to want more, you have to want to know something different. When you are out, you have to analyze every situation – if I do 'A' what are the range of repercussions?" He adds, "I'm not who I used to be. I'm growing. I'm being a better person, and making better choices. I want to be a better person than I was yesterday. I'm comfortable with me, and focusing on [bettering] my life."

## ***Interagency Collaboration: Cameo House***

San Francisco's first alternative sentencing program for pregnant and parenting women was implemented at Cameo House in 2014. Cameo House is operated by the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice and supported by APD and by the Human Services Agency. Serving up to 11 women and 22 children at a time, Cameo House offers women the opportunity to serve their time out of jail or prison, retain custody of their child[ren], and access needed services by staff trained in gender-responsive, trauma-informed interventions. Modeled after the Family Foundation Programs implemented by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Cameo House program provides 24-hour staffing, comprehensive treatment and recovery services, vocational and educational programming, parenting groups, referrals to pediatric care, and case management coordination that involves Cameo House staff, DPO, treatment providers, Child Welfare Services (as appropriate), and other key stakeholders. The one-year follow-up recidivism rates of Family Foundation Program participants ranged from a high of 16 percent to a low of 9 percent, as compared to general recidivism rates among comparable populations of 50-60 percent.<sup>8</sup>

According to the Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint: A Gender-Responsive, Family-Focused Approach to Integrating Criminal and Community Justice, prepared by Barbara Bloom, PhD, and Barbara Owen, PhD, for the Adult Probation Department and Sheriff's Department in 2012,

The emerging body of research on gender-responsive programs and services suggests the following essential elements are included as part of multi-agency collaboration with integrated programming across multiple service and treatment needs: gender-responsive theoretical foundation; assessment and intensive case management; services that address women's pathways; transitional planning and community reintegration; coordinated case management systems that are client (women) centered, including justice-involved women and peer mentors in the planning process; staff trained in gender-responsive practice, significance of relationships, trauma-informed treatment; and material needs, such as housing, transportation and childcare.

Cameo House addresses each of these components and serves a dual function as an alternative sentencing site, which diverts women from serving time in custody and diverts children from entering the child welfare system, thereby breaking intergenerational cycles of criminal offending, substance use, and poverty.

.....  
<sup>8</sup> See [http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/adult\\_research\\_branch/research\\_documents/mother\\_program\\_and\\_family\\_foundation\\_may\\_2008.pdf](http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/adult_research_branch/research_documents/mother_program_and_family_foundation_may_2008.pdf)

# Client Profile: Ebony Salazar

Walking through the campus of City College, where she is currently a full-time student, Ebony Salazar seems no different than anyone else. She is a smart, bright, and articulate 28-year-old woman. Many people would be surprised to learn how Ebony got where she is today.

Ebony became involved in the criminal justice system at the age of twelve. She explained that growing up was very difficult for her, having only negative role models to shape her. Both of her parents were addicted to drugs and transferred their behaviors to her. She started using at an early age and began to clash with the law, leading to a state prison term. Ebony attributes her recent transformation to her sobriety, a clear mind, spirituality, and the support of a variety of programs. Furthermore, she has the desire to be a good mother to her three-year-old son. "It's never too late to keep trying to change your life. It takes a lot of effort but you don't have to do it alone," she says

Ebony was sentenced to Cameo House and five years of probation supervision in lieu of state prison in January 2015. She explains, "I feel extremely grateful for this opportunity to continue at Cameo with my son and complete my education. I feel confident that I got this. Now that I am sober, I have a clear vision and new perspective. I am grateful for my struggles because it has given me a different outlook on life; it has shown me where I want to be and the type of mother I can be for my son."

In addition to being a full-time student, Ebony is active in her church and a member of the parent teacher association at her son's school. She receives support around her sobriety, parenting classes, and individualized therapy through Cameo House. She has been out of custody for almost two years and indicates that she is not going back. A lot is riding on Ebony's success and she knows this.

"There is no turning back. I have come too far to quit."

Ebony's future goals include giving back to her community. She hopes to find a job that will allow her to give back to people involved in the criminal justice system and continue to share her story, inspire others, and offer hope.



---

# Individual Department Responses

## ***Adult Probation Department Initiatives***

In its third year of implementation of Realignment, the Adult Probation Department (APD) continued to invest heavily in client reentry services in order to meet the complex needs of AB109 clients, in addition to moderate-to-high risk probation clients across the Department. These investments have led to improved outcomes and significant reductions in the overall Adult Probation population: as of September 30, 2014, the overall Adult Probation successful completion rate was 83 percent and the total probation population size was 4,436. Please see Outcomes from the First Three Years (pp. 43-51) for caseload size and completion rates specific to the AB109 population. Due to continued reductions in probation revocations to state prison in 2014, APD achieved high performing status under the Community Corrections Performance Incentive Act (SB678): only 44 individuals were revoked to state prison in fiscal year 2014, down from 256 just five years ago.

### **EVIDENCE-BASED SUPERVISION**

APD continues to supervise its population according to COMPAS-assessed risk and needs, and maintains specialized caseloads in its Realignment Division for the highest risk clients. A Pre-Release Unit of two Deputy Probation Officers works in the Reentry Pod to assist clients in their reentry planning and conducts pre-release planning for clients who will be released to PRCS directly from state prison. The PRCS Unit has a women-specific caseload, a gang caseload, a sex offender caseload, and two 20:1 intensive supervision caseloads; the 1170 Unit has also established a women-specific caseload. All Realignment caseloads maintain client-to-officer ratios of no more than 50:1, which is in keeping with the American Probation and Parole Association's recommendations.

Information about clients' criminogenic risk and needs, as identified by COMPAS, drives the formulation of clients' individualized treatment and rehabilitation plans (ITRP). Deputy Probation Officers work collaboratively with clients to implement the ITRP and refer clients to services and programs to fulfill the goals it contains. APD offers a broad array of services and resources for clients; detailed descriptions of the programs and services available to APD's AB109 clients are provided in Appendix A.

### **COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT AND SERVICES CENTER (CASC)**

In 2014 the Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC) celebrated its first year of operation. The CASC serves as a one-stop reentry services center for clients of APD where clients meet with probation officers, receive case management, attend cognitive behavioral groups, continue their education at a Five Keys Charter School site, get connected to employment and transitional housing, are assessed for behavioral health needs by Department of Public Health staff located onsite, and sign up for CalFresh and Medi-Cal with

an onsite eligibility worker from the Human Services Agency. The CASC also serves breakfast and lunch daily for clients in need of a meal. The CASC is designed to provide a safe, respectful space for clients to meet their needs and become connected to positive social support. Enrichment activities such as creative writing, ping pong tournaments, movie nights, holiday gatherings, and leadership development opportunities make the CASC a place where clients may thrive.

#### **REENTRY POD**

APD, along with the Sheriff's Department, also celebrated the first year of operation of the Reentry Pod in County Jail #2. A major development in 2014 was the implementation of a contract with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to bring individuals who will be released to PRCS to the Reentry Pod from state prison 60 days prior to their release date. The purpose of this unique initiative is to connect clients who have served time in state prison with local resources and reentry planning. The Reentry Pod also serves other individuals in custody who will be released to probation supervision.

#### **CAMEO HOUSE**

One of APD's proudest accomplishments has been the launch of Cameo House as an alternative sentencing site for pregnant and parenting justice-involved women. This program serves up to 11 women and 22 children at a time, while preserving families and offering mothers the opportunity to address their educational, vocational, and treatment needs in a community setting. As we collect data and are able to report on outcomes, we hope that Cameo House will serve as a model for additional alternative sentencing sites in San Francisco.

#### **REENTRY DIVISION**

Shortly before Realignment began, APD created the Reentry Division to direct collaborative efforts to promote policy, operational practices, and supportive services to effectively implement Realignment and coordinate reentry services within APD and with partner agencies. The Division provides support to the CCP, the CCPEC, and the Reentry Council and provides research and analysis related to Realignment to CCSF agencies, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the State of California, and other stakeholders. The Reentry Division also coordinates contracts for Realignment-related services and programs and provides information and support to APD sworn staff in making appropriate service referrals for APD clients. The Reentry Division also publishes *Getting Out and Staying Out: A Guide to San Francisco Resources for People Leaving Jail and Prison* (<http://sfgov.org/reentry>).

