

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

Approved Minutes

Dates: Wednesday, December 18, 2019
2:00pm to 3:00pm
St. Anthony Foundation
150 Golden Gate Avenue (Poverello Room)
San Francisco, CA 94102

Members Present: Chief Adult Probation Officer **Karen Fletcher** (Chair- Adult Probation Department), **Angelica Almeida** (Department of Public Health); Tara Anderson (District Attorney's Office), Sheriff-Elect Paul Miyamoto (Sheriff's Department); **Simin Shamji**, (Public Defender's Office); and Chief William Scott (San Francisco Police Department)

1. Call to Order and Introductions.

This meeting was called to order by Chair, Chief Probation Officer, Karen Fletcher, at 2:05pm.

2. A Nine/Ten Years Evaluation of Realignment in San Francisco (discussion and action).

The Chair, Chief Probation Officer, Karen Fletcher, informed the body that during the annual Community Corrections Partnership Meeting held on August 15, 2019, the body had a robust conversation about whether or not the body should hire an evaluator to analyze services and programs provided through AB 109 funding. The consensus from this discussion was that the executive committee needed to identify the scope of the work for a possible evaluator. There was also conversations about the funding stream for this report.

The Chair informed the body that today's meeting would begin to identify and solidify the suggested scope of work for this report and the possible funding streams for this report. In addition, the chair stated she would like to identify quarterly dates that would work for this body to meet with the chosen evaluator on the development of this comprehensive nine-year Realignment report.

The Chair then yielded the floor to Veronica Martinez, a member of Adult Probation Finance and Administrative Services Division. Veronica informed the body that three firms and one individual had been pre-qualified for APD's research and evaluation grant. Veronica informed the body that the pre-qualification list was good for 2 years. She stated contracts could be issued anytime within the next two years with a contract period for up to five years. She explained that the RFQ was intentionally broad so that APD could use the pre-qualified vendors in different ways and for different projects. Tara Agnese, an APD researcher, who assisted in developing the Scope of Work (SOW) of the RFQ spoke to the body about what question should be posed to the

researchers. The chair asked for any questions or comments from the larger body. Tara Anderson asked if this RFQ could be used by any agency. Veronica Martinez responded that other agency could use the pre-qualification list for their own department. It could be used by multiple purposes with or without including Adult Probation Department as a partner.

Tara Anderson asked if the four pre-qualified vendors could be disclosed at this time. Veronica Martinez responded, "yes" and she provided the body with the four qualifying firms.

1. Mathematica
2. Social Policy Research Associates, Inc.
3. Urban Institute
4. Rual Lee Britton

Lauren Bell, Director of Adult Probation Department Reentry Division, proposed three ideas on how the body should approach this task:

- 1) To use APD's Research Director, Tara Agnese, to determine what might be a good direction to go in given the scope of the work that you all have in front of you.
- 2) To share a summary of the proposals with the body and for you all to review and collectively determine who the contractor could be for this project and then have a group meeting with that vendor to discuss the project and what the scope could look like together.
- 3) Finally Lauren suggested the departments could meet outside of the CCP to meet with the vendor and determine the Scope of the Work, if direction cannot be decided in today's meeting. Lauren stated unless there are Sunshine Ordinance stipulations that need to be taken into consideration

Geoffrea Morris clarified that if individuals meet with an evaluator within the capacity of the CCP, it would need to happen within a public meeting. Veronica Martinez stated that the proposals are part of public record at this time, so they can be shared at this moment.

The Chair proposed members of the executive committee to go back to their individual departments to determine what is most important to them, and then come back together at one of the CCP Executive committee meetings in the future. The chair recognized it can be very challenging to determine a scope of work for an evaluator in such a limited time as we have today.

Tara Agnese, APD Researcher, stated that she liked Lauren Bell's suggestion of taking a collaborative approach to selecting the vendor to do an evaluation of services. She also wanted to offer some thoughts to keep in mind when going back to your respective departments to discuss what an appropriate scope might be. There are many things captured on the proposed scope table (located in the packet on page 3). She stated some of which may be appropriate within the scope of evaluation of services, but some seem to her as a researcher as beyond the scope of an evaluation of services. She stated some questions for the members to think about as they think about the scope are:

- Do we want to do an evaluation of services?–
- Do we want the next realignment report be a 9-year or a 10-year report. The evaluation of services could be included within the updated realignment report, but an updated

realignment report seems like a different task, which will require data from all departments.

- Do we want to do an evaluation of services specifically funded through AB109?
- Do we want to include other services that are important to San Francisco – even though they are funded from other funding streams?
- If we are evaluating only AB109 programs and services, are they only from one department or from multiple departments. If this is the case we could pull money from different departments into one contract for one vendor to handle the evaluation of the services across the departments.
- What is the best use of the money we have for the evaluation?
- What do we ultimately want to get out of the evaluation?

