

# Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Meeting

## AGENDA

Wednesday, September 16, 2020  
2pm-3pm

### **Join Zoom Meeting:**

- <https://zoom.us/j/97934518820?pwd=ZEphRjFYTEVPRkYpQdIJxS0FLUT09>
- 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/CCP EC member. 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 (CCP) Meeting

## AGENDA

Wednesday, September 16, 2020  
2pm-3pm  
Zoom

Note: *Each member of the public may be allotted no more than 3 minutes to speak on each item.*

1. Call to Order and Introductions.
2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only.”
3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of August 15, 2019 (discussion and action).
4. Staff Report Meeting Schedule, Racial Equity Work Group, CASC Virtual Services, Pretrial Housing Funded by Adult Probation and the CCPEC (discussion only).
5. Update from the CCPEC regarding the Realignment Evaluation Project discussion (discussion only).
6. LEAD, PRSPR, and STARR Updates (discussion only).
7. Roundtable Updates on the Implementation of Public Safety Realignment (AB109) and other comments, questions, and requests for future agenda items (discussion only).
8. Public comment on any item listed above, as well as items not listed on the Agenda.
9. 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 via email: [victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org](mailto: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 contacting Victoria Westbrook at [victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org](mailto:victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org) or (415) 930-2202 during normal business hours. The material can be emailed 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 contacting 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 contacting 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/>

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

## Draft Minutes

Thursday, August 15, 2019  
10am- 12pm  
State of California  
Milton Marks Conference Center  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Diego Room  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Members Present:** Chief Adult Probation Officer **Karen Fletcher** (Chair), **Simin Shamji** Public Defender's Office, **Angelica Almeida** Department of Public Health, **Tara Anderson** District Attorney's Office, **Chief William Scott**, **Kathy Johnson** for Sheriff Vicki Hennessy, **Jerel McCrary** Domestic Violence Consortium, **James Caldwell** for Mayor London Breed, **Sunny Schwartz** for Five Keys Charter School Executive Director Steve Good, **Cedric Akbar** with Positive Directions Equals Change, **Stephanie Garcia** Second Chance Life San Francisco

**Members Absent:** Superior Court Representative, Tajuana Gray, Noelle Simmons

**1. Call to Order and Introductions.**

Chief Fletcher called the meeting to order at 10:03am. She invited the other members to introduce themselves.

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

Chief Fletcher asked for public comment and there was none.

**3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of August 16, 2018 (discussion and action).**

After members reviewed the minutes, Simin Shamji moved to adopt the minutes of the August 16, 2018 meeting, Kathy Johnson seconded. There was no public comment and the motion passed.

**4. Staff Report Updated Rosters, Meeting Schedule, Racial Equity Work through GARE (discussion only).**

Chief Fletcher introduced Geoffrea Morris, the Reentry Policy Planner.

Geoffrea Morris directed the members to pages 10 & 11 of their CCP packet to see the Updated Roster for the Committee.

**Racial Equity Work**

Geoffrea informed the members that the CCPEC unanimously voted to adopt the Criminal Justice Racial Equity Statement at their last meeting on November 15, 2018 and the entire body would be asked to accept it when it is covered in agenda item # 5.

Geoffrea directed members to look at pages 12 – 32 of their CCP packet to see the Ordinance which amended the Administrative Code to create an Office of Racial Equity as a Division of the Human Rights Commission Department. Geoffrea informed members that the ordinance was signed by the Mayor and was endorsed by all Supervisors and passed by unanimous vote on 7/30/2019. Geoffrea stated that the creation of the Office of Racial Equity is needed to strengthen and advance Racial Equity in San Francisco and address the disparities and inequalities that continue to exist today.

Geoffrea also pointed out that Angelica Almeida from DPF would be providing an update Prop 47 grant funds and the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Program (LEAD) in Agenda item #8, referencing pages 35-38 of the packet..

### **Faith Based Initiatives**

Geoffrea stated that there was no report back on Faith Based Initiatives.

Chief Fletcher asked for public comment and there was none.