## ***Office of the District Attorney Initiatives***

#### **ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING PLANNER (ASP)**

The District Attorney created the Alternative Sentencing Planner (ASP) position in 2012 to examine and recommend cost effective sentencing alternatives that lead to better long-term outcomes for defendants and the community. The ASP contributes toward thoughtful sentences that address the seriousness of the crime, the criminogenic needs of the offender, and victim restoration. From February 2012 through September 2014, the ASP has conducted 363 in-depth reviews for prosecutors. The primary crime types for these cases are: Robbery (28 percent), Drugs (21 percent) and Burglary (16 percent). Additionally, over half of ASP cases involve defendants aged 18-24—the highest risk age group.

In 2014 the Office pursued a comprehensive outcome evaluation through UC Berkeley to assess ASP impact on case and defendant outcomes. The evaluation concluded in May 2014 and found compelling evidence that ASP reduces the rate of re-offense. Researchers estimated a 6 to 19 percent decrease in ASP participants' rate of reoffending over two years, as compared to statistically matched control groups. This was further associated with an estimated 88 percent decrease in the costs associated with avoided crimes. While these results are most certainly promising, the researchers recommended conducting a randomized control trial (RCT), which began in October 2014. Informed by the UC Berkeley findings the District Attorney is exploring program expansion and is currently pursuing several potential funding opportunities to increase the number of cases that can benefit from ASP expertise.

In fiscal year 2013-2014 the San Francisco District Attorney's office conducted an internal survey to identify the most valuable point at which prosecutors can utilize ASP recommendations and the elements of the ASP recommendations that are most useful to achieving the appropriate disposition. A majority of prosecutors found ASP reviews provide more information than they typically have on a defendant. ASP services are accessible and increase prosecutor confidence in their decisions about a case. Prosecutors were asked to make recommendations about improvements to the ASP process and work product, and the emerging theme was the need for ASP services in the Juvenile Division.

"The ASP would be most helpful in assisting attorneys with knowing all of the programs that are available to minors and which programs are effective for different problems faced by minors (mental health, substance abuse, etc). Knowing what programs are NOT good is also beneficial." –Survey Respondent.

The District Attorney remains confident that the ASP resource should be expanded to meet demand, including additional full-time staff, and continues to explore replicating the ASP model. This includes but is not limited to ASP positions with specialized expertise in young adult offenders aged 18-25, serious mental illness, and the juvenile justice population.

## **VICTIM SERVICES**

The District Attorney continues to provide comprehensive services to victims and witnesses of crimes, including assistance in filing claims with the State Victim Compensation Program, providing crisis intervention and emergency assistance, identifying appropriate community resources and services, securing restitution, assisting with relocation, meeting transportation needs, and providing help navigating the criminal justice system. The Victim Services Division (VSD) provides these services in English, Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish, and utilizes the language line services for additional language assistance. In 2014 the VSD caseloads remained high with 5,558 victims receiving 33,127 different services.

The San Francisco District Attorney's Office anticipates submitting requests for additional victim services resources from Realignment funds to appropriately meet the demand for services and ensure adequate coverage of Realignment-related hearings in addition to facilitating access to victim restitution. Victim restitution is just one element of ensuring that offenders are held accountable for their crimes and victims are made whole. Restitution is mandatory in every case resulting in a conviction where there is a victim who has incurred an economic loss. In 2012, Senate Bill 1210 (Lieu), Collection of Criminal Fines and Fees, was chaptered into law. The provisions of SB 1210 provide local county jurisdictions with the authority to collect restitution from post-disposition Realignment defendants while in local custody, on Mandatory Supervision, or on Post Release Community Supervision. Several California counties have utilized Realignment funds to hire restitution specialists to support victims as they navigate the complex compensation process. Victim witness advocates provide support and direction to victims with this process; however, victims' needs often exceed the scope of the VSD due to the demand for other support services. A full-time restitution specialist would be

able to both support victims with this time-sensitive and document-intensive program and further provide necessary follow up to ensure that victims successfully access and complete the restitution collection process.

#### **PAROLE HEARINGS**

From October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 the District Attorney's Office took action on over 500 parole revocations. The San Francisco District Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office, CDCR Parole Division and the Superior Courts continue to work closely together to ensure a fair process for parole hearings that places minimal burden on the court calendar.

#### **STAFF CAPACITY AND TRAININGS**

The Office continued to be actively engaged in staff capacity building, inter-agency collaboration, and training throughout 2014. In 2014 the District Attorney's Office continued to provide enhanced training to prosecutors, investigators, and victim witness staff. The Office experienced a smooth transition as the former Director of Training, Writs and Appeals, and Brady retired and Wade Chow took over leadership of office training. The staffing for this division now permits greater emphasis on staff professional development which ensures prosecutorial integrity and professionalism, while permitting staff exposure to the latest court guidelines, research based expertise, and educational materials. Among other Realignment-specific trainings, staff received training on the Victim Information Notification Everyday (VINE) Program, addiction, and primary & secondary trauma.

#### **DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

In 2014, the Office increased its data analysis and collection capacity for the ASP by developing a program database that links to the officewide case management system. This linkage is anticipated to increase both the efficiency of the ASP recommendations and permit accurate case level tracking for program evaluation.

In addition, the Office established a case data tracking protocol for PC § 1170(h) eligible cases. Now that the database is equipped to track these cases, the Crime Strategies Unit will review outcomes for all PC § 1170(h) eligible cases, including comparisons between those that did result in a PC § 1170(h) sentence and those that did not. This will be a multi-year project to inform future sentencing decisions and case outcomes. None of these improvements were supported by Realignment funds, and the Office remains under resourced in developing and maintaining Realignment data tracking systems, regularly reviewing those systems, and performing complex data analysis to inform agency practice.

### ***Office of the Public Defender Initiatives***

The Office of the Public defender is working to reduce the number of people coming into the criminal justice system under Realignment in a variety of ways.

#### **PUBLIC DEFENDER REALIGNMENT TEAM**

The Realignment Team consists of an attorney and criminal justice specialist within the Office's existing Reentry Unit. The team works primarily with individuals impacted by Realignment, and provides services and due process protections to those who are on PRCS, Mandatory Supervision, and parole. Attorneys in the

Office work alongside the Realignment Team to provide additional assistance, as needed, for individuals on Mandatory Supervision and parole.

The attorney assigned to the Realignment Team has extensive training and experience and understands the wide range of service needs of the Team's clients. The attorney is an effective advocate for the use of alternative sentencing strategies and equally well-versed in the legal issues and advocacy techniques required in the revocation process. The attorney provides legal representation during administrative hearings and investigates cases, litigates motions, conducts conference hearings with the District Attorney and Parole Liaison, and conducts formal revocation hearings.

The attorney has also been responsible for designing alternative sentencing strategies and identifying clients who are eligible for collaborative courts and other evidence-based programs. This attorney trains fellow deputy public defenders on alternative sentencing strategies and implementation of evidence-based strategies to improve legal and social outcomes. The attorney also works closely with the District Attorney's alternative sentencing planner to explore and develop new sentencing schemes.

The criminal justice specialist is a highly experienced reentry specialist with a social work background who conducts comprehensive assessments to determine client needs. The criminal justice specialist collaborates with the District Attorney's alternative sentencing planner and with the Adult Probation Department's AB109 Unit to help identify new referrals and to discuss progress of clients who are receiving services. The criminal justice specialist performs clinical work, assesses client needs, refers clients to services, and advocates for these individuals both in and out of court. Together with the attorney, the criminal justice specialist explores and advocates for community-based sanctions and seeks appropriate placements and programs for qualifying individuals.

#### **COORDINATION WITH EXISTING REENTRY PROGRAMS**

The Public Defender's Realignment Team and Reentry Unit provide an innovative blend of legal, social and practice support through the Clean Slate and Social Work components. The Reentry Unit's social workers provide high quality clinical work and advocacy, effectively placing hundreds of individuals in drug treatment and other service programs each year.

The Office's Clean Slate Program assists over 5,000 individuals each year who are seeking to "clean up" their records of criminal arrests and/or convictions. Clean Slate helps remove significant barriers to employment, housing, public benefits, civic participation, immigration, and attainment of other social, legal, and personal goals. The program prepares and files over 1,500 legal motions in court annually, conducts regular community outreach, distributes over 6,000 brochures in English and Spanish, and holds weekly walk-in clinics at five community-based sites, in predominantly African American and Latino neighborhoods most heavily impacted by the criminal justice system. The Clean Slate program also holds hours at the CASC to serve APD clients.

With the passage of new laws specifically aimed at the Realignment population, the Realignment Team has assisted many clients with getting their records expunged.

#### **ADVOCATE USE OF ALTERNATIVE SENTENCES**

The Public Defender's Office continues to conduct in-house trainings about alternative sentences, reflected in CCSF's high percentage of PC § 1170(h) split sentences. The Realignment social worker successfully advocates in court for alternative sentences, including making appropriate placements of PC § 1170(h) individuals in residential programs prior to completion of their jail sentences and working with the District Attorney's office alternative sentencing planner to identify alternative sentences.

