

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

## MINUTES

Thursday,  
December 15, 2016  
10 am-12 noon  
San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse  
400 McAllister Street, Room 617  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Members Present:** Chief Karen Fletcher, Adult Probation (Chair); District Attorney George Gascón,; Noah Mallinger for Acting Police Chief Toney Chaplin; Craig Murdock for Public Health Director Barbara Garcia; Alison Riker for Sheriff Vicki Hennessey; Simin Shamji for Public Defender Jeff Adachi

1. Call to Order and Introductions. Karen Fletcher called the meeting to order at 10:12 and asked that everyone introduce themselves.
2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only.” There was none.
3. Review and Discussion of Agenda (discussion only). Karen Fletcher opened the discussion by stating the following goals of the meeting: (1) examine AB109 funding collectively, (2) discuss issues that impact the criminal justice stakeholders, and (3) discuss next steps on how to move forward
4. Realignment budget: (discussion and possible action). Chief Fletcher asked Lauren Bell to facilitate a discussion regarding priorities for Realignment dollars. Lauren asked members to look through the supporting materials for the meeting, as they would be referenced throughout the meeting. She said there were three major areas for discussion: AB 109 allocations, innovation subaccounts, Prop 47 allocations. Craig Murdock suggested that LEAD (Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion) also be included in the discussion.

Lauren Bell stated to the partnership that at the last CCP meeting there was a motion by Chief Fletcher to have a value based discussion to talk about AB109 amongst leaders in local criminal justice communities and how to better approach the Board of Supervisors in future budget discussions. The goal is to come up with values priorities that the body is interested in seeing. This discussion wasn't to shift entirely from annual department-directed budgeting, but rather to find overlapping budget values and priorities that could be anchor asks across all CCPEC partners. Lauren asked if these expectations were unanimous amongst the members.

Simin Shamji, DA Gascon and Craig Murdock stressed that budget transparency was a central issue. It is the current practice to have individual conversations between department heads and the Mayor's Budget Office. Simin Shamji stated that all criminal justice agencies should have budget transparency. DA Gascon agreed and gave the example about how pretrial diversion resources are underfunded and that collaborative conversations on how to better allocate funds to adequately resource pre-trial services are needed.

Chief Fletcher stated she had met with the Sheriff on how to support pretrial and leverage existing services within the Adult Probation Department and San Francisco Sheriff's Department.

Ali Riker echoed DA Gascón and the need for pre-trial resources to create stability that doesn't depend on institutionalization.

Craig Murdock offered for the purposes of transparency to articulate allocations of the Department of Public Health.

DA Gascón, Simin Shamji and Chief Fletcher discussed how their respective agencies serve the same individuals and there could be a stronger attempt at coordinating services using existing resources. The Community Assessment and Services Center (CASC) was discussed as a prime example of a space that could serve multiple purposes, inclusive of LEAD. Chief Fletcher stated that the APD is best positioned and has the capacity to serve the population.

Craig Murdock suggested that a conversation be had about the issue of Allocations vs. Actual spending. He clarified that DPH can provide a breakdown of clients served and criminal justice status.

Simin Shamji spoke to raise awareness about the bail reform movement underway, its impacts on criminal justice departments, and its specific relationship to pretrial diversion.

Craig Murdock told the partnership about the DPH efforts around Prop 47. DPH has contracted with a grant writer who begins in December 2016. A Prop 47 subgroup created from the Re-Envisioning the Jail group will resume in the New Year. Meetings between Barbara Garcia and other department heads are underway to discuss LEAD.

DPH has integrated the LEAD model with Prop 47 resources to build out treatment capacity to serve LEAD individuals. DA Gascón stated that he supports the LEAD model, and underscored the important diversion work of Miami-Dade and Judge Leifman. He expressed concerns about maintaining the integrity of the LEAD model. He stated that it is his belief that the CASC-operated by APD would be the best fit.

Karen Fletcher moved on to the subject of reentry supportive housing. It is a recognized need across all departments. It was unanimously agreed by all members of the partnership that supportive housing is an agreed upon priority. Ali Riker mentioned the grant funding for the MIOCR which will end in 2018 and hopes that the Prop 47 funding can help sustain efforts. Case management was agreed by all members of the partnership as a critical component to reentry supportive housing.

DA Gascón stated he was fearful that local criminal justice system money is not being invested effectively. He suggested that an outside consultant examine spending across the stakeholders. Lauren Bell responded that the Annual Realignment report could potentially include a report on spending patterns of the San Francisco criminal justice system. Craig Murdock referenced DPH's 2013 report on High Users of Multiple System (HUMS). In the report, DPH identified 18 HUMS, with indications that these HUMS are undoubtedly the same users of the criminal justice system. Craig Murdock shared that new data from the Sheriff's Department medical records has also been retrieved. DPH identified overlap across three health systems: medical, mental health and substance abuse.

Ali Riker referenced participants in Misdemeanor Behavioral Health Court, and that they spend extended time in custody as they wait for a proper placement bed. Ali hopes that MIOCR/MISD BHC clients will be included as a population of focus in any expansion of reentry supportive housing.

The discussion moved on to address funds in the subaccounts. The dollar amount is estimated to be \$252,064. Karen Fletcher explained that ultimately the Board of Supervisors determines how funds are to be used, but the purpose of this meeting is so that the department heads can come together to suggest how the funds are used.

Tara Anderson clarified that “allowable” means that the funds are aimed to reduce ~~to~~ recidivism in ~~an~~ innovative ways. There ~~is~~ are no rules on how funds are allocated, but rather guiding principles. We can be creative. Chief Fletcher made note that this amount is inclusive of Juvenile Justice Department and Chief Nance from Juvenile Probation must be included in on the conversation. Chief Fletcher offered to reach out to Chief Nance. The group talked of the possibility of RFP’ing the subaccount funds in a “mini-grant” type of initiative. The recommendation passed among the partnership unanimously.

DA Gascón brought up the need for translation services. This is an unmet need for all criminal justice agencies. Lauren Bell attended a meeting with Adrienne Pon and offered to connect her with the CCP meeting in February. Craig Murdock outlined DPH’s translation policy, which requires the agency to maintain services in threshold languages.

DA Gascón expressed his desire to hire another Alternative Sentence Planner for his office. Simin Shamji expressed a desire for more transparency in the budgeting process.

Chief Fletcher stated that the partnership needs to be a more focused group in budget conversations. It will likely carry more weight if the partnership is united in its requests. It is her aim to also have transparent discussion rather than individual discussions.

Lauren Bell suggested that the group convene every October to discuss budgets related to AB109/ Prop 47 funding.

5. Public comment on any item listed above, as well as items not listed on the Agenda. There was none.
6. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10.