## **5. Criminal Justice Racial Equity Statement (discussion and possibly action)**

Chief Fletcher began by saying that the Community Correction Partnership Executive Members unanimously passed the Racial Equity statement. Today, Tara Anderson, from the District Attorney's office and Geoffrea Morris, of Adult Probation's Reentry Division, is seeking the approval of the entire partnership. Tara and Geoffrea will briefly share with you all what been happening with Criminal Justice Racial Equity Statement.

Geoffrea directed members to page 33 of their packets, which details the exact language of the Criminal Justice Racial Equity Statement and lists the names of the Criminal Justice Bodies that have approved the statement. Geoffrea stated the statement was developed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Cohort of the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) of which she and Tara Anderson, the Director of Policy for the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, are graduates of. Geoffrea explained that she, Tara Anderson, and Sabrina Shoemate, a probation officer developed the hybrid statement instead of each department having their own statement. Geoffrea further stated that they been going to all of the criminal justice bodies speaking about the Racial Equity Statement. This year, all criminal justice bodies have a representative that is involved with GARE.

Geoffrea directed members to page 34 of their packets, which is the Draft Agenda for Action. Geoffrea explained that only the first two bodies have agreed to the Agenda for Action, but that it will help with creating the Racial Equity Plan that each policy Body will need to draft in the future.

Geoffrea asked Tara Anderson to speak.

Tara began by acknowledging and thanking the Human Rights Commission for their work in advancing Racial Equity in San Francisco. Tara stated that Action Items #1 and #8 on the Draft Agenda for Action have already been completed. Tara further stated that item #1 reinforces the need for government to acknowledge the harm we have done and that we must take responsibility for causing that harm – whether we meant to cause the harm or not – and commit to eliminating racial disparities in the criminal justice system. Tara then stated that #8 is complete because seats have been set aside for all of our agencies to participate in the National GARE Initiative. Tara continued by describing the result of all of the policy bodies endorsing this work and being a part of GARE is that they now meet every other month to follow up and work together. The meetings are a place for shared learning in which there are opportunities for other departments that are not typically criminal

justice departments to learn from the work they have accomplished. This benefits each individual agency and the City as a whole.

Tara then spoke the Safety and Justice Challenge, which is the \$2Million MacArthur investment grant focused on safely reducing out jail population. When taking steps to safely reduce the jail population, we must ensure that one group of people is not benefiting more than others. Tara continued by saying that we must be mindful of who is in custody, their demographics, for what crime, and for how long. Tara stated that the working group provides an opportunity for other eyes (from other states) to look at what we do and replicate it in their own jurisdictions. For example, North Carolina used our Racial Equity statement to build out their own Criminal justice Racial Equity statement.

Tara stated that she and Geoffrea presented the Training Letter around Racial Equity and Diversity to the Reentry Council. Tara explained that the goal of the letter is to amplify procedural justice and the trainings regarding implicit bias and fill some of the gaps we see in the work we do here in San Francisco. They acknowledged the works that the Human Rights Commission has already done and are working in tandem to submit all information on training to the department to help support the need for trainings citywide. The letter was sent out on July 31, 2019 to all law enforcement bodies. All requested information is due by September 30, 2019.

Geoffrea stated that all except one department has identified a point person, but that only the Police department has completed their request by submitting a robust training inventory.

Geoffrea concluded by reading the Criminal Justice Racial Equity Statement from page 33 of the CCP packet.

Chief Fletcher thanked Geoffrea and Tara and asked if the members had any comments or questions.

Simin Shamji asked if an item #12 could be added to the Draft Agenda for Action, which said “Adopt Humanizing Language Resolution”

Geoffrea explained that the Humanizing Language passed in July, 2019 and was signed by Mayor Breed.

Chief Fletcher asked if there was a motion for the CCP to adopt the Criminal Justice Racial Equity Statement, adding an item #12, that addresses the addition of the Humanizing Language. Sonny Schwartz made a motion. Susie Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **6. AB 109 Funding, Allocations, Program and Evaluation (discussion only)**

Chief Fletcher stated in 2011, the City and County of San Francisco faced unique opportunities and challenges in responding to the Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011, Assembly Bill 109. During the implementation of Realignment funding, this Partnership documented AB 109 funding, allocations, programming annually for the first three years. The last comprehensive report was completed in February of 2015. This was the last time we shared with our community stakeholders the impactful work we all continued to do with Realignment funding.