The Office has successfully advocated for the expansion of existing eligibility criteria for Collaborative Courts, including Drug Court, to now include PC § 1170(h) clients.

#### **PRE-TRIAL REFORM**

The Public Defender's Office is actively involved in the San Francisco Sentencing Commission. The Public Defender, along with other partners, continue to develop strategies to reduce San Francisco's pre-trial jail population, advocate for sentencing reform, and implement evidence-based policies that reduce recidivism.

#### **PAROLEE REPRESENTATION**

The Public Defender's Office represents San Francisco parolees facing parole revocation proceedings in Parole Court. The parole attorney has handled over 600 parole revocation petitions since July 1, 2013. San Francisco parolees have significant housing and service barriers to their reintegration into the community. The attorney assigned to Parole Court is an experienced attorney with a strong understanding of collaborative court principles. He works closely with community-based treatment providers to identify resources and services for this high-risk and high-needs population and has been very successful in connecting parolees to treatment and services. The parole attorney, District Attorney, Court, and Division of Adult Parole Operations work closely to ensure that parolees are provided with opportunities to address their underlying needs. That said, however, housing and treatment resources in San Francisco remain inadequate to serve this very high-needs population.

### ***San Francisco Sheriff's Department Initiatives***

The San Francisco Sheriff's Department continues to provide programming and services focused on reducing recidivism for individuals in custody and in the community.

#### **IN-CUSTODY PROGRAMS**

The Sheriff's in-custody programs include: Resolve to Stop the Violence Project (RSVP), Roads to Recovery, Sisters in Sober Treatment Empowered in Recovery (SISTERS), Community of Veterans Engaged in Recovery (COVER), NextCourse culinary programming, academic and vocational education by Five Keys Charter School, and a bicycle repair and maintenance class.

In 2014, the Five Keys Charter School and the Sheriff's Department introduced a digital learning experience to the incarcerated by issuing tablet computers to students in educational programs. The tablets are loaded with educational and reentry curriculum and resources. The digital skill-building in the blended learning environment of the jail allows students to work at their own pace, and helps build skills necessary for employment in the workforce upon reentry.

The Sheriff's Department continues its successful partnership with the Adult Probation Department in managing the Reentry Pod, the housing unit designed to prepare sentenced inmates from CDCR for reentry into the community.

## **VISITING SERVICES**

Family and friends visiting inmates at County Jail 5 in San Bruno are now able to utilize an online visiting sign up system, rather than signing up through the phone hotline or in person at the jail. Additionally, construction is nearing completion of a new bus stop at County Jail 5 that will allow public transportation to stop right at the front gate. These initiatives improve inmates' connections to their families and communities, which can improve their successful transition to the community upon their release from custody.

## **COMMUNITY PROGRAMS**

The Sheriff's Department has a long-established unit providing alternatives to incarceration. This unit oversees a variety of employment and educational programs including: the Sheriff's Work Alternative Program (SWAP), a work program available to eligible individuals in lieu of incarceration; the Post Release Education Program (PREP), which provides reentry, educational, vocational, substance abuse treatment, anger management, and batterers' intervention classes; electronic monitoring; and a variety of specialized services designed to help ex-offenders successfully reenter the community following periods of incarceration.

The Five Keys Charter School, with classrooms in the County Jail, APD's office in the Hall of Justice, and the CASC, provides individual skill development to students in pursuit of their high school diploma, GED, or other academic goals, including basic literacy and services for English language learners. Assessment tools are used to establish students' academic level and Five Keys instructors work with students to establish academic goals and plans to achieve them.

The Women's Resource Center (WRC), located at 830 Bryant Street, is designed to give women the services necessary to achieve and maintain safe and healthy lifestyles. Services include assistance and referrals for housing, substance abuse programs, employment readiness training and placement, mental health services, and legal assistance. Personal development classes including empowerment groups, relapse prevention, and visual and written performing arts, are offered. Workshops focus on vocational skills, life skills, violence prevention, computer instruction, culinary arts and nutrition, parenting skills, and financial literacy.

## **VICTIMS' SERVICES**

The Sheriff's Department Survivor Restoration Program (SRP) provides services for survivors of violence and crime. SRP provides survivors with a needs assessment, safety planning, and domestic violence support groups, and connects clients to other Survivor Restoration Programs. SRP also raises awareness about the importance of restorative justice programs that hold offenders accountable, repair the harm caused by crime, and provide survivor restoration, empowerment, and community involvement for both. Survivors are supported while navigating through family, criminal, and civil appearances, as well as other criminal justice and city agencies. Through the SRP, survivors of domestic and random violence whose perpetrators are participating in Sheriff's Department in-custody offender programs are provided with advocacy and support services. Offenders are provided with the opportunity to hear about the experiences of survivors of violence and the lifelong impact of crime.

## **VICTIM NOTIFICATION**

The Sheriff's Department implemented Victim Information and Notification Everyday (VINE) in August 2014. VINE is a free service that provides notifications to victims regarding changes to an inmate's custody status. Notifications of an inmate's transfer to another jurisdiction occur within eight hours and notifications of an inmate's release occur within 30 minutes.

## ***Department of Public Health Initiatives***

The San Francisco Health Network (SFHN) continues to partner with the Adult Probation Department in creating innovative mechanisms to improve the health outcomes of all Realignment clients. Regardless of the presenting problem—behavioral health, primary medical care, or stabilization needs—the SFHN provides primary intervention and authorization into the larger system of care in San Francisco County. Through the work of the AB109 Case Management Unit within the SFHN’s Behavioral Health Services, AB109 clients who meet medical necessity can avail themselves of a spectrum of holistic, appropriate, and culturally-competent care. This matrix of services is comprehensive and integrated, and provides an opportunity for all AB109 clients to achieve their highest levels of wellness and recovery.

The AB109 Case Management Unit is intentionally co-located with other important programs that address the needs of clients with outstanding health concerns. These services include direct access to substance abuse and mental health services, assessment and triage into primary care medical services, narcotic replacement therapies (including buprenorphone induction), treatment engagement activities, medically-assisted detoxification services, access to pharmacy services and medications, and stabilization housing.

It is with this commitment to returning residents that the program seeks to inspire those it serves, achieving wellness and recovery. Continuing efforts in quality improvement and service delivery have focused on three areas:

1. Enhancing the matrix of services to be more responsive to the needs of San Francisco’s AB109 clients.
2. Recruiting experienced staff with the clinical expertise and knowledge of the forensics population.
3. Investing in specific clinical interventions that target critical areas of concern for AB109 clients.

These guiding principles inform the SFHN Behavioral Health Services in its work with AB109 clients.

Over the course of the reporting period, 217 AB109 clients were referred to the AB109 Case Management Unit for the purposes of screening and assessment (898 have been referred since AB109’s inception). This is comprised of 35 PC § 1170(h) clients and 182 PRCS clients. A total of 140 were deemed to have met medical necessity and were authorized for ongoing care within the larger service delivery system.

## ***Superior Court Initiatives***

The Superior Court continues to review and make appropriate adjustments to current processes and procedures to respond to the requirements of Realignment legislation. The Court also provides updated education and training for all staff, judges, and hearing officers in the areas of PRCS, Mandatory Supervision, PC § 1170(h) sentencing, and parole hearings.

The Court has enhanced its information technology and data analysis capacity in order to produce data on Realignment populations within the Court. As a result, the Court has developed and refined processes and procedures regarding PC § 1170(h) sentencing and PC § 3455 PRCS violations. The Court is in the initial phases

of developing and implementing a new case management system. Current and desired AB109 processes, data collecting, and tracking tools will be a part of the new system.

The Court expanded its capacity to hear parole revocation matters in Department 22 to every afternoon as of October 2014.

Standing committees with Adult Probation, Public Defender and District Attorney representatives meet regularly to discuss current policies and procedures related to parole revocations, PRCS, Mandatory Supervision and other AB109-related issues to identify adjustments and refinements that are needed.

## ***Human Services Agency Initiatives***

Entitlement programs such as Medi-Cal, CalFresh and County Adult Assistance Programs (CAAP) play a critical role in supporting successful community reentry by providing eligible individuals with health coverage, nutrition assistance, and cash aid. During the past year, the Human Services Agency (HSA) has worked collaboratively with Adult Probation, the Sheriff's Department and the Department of Public Health to ensure that justice-involved individuals are linked to public benefits.