Simin, representing the Public Defender’s Office, stated at the end of the day, we want to understand what is happening across the board. We want to understand what is the amount coming to San Francisco and where is it going. She also asked if there was any money allotted for evaluation. She went on to say that departments do not have extra money for evaluating services. It is important that we keep focused on the CCP.

The chair stated the report should reflect on the “totality of services.”

Tara Agnese stated that different departments report in different levels of detail and report on different things.

Tara Anderson stated that it might be possible to leverage the Criminal justice Dashboard from the Safety and Justice Challenge. However, the data would be exclusive to local convictions. She went on to say that, it would be difficult for researchers to get statewide data from California’s Department Of Justice (DOJ).

The Chair asked if there was a motion related to this agenda item.

Police Chief William Scott asked, “why the Police Department did not report anything in the 2015 report and Why were the police departments not part of the initial funding?”

The Chair stated that police departments throughout the states did not receive any funds.

Sheriff –Elect, Paul Miyamoto moved for members to go back to their individual agencies to evaluate the proposed scope of work ideas and then bring that information back to the next CCP Executive Committee meeting.

Tara Anderson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Status of Local Innovation Fund (discussion and action)

The chair stated starting in FY 2015-16, the State legislature approved allocating 10 percent of the growth in the State's AB 109 allocation to a Local Innovation Subaccount, which is to be used for local programs subjected to board of supervisors' approval.

According to the chair, the following decisions was made in October 2017 CCPEC meeting; in which the body would ask the County's Board of Supervisors to delegate Local Subaccount Authority to the Executive Committee of the Community Corrections Partnership, and to permit the Executive Committee to direct sub account funds towards pretrial services and/ or Transitional Housing for young adults ages 18 – 35.

On March 9, 2018, the Board approved the Local Sub Account Resolution agreeing to the language in the resolution. A copy of this resolution is provide in the public handout. Then In 2018, there was \$168,677 in the local sub account from FY 17/18. On November 15, 2018, the Community Correction Partnership Executive Committee voted unanimously that the money would be directed towards housing for individuals 18-24 receiving pre-trial services primarily, but not to limit access to individuals 25-35 who were also receiving pre-trial services.

Lauren Bell, Adult Probation Department's Reentry Division Director, addressed the status of this funding and possible programming. She stated that Adult Probation Department has been in discussion about a housing project with the Recovery Survivor Network (RSN). Lauren went on to say that this would be the quickest way to get funds to the people who the resolution was intended to help. Lauren informed the body that APD would be able to fund 7 to 8 rooms with a peer support person onsite for the housing with the money from the Local Innovation Fund.

Chair opened the floor for comments and questions from the committee members.

Simin stated that she wanted more time to see if this was the best option. She asked, "When do we need to make a decision?"

Prior to answering Simin question, Veronica Martinez, a member of APD Finance Department, provided more context around the local Innovation funds that included several growth funds. The chair also informed the body that APD would begin providing a projected marker at the annual CCP meeting.

Lauren Bell stated she believed \$613,643.45 could cover two to three years of housing. Lauren stated RSN was chosen because they are already approved housing vendor and that they have an existing contract with APD that could easily be expanded. RSN is currently over the Norma, an existing housing project for TAY youth (18-35 years old).

Tara Anderson stated she did not feel comfortable voting on this funding because she had not fully briefed the interim DA. She spoke of her department having a new incoming District Attorney.

Angelica Almeida, representing the Department of Public Health, suggested that Homeless and Supportive Housing should be a part of the conversation. HSH has people who train providers to do coordinated entry assessments.

Simin asked if there were any thoughts for investing in housing.

Chief Scott asked what the age group would be.

Lauren Bell answered 18 to 35 years old.

Simin stated that she wanted to see other options that leverages the money better. Options that provide better space and more than just peer support. The Chair suggested that the body move forward with the proposal and then do an evaluation of services.

Simin stated that the housing is to support 18-35 year olds on pre-trial. She went on to say that, she would feel more comfortable if the referral process was centralized so that all agencies could make referrals.

Lauren Bell stated contracting with RSN would assist this body in meeting its target population with services as quickly as possible. Lauren stated the body could do an initial; one-year contract with extensions if that would make people more comfortable. Lauren stated by doing this way, the CCPEC provide the services to the targeted population, evaluate those services, and then do something different if there were concerns.

The Chair asked if there was a motion regarding this agenda item. Chief Scott motioned that the committee move forward with the proposed plan of having RSN provide housing with the understanding that the services would be evaluated in the future. The motion was seconded by Sheriff-Elect Paul Miyamoto. The motion was passed unanimously.

After the vote had concluded, Geoffrea Morris, Reentry Policy planner for Community Correction Partnership Executive Committee, mentioned the possibility of having a meeting in January before the Reentry Council or in meeting in February.

4. Adjournment.

Chief Scott motioned to adjourned and Simin Shamji seconded. The body unanimously passed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:08pm

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

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 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 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.

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

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/>