

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

## Approved 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

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

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 (Sherriff's Department), 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.

### **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, informed the body during the last Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee meeting held on December 18, 2019, the body 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 and how those funds are used and the outcomes.

Geoffrea Morris responded, that is the goal to hire four evaluators, the body also recognized that AB-109 funds intertwine with other general funds which will also be mentioned, if the body agrees, and 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, 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 report and realized how time intensive the project is, and that a lot of programs are dedicated to it. 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, and if not, if someone who is not involve in program or 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 appeared 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 for the public to know and all of us to be aware of how that money is spent and how we supplement from whether the general fund or SB-678 to ensure that services are provided to the individuals we serve.

Tara Anderson, District Attorney's Office, added that it is important to emphasize budget, to zoom out and see the budget from a bigger lens not only exclusive to the allocation of AB-109 but relative to how general fund is being leaned on to enhance the work that is happening or how the funding have been structured to deliver services and programs. She also stated that a lot of communication would happen with them as a department around what are the activities that they are involved in as a part of AB-109 funded activities knowing that their department has the smallest share so they're arguing about a little bit of something and in the past years they provided that narrative to Adult Probation and it has been incorporated. She thinks some components of this as we are thinking of scope of work are not going to be heavy lift on the evaluators, emphasizing their time on the latter components where we are looking at the process of outcomes, not that it is a heavy lean on Tara Agnese, APD Researcher and the analyst team, but also looking whether it would help provide the greatest external expertise, is doing the impact analysis and in previous years which has been broken down on to three different components where we are looking at both the community supervision effects of compliance and violations, also recidivism because we did so much work around the recidivism work group unpacking that term. She would like the body as best as possible to use that logic or have the

evaluators use that logic. She recommended it because it 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 responsivity.

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

Kathy agrees with Danielle with the broader scope of work and it ties with the budget because this was focused realignment and we are so much more expansive than just that issue. Our programs had expansive based on general fund dollars and 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 at a more broad expansive program curriculum to create outline on some of the accomplishments our discharge planning offices and how different departments have been able to work cooperatively to address the needs of those people that come from the criminal justice system but also have ways to address and that needs to be articulated in any report the services and programs really bring in to play to look at the overall criminal justice system and how we are affecting those. She would like to see a report that is more expansive than just the limits of AB-109 especially even 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 identified that you would only spend those dollars on that population. As we have progressed over the years, in most counties it becomes a general fund pot of money and that you could serve anybody because most of these individuals are one day is a PRCS and the next day is a probation formal client or not, is a pretrial client, or however that goes. 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 report that part of the goal was reducing the disproportion involvement of people of color and African Americans in particular in the criminal justice and when we over to the outcomes through the years, (page 43), it talks about completion of sanctions and recidivism which does not touch the issue 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 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.
- 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 the advocacy, 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. 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 pretrial. 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 their mistakes they made. Having to take site control of the building reduced the likelihood of 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 involved and it becomes a different set of issues.

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 partners referral list that can refer to the 7 beds. The other 21 rooms are more 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 him and Lauren Bell had planned is similar to what they did at 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 to 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 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 have 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 be going to 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/>