Beginning in August 2014, these City agencies implemented a pilot program to pre-enroll jail inmates in health coverage prior to their release date. The pilot was designed to capitalize on the Affordable Care Act's expansion of Medi-Cal eligibility to previously ineligible low-income single adults. During the three-month pilot, 75 applications were taken in the jails, 69 of which were approved (92 percent). Five of the remaining six applications were forwarded to another county of residence for processing and one was denied. More importantly, a business process for taking in-custody health care applications has now been established and tested, and the lessons learned will be used to take this effort to scale in 2015.

Other HSA activities in 2014 included the following:

- > An eligibility worker was out-stationed two days per week at the Community Assessment and Service Center (CASC) to take applications for CAAP, CalFresh and Medi-Cal. An average of six Adult Probation clients are submitting applications every day.
- > A benefits outreach video targeted to Reentry clients was produced and will be shown at exit orientation workshops, the CASC, and other venues beginning in December 2014.
- > Periodic information sessions about public benefits and services were delivered by HSA staff to inmates within the Reentry Pod.



---

# Outcomes from the First Three Years

## *Completions, Sanctions, and Recidivism*


### **COMPLETIONS**

Since the outset of Realignment, 605 individuals sentenced under PC § 1170(h) have completed their jail sentences, including 286 individuals who were released at sentencing due to their credits for time served.

Mandatory Supervision clients complete supervision through completion of their court-ordered Mandatory Supervision term, revocation or termination of their term by the Court, or transferring their supervision to another jurisdiction. PRCS clients serve a term of up to three years, but are released after any 12 consecutive months without a custodial sanction and may be released after six successful months on PRCS, per the Chief Adult Probation Officer's discretion. Overall, 60 percent of the 631 individuals completing a PRCS or Mandatory Supervision term with APD during the first three years of Realignment completed successfully. As of September 30, 2014, 532 PRCS clients had spent at least 12 months on PRCS. Of these, 332 (62 percent) were released for having no custodial sanctions for 12 consecutive months

Of the 777 releases to PRCS during the first three years of Realignment, 433 (56 percent) completed or were terminated from PRCS, with most of these completions (332 or 77 percent) due to the clients completing 12 consecutive months without a custodial sanction. Six PRCS clients were released early after six successful months on PRCS. Sixty-four PRCS clients (15 percent of all completions) were terminated by the Court, mostly due to other pending charges. Twenty-four clients who completed PRCS during this time period (6 percent) were on PRCS to complete their parole terms after having been returned to custody and did so successfully. Seven clients died while on PRCS. Another forty clients transferred to other counties.

**Chart 11. 433 PRCS Clients have Completed  
October 2011 - September 2014**




Notes: RTC refers to those parole violators who were returned to custody (RTC) to state prison prior to October 1, 2011 and released to PRCS after October 1, 2011 to complete the remainder of their parole term on PRCS.

Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

From the outset of Realignment through September 2014, 153 of the 352 individuals who began a Mandatory Supervision term (43 percent) completed or were terminated from supervision. Of those, 43 (28 percent of all completions) completed their Mandatory Supervision term successfully, 64 (42 percent) were terminated unsuccessfully or had their Mandatory Supervision term revoked, and 46 individuals' (30 percent) Mandatory Supervision term expired while in custody for a violation or new charge. Another 8 individuals who began a Mandatory Supervision term were transferred to another county.

**Chart 12. 153 Mandatory Supervision Clients have Completed  
October 2011 - September 2014**




Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

## SANCTIONS

Under the authority granted by AB109 to impose flash incarcerations for PRCS clients for up to 10 days (PC § 3454b), APD imposed 593 flash incarcerations for 253 PRCS clients.<sup>9</sup> A majority of PRCS clients, 67 percent, had no flashes imposed, while 12 percent had received one flash, 10 percent had received two flashes, 5 percent had received three flashes, and 6 percent had received four or more flashes. The average length of a flash incarceration was 9 days.

**Chart 13. Number of Flash Incarcerations Imposed on PRCS Clients, October 2011 - September 2014**



Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department


The next level of sanction imposed for PRCS clients, after a flash incarceration, is a PRCS violation (PC § 3455a), which is filed for a more serious violation of supervision terms, a pattern of non-compliance that continues after flash incarcerations have been imposed, or for a new law violation that may or may not be pursued as a new charge. A majority of PC § 3455a violations result in a sentence in County Jail. Others result in a period of time on electronic monitoring. Over the first two years of Realignment, APD imposed 747 PC § 3455a violations for 316 PRCS clients, 17 of which resulted in electronic monitoring sentences while the rest resulted in jail sentences averaging 80 days.<sup>10</sup>

A majority, 59 percent, of PRCS clients did not receive a PC § 3455a violation during the first three years of Realignment. Eighteen percent of PRCS clients received one violation, nine percent received two, six percent received three, four percent received four, and four percent received five or more violations.

<sup>9</sup> San Francisco provides for due process and legal representation prior to any flash incarceration under PC § 3454. See Community Corrections Executive Committee, *Public Safety Realignment in San Francisco: The First 12 Months*: December 19, 2012, page 27.

<sup>10</sup> Time served for a PC § 3455a violation is eligible for half time credits and therefore individuals serve half of their sentence.


**Chart 14. PC § 3455a Violations Imposed on PRCS Clients  
October 2011 - September 2014**



Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department:

Over one-half of PRCS clients, 59 percent, received neither a flash incarceration nor a violation during the first three years of Realignment. Ten percent received one or more flash but did not subsequently receive a PC § 3455a violation, while 23 percent received one or more flash and one or more violation. Eighteen percent of PRCS clients received a violation but not a flash, most of which (70 percent) were for new law violations.


**Chart 15. PRCS Clients, by Sanction(s) Imposed  
October 2011 - September 2014**



Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Of the 747 PC § 3455a violations imposed, 549 (73 percent) were due to a new law violation, rather than a technical violation. Thirty-six percent of these were due to a property crime arrest, thirty percent to a violent crime arrest, and twenty-nine percent to a drug or narcotic crime arrest. The remaining five percent of PC § 3455a violations issued for new law violations were due to another warrant (three percent), a violation of a stay away order (two percent), a failure to report, another condition violation, or a sex crime arrest (each less than one percent).


**Chart 16. PC § 3455a Violations Issued for New Law Violations,  
October 2011 - September 2014  
by Type of Crime**



Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Of the 549 violations issued for a new law violation, 131 resulted in a new sentence, most of which (37 percent) were a new felony probation grant. Seventeen percent were felony charges resulting in a county jail and probation sentence, another 15 percent were misdemeanor charges resulting in county jail sentences, 19 percent resulted in state prison sentences, and 10 percent resulted in PC § 1170(h) sentences.

**Chart 17. PRCS Violations for a New Charge Resulting in a New Sentence,  
October 2011 - September 2014  
by Type of Sentence**



Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

PRCS clients are required to report to APD within two days of their release from state prison. Of the 777 PRCS clients released to San Francisco from October 2011 through September 2014, 91 percent complied with this


requirement. Of the 70 individuals who did not report within two days and for whom a warrant was issued, 67 subsequently reported, over half of them within two weeks of issuance of the warrant. Three individuals have yet to report.

Per AB109, probation departments are not provided the same sanctioning tools for Mandatory Supervision as for PRCS, namely the authority to impose flash incarcerations and PC § 3455a violations. Therefore, when a Mandatory Supervision client is not in compliance, the result is either a charge for a new crime or a Motion to Revoke (MTR) for a violation of his or her supervision terms.

During the first three years of Realignment, 131 Mandatory Supervision clients (40 percent) were arrested at least once for new charges for a total of 211 arrests.<sup>11</sup> Of these arrests, 41 (19 percent) resulted in charges being dismissed, 95 (45 percent) resulted in a MTR, 48 (23 percent) resulted in a sentence for a new charge, and 23 (11 percent) were pending as of September 30, 2014.

Of the 111 clients who were arrested and subsequently charged, most (70 percent) were arrested only once. Twenty-seven percent of these clients were arrested twice, six percent three times, and four clients were arrested four or more times. About half of the new law violation arrests that were not subsequently dismissed were due to a property crime charge, thirty-nine percent to a drug or narcotics charge, eleven percent to a violent crime charge, and one percent each to a sex offense charge or violation of a stay away order.


**Chart 18. Number of Arrests of Mandatory Supervision Clients, October 2011 - September 2014**



Notes: Includes arrests for reasons other than non-compliance that occurred in San Francisco County.  
 Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

<sup>11</sup> Not including arrests for technical violations or those that were connected to the same court number as the original Mandatory Supervision sentence.


**Chart 19. Mandatory Supervision Arrests  
October 2011 - September 2014,  
by Arrest Reason**



Notes: Includes arrests in San Francisco County only. Does not include those arrests for which charges were later dismissed.  
Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Almost two-thirds of all arrests for which charges were not dismissed resulted in a Motion to Revoke Mandatory Supervision while a quarter resulted in a new sentence. Slightly more drug and narcotics arrests resulted in an MTR than in a new sentence and a majority of non-compliance arrests arrested in an MTR while few resulted in a new sentence.


**Chart 20. Arrest Charge Results for Arrest Types, Mandatory Supervision Arrests,  
October 2011 - September 2014**



Notes: Includes arrests in San Francisco County only. Does not include those arrests for which charges were later dismissed.  
Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

Of the 57 Mandatory Supervision arrests that resulted in new sentences, 80 percent were for felony charges and 20 percent were for misdemeanors. About a third were sentenced to a new PC § 1170(h) sentence, over a quarter to county jail, 19 percent to county jail and probation, and the remaining 19 percent were sentenced to the Community Justice Center (7), a new grant of probation (3), or court probation (1).

**Chart 21. Mandatory Supervision Arrests Resulting in a New Sentence, October 2011 - September 2014 by Type of Sentence**




Notes: Includes arrests in San Francisco County only.  
Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

**RECIDIVISM**

The Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) defines recidivism as “a subsequent criminal adjudication/conviction while on probation supervision,” as determined at the time the individual completes supervision.<sup>12</sup> According to this definition, San Francisco’s recidivism rate for AB109 clients for the first three years is 14 percent. The recidivism rates for PRCS and Mandatory Supervision clients are comparable, at 13 and 14 percent, respectively. The overall recidivism rate for AB109 clients has remained at 14 percent since the previous year, as has the PRCS rate, while the recidivism rate for Mandatory Supervision clients has dropped from 21 percent in September 2013 to 14 percent in September 2014.

**Chart 22. PRCS and Mandatory Supervision Felony Recidivism, October 2011 - September 2014**



Source: San Francisco Adult Probation Department

<sup>12</sup> This includes those whose new conviction resulted in terminating their supervision term.

Direct comparisons to recidivism rates for this population prior to AB109 are difficult, due to the fundamental differences in the recidivism definitions used. Prior to AB109 implementation, CDCR reported a parole recidivism rate in San Francisco of 78 percent, defining recidivism as any return to custody in the first three years after release from state prison. The recidivism definition used by CPOC is more specific, measuring only new convictions during one's time on supervision. The most comparable measure to CDCR's pre-AB109 recidivism measure is APD's compliance rate for PRCS and Mandatory Supervision clients. Those clients who did not receive any custodial sanctions (PRCS) or new arrests<sup>13</sup> resulting in an MTR or new sentence (Mandatory Supervision) are considered in compliance. Over the first three years of Realignment, the compliance rate for PRCS clients was 50 percent, up slightly from 49 percent over the first two years of Realignment. For Mandatory Supervision clients, the compliance rate was 57 percent, a slight decrease from a 60 percent compliance rate over the first two years of Realignment. Therefore from October 2011 through September 2014, 50 percent of PRCS and 43 percent of Mandatory Supervision clients were returned to custody at some point during their supervision terms, representing a drastic reduction from the parole return to custody rate of 78 percent prior to AB109.

.....  
13 Includes only those arrests for new charges rather than for technical violations, thus making the measure not fully comparable to CDCR's recidivism measure, which measures the return to custody for any reason.



# Appendix A

**Table 4. Available Rehabilitation Services  
San Francisco Adult Probation Department**

SFAPD-Funded Services	Description of Services	Capacity
<b>Outpatient and Residential Behavioral Health Treatment and Health Care Enrollment</b>	SFAPD clients are referred to the SF Department of Public Health's Behavioral Health Access Center or the Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC), where Care Coordinators assess for placement in behavioral health treatment and sober living environments. Clients are also connected to health coverage.	<i>All APD clients can be referred to DPH for assessment and placement into an array of community based treatment providers.</i>
<b>Basic Needs</b>	DPOs distribute Muni tokens, hygiene kits, and clothing vouchers to clients in need. Clients are provided assistance in applying for the Federal Lifeline cell phone service program and provided verification for reduced-fee California IDs from the Department of Motor Vehicles. The CASC provides meals free of charge for clients.	<i>All APD clients are eligible to receive basic needs items.</i>
<b>Intensive Case Management</b>	All SFAPD clients may be referred to receive intensive case management and barrier removal services from Leaders in Community Alternatives (LCA), which operates the CASC in partnership with SFAPD. Eligible clients may be referred to Senior Ex-Offender Program and Citywide Case Management, which provide intensive case management and resource brokerage.	<i>LCA/CASC: 150</i>  <i>SEOP (for clients ages 40+): 30</i>  <i>UCSF/Citywide (for clients with mental health disorders): 30</i>
<b>Clinical Interventions</b>	In partnership with the Department of Public Health, clients of SFAPD may be referred for clinical assessments, brief therapy, and resource brokerage by clinicians based at SFAPD and the CASC.	<i>DPH Clinicians: Up to 50 clients.</i>  <i>Intensive Supervision Court: Up to 50 clients.</i>
<b>Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC)</b>	The CASC is an innovative "one-stop" community corrections reentry center that provides on-site supervision of clients and comprehensive case management, and co-locates services including a charter school, vocational training, behavioral health services, and cognitive behavioral groups that address criminal attitudes and behaviors. The CASC also helps to reduce barriers to accessing health and public benefits by providing office space for public sector partners, including the Department of Public Health and Human Services Agency.	<i>600 unduplicated clients per year.</i>

SFAPD-Funded Services	Description of Services	Capacity
<b>Basic Literacy and Secondary Education</b>	Five Keys Charter High School provides educational instruction and preparation for students interested in receiving a GED or High School Diploma. Five Keys has sites at the Learning Center at the Hall of Justice inside SFAPD and at the CASC.	<i>Learning Center at HOJ: Up to 15 students at a time.</i>  <i>CASC Learning Center: Up to 15 students at a time.</i>
<b>Emergency Stabilization Units</b>	Homeless and extremely unstable clients of SFAPD are referred to short-term stabilization rooms in partnership with Department of Public Health Housing and Urban Health.	<i>There are 46 stabilization units.</i>
<b>Job Training and Employment</b>	Clients of all ages and educational backgrounds are referred to America Works, which provides job training and placement services. 18-25-year-old clients may also be referred to the Interrupt Predict and Organize (IPO) Employment Initiative, a project of the Mayor's Office of Violence Prevention Services; 18-21-year-old clients may be referred to the Occupational Therapy Training Program.	<i>America Works: 108 APD clients to be placed in unsubsidized employment.</i>  <i>IPO: Potential for 100 clients as Mayor's office adds new cohorts</i>
<b>Reentry Pod</b>	In collaboration with the Sheriff's Department, SFAPD and its partner agencies provide pre-release case management, engagement, and interventions to up to 56 individuals who will be released to probation supervision. The Reentry Pod serves individuals who have 30-120 days remaining in custody. Eligible clients include those who will be released to PRCS, Mandatory Supervision under PC § 1170(h), or felony probation.	<i>The Reentry Pod houses up to 56 men.</i>
<b>Restorative Justice/Victim-Offender Education</b>	SFAPD clients may be referred to attend Restorative Justice process groups provided by Insight Prison Project. These groups meet for six hours per week on an ongoing basis.	<i>Up to 12 clients at a time.</i>
<b>Sex Offender Treatment</b>	SFAPD clients mandated to treatment under the Containment Model receive treatment from San Francisco Forensics Institute. Clients receive treatment for at least one full year, typically during one group and one individual session per week.	<i>All mandated clients to be referred for services under the containment model.</i>
<b>Thinking for a Change</b>	SFAPD clients may be referred to cognitive behavioral groups facilitated by staff trained by the National Institute of Corrections. Thinking for a Change groups meet twice per week for 13 weeks, for a total of 26 two-hour sessions.	<i>Up to 15 clients per cohort.</i>
<b>Transitional Housing</b>	Partnerships with community-based providers provide clients access to transitional housing, which combine short-term housing with assistance in identifying permanent housing options in San Francisco. Forthcoming partnerships will expand transitional housing capacity.	<i>There are up to 24 transitional housing units.</i>
<b>Transitional Rental Subsidies</b>	Work-ready or employed clients may be referred to the New Roads Rental Subsidy Program, operated by Tenderloin Housing Clinic, for partial rental subsidies for up to one year.	<i>Up to 15 rental subsidies at any point in time.</i>

# Appendix B

**Table 5. Characteristics of AB109 Individuals,  
October 2011 through September 2014**

	PRCS Individuals		PC § 1170(h)-Sentenced Individuals		Parole Violators		Total		San Francisco Pop. (2010 Census)
	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	
Total	777		628		4,759		6,164		805,235
<b>GENDER</b>									
Male	716	92%	549	87%	4,513	95%	5,778	94%	51%
Female	61	8%	79	13%	246	5%	386	6%	49%
<b>AGE</b>									
Average Age, Men	40		38		41		41		39
Average Age, Women	39		38		37		38		39
18–24 Years	64	8%	69	11%	249	5%	382	6%	10%
25–39 Years	320	41%	296	47%	1,904	40%	2,520	41%	30%
40–54 Years	316	41%	209	33%	2,136	45%	2,661	43%	22%
55–69 Years	77	10%	52	8%	455	10%	584	9%	16%
70+ Years	0	0%	2	0%	15	0%	17	0%	10%
<b>RACE / ETHNICITY</b>									
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	0%	NA	NA	29	1%	31	1%	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	38	5%	44	7%	143	3%	225	4%	36%
African American / Black	451	58%	351	56%	2,962	62%	3,764	61%	7%
Hispanic	100	13%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7%
Other	26	3%	NA	NA	133	3%	159	3%	NA
White	158	20%	216	34%	1,449	30%	1,823	30%	54%
Unknown	2	0%	17	3%	43	1%	62	1%	3%

**Table 6. Characteristics of Post Release Community Supervision Clients**

	#	% of Total		#	% of Total
Total PRCS Population	777		<b>ACTIVE PRCS CLIENTS BY CDCR FACILITY OF RELEASE</b>		
<b>PRCS COMPLETIONS</b>			California State Prison, San Quentin	254	33%
Return to Custody PRCS Clients	24	3%	California Correctional Center	41	5%
Successful Early Completions (6 month)	6	1%	Valley State Prison for Women	31	4%
Successful Completions (12 months)	332	43%	Deuel Vocational Institution	26	3%
Terminated by the Court	64	8%	Folsom State Prison	26	3%
Completions due to Client's Death	7	1%	California Medical Facility	21	3%
<b>HOLDS</b>			Avenal State Prison	19	2%
PRCS Clients with ICE Hold	19	2%	Sierra Conservation Center	19	2%
PRCS Clients with Federal Hold	4	1%	CA Substance Abuse Treatment Facility	18	2%
PRCS Clients with State Hold	4	1%	Correctional Training Facility	17	2%
PRCS Clients with Other County Hold	12	2%	California State Prison, Solano	15	2%
<b>PRCS CLIENTS' PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS</b>			High Desert State Prison	14	2%
Average Number of Prior Convictions	7		California State Prison, Sacramento	12	2%
0 Prior Convictions	51	7%	California Men's Colony	11	1%
1 – 2 Prior Convictions	78	10%	Pelican Bay State Prison	9	1%
3 – 5 Prior Convictions	221	28%	Salinas Valley State Prison	9	1%
6 – 10 Prior Convictions	257	33%	North Kern State Prison	8	1%
11 or More Prior Convictions	170	22%	California Institute for Men	8	1%
<b>PRCS CLIENTS' MOST SERIOUS PRIOR CONVICTION</b>			California Correctional Institution	8	1%
Violent Crime	358	46%	California State Prison, Corcoran	7	1%
Property Crime	161	21%	California Institution for Women	6	1%
Weapons Crime	106	14%	Central California Women's Facility	6	1%
Drug Crime	68	9%	Mule Creek State Prison, Ione	5	1%
Vehicle Crime	22	3%	Contract Bed Unit	5	1%
Sex Offense	17	2%	California Rehabilitation Center	4	1%
Fraud	8	1%	Calipatria State Prison	3	<1%
Arson	5	1%	Kern Valley State Prison	2	<1%
Gang Crime	1	0%	Pleasant Valley State Prison	2	<1%
Total with violent, weapons, or sex crime	481	62%	Wasco State Prison	2	<1%
			Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	1	<1%
			Centinela State Prison	1	<1%
			Court Walkover / Transfer from another County	142	18%

**Table 7. Characteristics of PC § 1170(h)-Sentenced Individuals**

	#	% of Total		#	% of Total
<b>ALL PC § 1170(H) SENTENCES</b>			<b>PC § 1170(H)(5)(B) - SPLIT SENTENCES</b>		
Total Sentenced under PC § 1170(h)	628		<i>Jail Portion</i>		
Total Sentenced to Jail Only - PC § 1170(h)(5)(a)	279	44%	Low Sentence Length (months)	0	
Total Sentenced to Split Sentence - PC § 1170(h)(5)(b)	349	56%	High Sentence Length (months)	55	
			Average Sentence Length (months)	12	
<b>PC § 1170(H)(5)(A) - STRAIGHT JAIL SENTENCES</b>			Number Whose Jail Sentence is Served with Credit for Time Served	142	41%
Low Sentence Length (months)	3		Average Sentence if Not Released at Sentencing	5	
High Sentence Length (months)	144		<i>Mandatory Supervision Portion</i>		
Average Sentence Length (months)	28		Low Sentence Length (months)	1	
Number Whose Jail Sentence is Served with Credit for Time Served	111	40%	High Sentence Length (months)	78	
Average Sentence if Not Released at Sentencing	7		Average Sentence Length (months)	26	

**Table 8. Characteristics of State Parole Violators**

	#	% of Total		#	% of Total
<b>PC § 1170(H) SENTENCES</b>			<b>NUMBER OF PAROLE VIOLATIONS PER INDIVIDUAL</b>		
Total Individuals Sentenced to Parole Violation	1,618		1	729	45%
Total Number of Parole Violations	4,855		2	271	17%
Average Number of Violations per Individual	3		3	166	10%
			4	131	8%
			5	92	6%
			6	52	3%
			7	50	3%
			8	34	2%
			9	25	2%
			10	13	1%
			11	21	1%
			12	5	0%
			13	13	1%
			14 or more	16	1%



---

# Appendix C

## ***Legislative Background and Context***

Over the last two years, the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) has embraced the implementation of the Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 (“Realignment,” also known as Assembly Bill 109 [AB109]), and related legislation. It has been widely observed that Realignment is the most significant change in California’s criminal justice policy in over 50 years. Realignment amended a broad array of statutes concerning where a defendant will serve his or her sentence and how a defendant is to be supervised upon release from custody. In enacting Realignment, the Legislature declared, “Criminal Justice policies that rely on building and operating more prisons to address community safety concerns are not sustainable and will not result in improved public safety. California must reinvest its criminal justice resources to support community based corrections programs and evidence-based practices that will achieve improved public safety returns on this state’s substantial investment in its criminal justice system. Realigning low-level felony offenders who do not have prior convictions for serious, violent or sex offenses to locally run community based corrections programs, which are strengthened through community based punishment, evidence-based practices, improved supervision strategies, and enhanced secured capacity, will improve public safety outcomes among adult felons and facilitate their reintegration back into society.” [Cal. Pen. Code § 17.5(a)(3)-(5)]

A summary of the four major changes enacted by Realignment follows:

**Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS):** Individuals released from state prison on or after October 1, 2011, who were serving sentences for non-serious, non-violent, non-sex offenses, are released to Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS). Prior to October 1, 2011, these individuals would have been released to parole. The San Francisco Adult Probation Department administers PRCS. PRCS revocations are heard in San Francisco Superior Court, and revocation sentences are served in San Francisco County Jail.

**Cal. Pen. Code § 1170(h):** Individuals convicted of certain felonies on or after October 1, 2011, may be sentenced to San Francisco County Jail for more than 12 months. Individuals sentenced under PC § 1170(h) may be sentenced to the low, mid, or upper term of a triad. The individual may be sentenced to serve that entire time in county jail, or may be sentenced to serve that time split between county jail and Mandatory Supervision. Mandatory Supervision is administered by the San Francisco Adult Probation Department.

**Flash Incarceration:** Flash Incarceration is defined under Cal. Pen. Code § 3454(c) as a period of detention in county jail for up to ten consecutive days. The San Francisco Adult Probation Department is authorized to impose flash incarcerations for individuals on PRCS, giving the Department the ability to impose shorter, but if necessary, more frequent sanctions for violations of PRCS conditions.

**Adjudication of Parole Violations (Cal. Pen. Code § 3000.08, effective July 1, 2013):** Beginning July 1, 2013, parole revocation proceedings (with the exception of cases involving individuals released from prison

following a life sentence) are no longer administrative proceedings under the jurisdiction of the Board of Parole Hearings. Instead, revocation proceedings are heard by the Superior Court in the county where the parolee was released. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Adult Parole Operations continues to supervise persons placed on parole. As of October 1, 2011, parole violation sentences are no longer served in state prison, but in county jail.

## ***California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009***

The California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009, or Senate Bill 678 (SB678), created the Community Corrections Performance Incentives Fund to encourage the implementation of evidence-based practices in probation departments across California in order to reduce probation revocations to state prison. The law also mandated the creation of a Community Corrections Partnership, chaired by the Chief Probation Officer in each county, to advise on the uses of these funds.

Section 1230.1 of the California Penal Code was amended by AB109 and AB117 to read "(a) Each county local Community Corrections Partnership established pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1230 shall recommend a local plan to the County Board of Supervisors for the implementation of the 2011 public safety realignment. (b) The plan shall be voted on by an executive committee of each county's Community Corrections Partnership consisting of the Chief Probation Officer of the county as chair, a Chief of Police, the Sheriff, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, presiding Judge or his or her designee, and the department representative listed in either section 1230(b)(2)(G), 1230(b)(2)(H), or 1230(b)(2)(J) as designated by the county board of supervisors for purposes related to the development and presentation of the plan. (c) The plan shall be deemed accepted by the County Board of Supervisors unless rejected by a vote of 4/5ths in which case the plan goes back to the Community Corrections Partnership for further consideration. (d) Consistent with local needs and resources, the plan may include recommendations to maximize the effective investment of criminal justice resources in evidence-based correctional sanctions and programs, including, but not limited to, day reporting centers, drug courts, residential multiservice centers, mental health treatment programs, electronic and Global Position System (GPS) monitoring programs, victim restitution programs, counseling programs, community service programs, educational programs, and work training programs.

### About the Funding Formula for AB109

According to the Legislative Analyst Office's Public Safety Realignment Funding Allocation, published May 12, 2014, the 2011 Realignment legislation only specified the first-year allocation (2011-12) of Realignment funding among counties. It requires the Department of Finance (DOF) to determine allocations after 2011-12. The DOF has asked the California State Association of Counties to create the subsequent allocation formulas. For the second and third year of Realignment, each county (except Los Angeles, which was separately given an allocation of \$267.8 million in 2012-13 and \$317.3 million in 2013-14) received an allocation based on whichever of the following formulas benefitted it the most.

The following formula expired at the end of 2013-2014:

- > Double the county's 2011-12 allocation.
- > The 2011-12 formula with updated population and SB678 performance data.
- > A caseload-driven formula based on the number of offenders the county would be responsible for upon full implementation of Realignment as estimated by DOF in 2011.
- > A population-driven formula based on the county's population of adults ages 18 to 64.

In 2014-2015, the funding formula changed to establish a “blended rate,” which combines each county’s share of 2013-14 programmatic funds and its share of 2012-13 growth funds. The blended rate would be applied to 2014-15 base amount of \$934.1 million.<sup>14</sup>

**Table 9. City and County of San Francisco Realignment Budget Detail**

SOURCES	FY 11-12 (9 months)	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
<b>AB109 Revenue Allocation</b>				
Sheriff	\$350,938	\$8,539,301	\$10,500,000	\$10,090,000
Sheriff - Trial Courts				\$11,099,000
Adult Probation, Ongoing	\$4,498,899	\$8,539,301	\$10,500,000	\$10,290,000
Adult Probation, One-Time	\$556,323			
District Attorney	\$190,507	\$109,755	\$200,000	\$170,000
Public Defender	\$190,507	\$109,755	\$200,000	\$170,000
<b>Total AB109 Revenue</b>	<b>\$5,787,174</b>	<b>\$17,298,112</b>	<b>\$21,400,000</b>	<b>\$31,819,000</b>
<b>General Fund Support</b>	<b>\$6,908,912</b>	<b>\$2,339,714</b>	<b>\$2,400,000</b>	<b>\$3,094,808</b>
<b>TOTAL SOURCES</b>	<b>\$12,696,086</b>	<b>\$19,637,826</b>	<b>\$23,800,000</b>	<b>\$34,913,808</b>
USES	FY 11-12 (9 months)	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
Sheriff	\$7,259,850	\$9,679,800	\$11,100,000	\$10,090,000
Sheriff - Trial Courts				\$11,099,000
Adult Probation Supervision, Training and Operations	\$3,238,060	\$6,471,139	\$5,546,400	\$5,888,604
Adult Probation Services, Treatment, and Housing	\$1,817,162	\$2,907,987	\$6,553,600	\$7,496,204
District Attorney	\$190,507	\$289,450	\$300,000	\$170,000
Public Defender	\$190,507	\$289,450	\$300,000	\$170,000
<b>TOTAL USES</b>	<b>\$12,696,086</b>	<b>\$19,637,826</b>	<b>\$23,800,000</b>	<b>\$34,913,808</b>

### Local Planning and Oversight

San Francisco agencies impacted by Realignment benefit from the activities of advisory and policy bodies tasked with examining best practices and approaches to support individuals involved in the criminal justice system.

<sup>14</sup> Final Recommendation of Realignment Allocation Committee (RAC), the California State Association of Counties and the County Administrative Officers Association of California, October 2014.

## **COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP (CCP) & COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (CCPEC)**

California Penal Code § 1203.83 established a Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) in each county, to be chaired by the Chief Probation Officer and charged with advising on the implementation of SB678-funded initiatives. AB109 and AB117 (2011) established an Executive Committee of the CCP charged with development of a plan to implement Realignment, for consideration and adoption by the Board of Supervisors (Cal. Pen. Code § 1230.1). Chaired in San Francisco by the Chief Adult Probation Officer, the CCPEC developed the 2011 and 2012 Implementation Plans, which were approved by the Board of Supervisors on September 29, 2011, and by the CCPEC on June 1, 2012, respectively. The complete 2011 and 2012 Implementation Plans are available at <http://sfgov.org/adultprobation>.

The Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC) provides leadership on the Implementation Plan, oversees the Realignment process, and votes on annual funding allocations. The County's Realignment budget detail for Fiscal Years 2011/12 through 2014/15 is in Table 9 above.

## **REENTRY COUNCIL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

San Francisco's criminal justice leadership recognized the need for coordination of services, policies, and operational practices before the State mandated the creation of the CCP and CCPEC. From 2005 until 2008, two ad hoc reentry councils focused on different aspects of the reentry process in San Francisco communities: the Safe Communities Reentry Council (SCRC), co-chaired by Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi and Public Defender Jeff Adachi, and the San Francisco Reentry Council (SFRC), co-chaired by District Attorney Kamala D. Harris and Sheriff Michael Hennessey. The two councils coordinated their efforts, and jointly developed *Getting Out & Staying Out: A Guide to San Francisco Resources for People Leaving Jails and Prison* in September 2007. In September of 2008, these ad hoc councils were unified and strengthened through the creation of the Reentry Council of the City and County of San Francisco (Reentry Council). The purpose of the Reentry Council (San Francisco Administrative Code 5.1) is to coordinate local efforts to support adults exiting San Francisco County Jail, San Francisco juvenile justice out-of-home placements, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation facilities, and the United States Federal Bureau of Prison facilities. The Council coordinates information sharing, planning, and engagement among all interested private and public stakeholders to the extent permissible under federal and State law.

The success of the Reentry Council is rooted in its shared leadership, engagement of formerly incarcerated representatives, and strong participation of safety net and health care partners. It is co-chaired by the Chief Adult Probation Officer, District Attorney, Mayor, Public Defender, and Sheriff. The Public Defender's Office provided primary staffing of the Council from February 2007 until October 2011, at which time the Adult Probation Department assumed staffing for the Council. Centralizing support for the Reentry Council and Community Corrections Partnership in the Reentry Division of the Adult Probation Department has strengthened citywide collaboration, coordination of resources, and Realignment efforts. The Reentry Council has three subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Policy and Operational Practices, the Subcommittee on Support and Opportunities, and the Subcommittee on Assessments and Connections.

## **SAN FRANCISCO SENTENCING COMMISSION**

The San Francisco Sentencing Commission, established by Article XXV Chapter 5.250 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, was spearheaded and is chaired by District Attorney George Gascón. The Sentencing Commission encourages the development of criminal sentencing strategies that reduce recidivism, prioritize public safety and victim protection, emphasize fairness, employ evidence-based best practices, and efficiently utilize San Francisco's criminal justice resources. The Sentencing Commission analyzes sentencing patterns and outcomes; advises the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and other City departments on the best approaches to

reduce recidivism; and makes recommendations for sentencing reforms that advance public safety and utilize best practices in criminal justice.

The Second Report of the San Francisco Sentencing Commission was issued in December 2014 and is available at <http://sfdistrictattorney.org/index.aspx?page=311>

### **JUSTICE REINVESTMENT INITIATIVE**

In April 2011, the Reentry Council was awarded a technical assistance grant by the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Assistance to participate in the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI). The purpose of JRI is to assist jurisdictions in identifying the major cost drivers of their criminal justice systems, exploring ways to make these systems more cost effective, and generating savings that can be reinvested in evidence-based strategies that increase public safety while holding offenders accountable. States and localities engaging in justice reinvestment collect and analyze data on drivers of criminal justice populations and costs, identify and implement changes to increase efficiencies, and measure both the fiscal and public safety impacts of those changes. Cal. Pen. Code § 3450(b)(7), as added by AB109, states that “fiscal policy and correctional practices should align to promote a justice reinvestment strategy that fits each county.”

The Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice was the technical assistance provider for San Francisco’s JRI Phase I. During Phase I, local partners met with consultants to discuss challenges and identify inefficiencies in San Francisco’s criminal justice system. The consultants then conducted an in-depth analysis of San Francisco’s criminal justice data and identified the main drivers of criminal justice costs. This analysis led to policy recommendations, developed by local partners with support of the JRI team, aimed at reducing inefficiencies and improving outcomes. The three policy strategies that grew out of this work are currently being pursued, are as follows:

- > Strategy 1: Shorten the standard probation term from 36 to 24 months.
- > Strategy 2: Maintain and expand pretrial alternatives to detention, including a consideration of the bail schedule, to further reduce the County Jail population.
- > Strategy 3: Reduce or eliminate disproportionately high involvement of people of color, African Americans in particular, in San Francisco’s criminal justice system.

### **CALIFORNIA RISK ASSESSMENT PILOT PROJECT**

The Judicial Council (formerly the Administrative Office of the Courts) and the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) have been working since 2009 with San Francisco, Napa, Santa Cruz, and Yolo Counties in order to implement evidence-based sentencing practices through the California Risk Assessment Pilot Project (CalRAPP). The project is a collaborative effort bringing together county teams from the superior courts, probation departments, public defenders, district attorneys, and other justice partners.

APD implemented COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions), a validated risk and needs assessment instrument which calculates a client’s criminogenic risks and needs and informs the development of a client’s individualized treatment and rehabilitation plan (ITRP), in 2011. As part of the CalRAPP, Deputy Probation Officers incorporate COMPAS data into the Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) report provided to the Court, which contains critical information about an individual’s criminogenic risk and needs factors for use in sentencing decisions.

Recidivism and revocation rates will be tracked by the CalRAPP team for up to three years for both participating offenders and a control group of similar offenders not participating in the project, to identify the effects of using risk assessment information in sentencing recommendations and decisions.

### **WOMEN'S COMMUNITY JUSTICE REFORM**

Collaborative partners continue to work together to achieve a gender-responsive approach to criminal justice in San Francisco City and County. As discussed earlier, Cameo House, an alternative sentencing program for mothers and their children, was opened in 2014. This innovative collaboration includes several public agencies, including the Courts, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Department of Children and Family Services, and Adult Probation Department. Staffed by Center on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, it is expected that Cameo House will become a statewide and national model for gender-responsive alternative sentencing.

Late 2014 saw the introduction of a gender-specific COMPAS pre-trial assessment tool for women entering the San Francisco County Jail. It is expected that this new tool will result in promotion of better services for women throughout the system.

NOTES

## Chart & Table Index

- Chart 1. San Francisco's Criminal Justice Trends, 2009-2014, 9
- Chart 2. Average Daily Jail Population, by Type of Commitment, October 2011 - September 2014, 10
- Chart 3. Crime Rates, California and San Francisco, 1986-2014\*, 10
- Chart 4. Percentage of San Francisco Residents Not Reporting a Crime, 1986-2014, 11
- Chart 5. Individuals Newly Processed Under AB109 Countywide, October 2011-September 2011, 13
- Chart 6. Average Daily AB109 Population, Adult Probation and Sheriff's Departments, October 2011 - September 2014, 14
- Chart 7. AB109 Population Caseload by Adult Probation and Sheriff's Departments, October 2011-September 2014, 15
- Chart 8. PC § 1170(h) Straight and Split Sentences Imposed by Quarter, Q4 2011-Q3 2014, 16
- Chart 9. Risk Level of Adult Probation Department, AB109 and non-AB109 Clients, 17
- Chart 10. Assessed Needs of APD's AB109 and Non-AB109 Clients, 17
- Chart 11. 433 PRCS Clients have Completed, October 2011-September 2014, 44
- Chart 12. 153 Mandatory Supervision Clients have Completed, October 2011-September 2014, 44
- Chart 13. Number of Flash Incarcerations Imposed on PRCS Clients, October 2011-September 2014, 45
- Chart 14. PC § 3455a Violations Imposed on PRCS Clients, October 2011-September 2014, 46
- Chart 15. PRCS Clients, by Sanction(s) Imposed, October 2011-September 2014, 46
- Chart 16. PC § 3455a Violations Issued for New Law Violations, by Type of Crime, October 2011-September 2014, 47
- Chart 17. PRCS Violations for a New Charge Resulting in a New Sentence, October 2011-September 2014, by Type of Sentence, 47
- Chart 18. Number of Arrests of Mandatory Supervision Clients, October 2011-September 2014, 48
- Chart 19. Mandatory Supervision Arrests, October 2011-September 2014, by Arrest Reason, 49
- Chart 20. Arrest Charge Results for Arrest Types, Mandatory Supervision Arrests, October 2011-September 2014, 49
- Chart 21. Mandatory Supervision Arrests Resulting in a New Sentence, October 2011-September 2014, by Type of Sentence, 50
- Chart 22. PRCS and Mandatory Supervision Felony Recidivism, October 2011-September 2014, 50
- 
- Table 1. PC § 1170(h) Sentence Lengths, 16
- Table 2. Reentry Pod Summary, As of September 2014, 23
- Table 3. APD Referrals to CASC, July 2013 through September 2014, 27
- Table 4. Available Rehabilitation Services San Francisco Adult Probation Department, 53
- Table 5. Characteristics of AB109 Individuals, October 2011 through September 2014, 55
- Table 6. Characteristics of Post Release Community Supervision Clients, 56
- Table 7. Characteristics of PC § 1170(h)-Sentenced Individuals, 57
- Table 8. Characteristics of State Parole Violators, 57
- Table 9. City and County of San Francisco Realignment Budget Detail, 61

---

**Community Corrections Partnership  
and its Executive Committee  
City and County of San Francisco**

---

**Roster of Members**

**WENDY STILL\* (CHAIR)**

Chief Adult Probation Officer  
Adult Probation Department  
<http://sfgov.org/adultprobation/>

**JEFF ADACHI\***

Public Defender  
Office of the Public Defender  
<http://sfpublicdefender.org/>

**BARBARA GARCIA\***

Director  
Department of Public Health  
<https://www.sfdph.org/dph/>

**GEORGE GASCÓN\***

District Attorney  
<http://www.sfdistrictattorney.org/>

**ROSS MIRKARIMI\***

Sheriff  
<http://www.sfsheriff.com/>

**GREGORY SUHR\***

Chief  
Police Department  
<http://sf-police.org/>

**SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE\***

Vacant (Declined to participate due to stated conflict of interest)

**STEVE ARCELONA**

Welfare to Work Director  
Human Services Agency  
<http://www.sfhsa.org/>

**GREG ASAY**

Workforce Division  
Office of Economic Workforce Development  
<http://www.oewd.org/>

**STEVE GOOD**

Executive Director  
Five Keys Charter School  
<http://www.fivekeyscharter.org/>

**PAUL HENDERSON**

Deputy Chief of Staff for Public Safety  
Mayor's Office  
<http://www.sfmayor.org/>

**FRANK WILLIAMS**

Director  
Senior Ex-Offender Program  
<http://www.bhpmss.org/>

OR

**MIMI SILBERT**

President  
Delancey Street Foundation  
<http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/>

**BEVERLY UPTON**

Executive Director  
San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium  
<http://dvcpartners.org/>

\*Member of Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee

---

Wendy Still, Chief Adult Probation Officer  
Chair, Community Corrections Partnership  
San Francisco Adult Probation Department  
880 Bryant Street, Room 200  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 553-1687



<http://sfgov.org/adultprobation>

---