Since this is an annual meeting, I believe we all need to have a discussion on whether we should hire an evaluator to analyze our services and programs provided through AB 109 funding and for this evaluator to create the body a comprehensive Realignment report for 2020 to be reviewed by community, local, and state stakeholders.

Chief Fletcher called up Lauren Bell to lead the discussion. Before Lauren came up, Chief Fletcher wanted to provide some context for the discussion. She went on to say that more and more public records requests happening across the state to look at what we have done with AB109 funding. She continued by saying that we should be very proud as a City who has spent most of the funds on direct services for the population that needs the most service – we have expanded services and have done many great things with that money across the board in San Francisco. Chief Fletcher said that she thinks that it is important for us to document that and share it more publically. Chief Fletcher invited Lauren Bell to talk about that.

Lauren Bell stated that in addition to what the Chief said, we wanted to add this to the agenda because we wanted to address a couple things. First, we know that when we speak of evaluation, that there is fear because of the challenges we face to data collection and the fear of increased workload. We should remember that evaluation is important with regard to public safety and the dignity of the people we serve. We want to make sure that as a city we do not just say we believe in safety or that we believe in dignity but that we really have some backup for what we have done. We would like to get everyone's buy in that in addition to highlighting all the great things that we have done in each of our departments that there is some real data to better tell the story. We need to answer more questions than simply, "What have we done with AB 109 funds?" We know that in San Francisco we have primarily used the funds to expand services. Of course, we should document all of those services and share with the public. We also need to evaluate the impact of these services. Lauren continued by saying that in the past 5-10 years our laws have changed and because of these changes, the needs of our justice involved people have changed. We need to answer the questions, "Are we really meeting those needs?" and "How well are our reentry and in-custody services going?" Lauren stated that we need to answers these questions with something that is more objective (data) – not just our daily commitment to growth and change.

Over the last 15-20 years, I was taking stock of the processes that we have been through. Realignment and the realignment report when realignment first implemented. It was a huge endeavor to get a lot of data collected for those reports. We had Justice Reinvestment, which was an amazing first step and from that, the pre-trial assessment tool was generated. We then took a deeper dive into the racial disparities in the criminal justice system. We went through the re-envisioning the jail process to look more deeply at how do we reduce the jail population safely. From that we have fine tuned a lot of processes, including some discharge planning work recently and a stronger focus on women's gender responsive services. Different departments have been working on decision point analysis, taking a critical look at policies. Our Safety and Justice challenge work is our current system focused work. We have done a great deal of systems work, but we have not done a lot of work regarding what programs and services are having the greatest impact on the population of people we collectively see every single day.

Tara Agnese, the Research Director for the San Francisco Adult Probation Department, is going to walk us through some history, some highlights, and some viewpoints. Then we will open up the conversation to determine if there are things going on in your specific departments or the Mayor's office. Are there objectives that we can collectively get behind to try and move forward with data or with an evaluation to tell our SF Story clearer?

Lauren introduced Tara Agnese, the Research Director for the San Francisco Adult Probation Department.

Tara Agnese stated that the first step would be to consider what a comprehensive evaluation of services could look like. We have been involved in a number of initiatives, such as PPIC. The Public Policy Institute of California's (PPIC) multi county study. The project is a joint endeavor of the PPIC and Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), and San Francisco is one of the 12 counties in the study, which is looking at realignment and recidivism rate. Tara said that one of the starting points is to create an inventory of services that are currently available from the Sheriff's Department, the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's office and the Adult Probation Department. Ideally, the inventory needs to list the service name, description, target population, the duration of the program, the capacity, the cost, and the outcomes. Once we have the inventory, then we can look at which one of the services are evidence based. Are the components of the program in line with what we know to be evidence based? If they are, we can then look at the effect size and do a cost benefit analysis. If an outcome is significant. It is one thing to say that the outcomes of a program are significant. It is something else to determine the size of that significance. The effect size is a measure of the size of that significance. We can then track people who have gone through these evidence based programs and look at recidivism and other outcomes that are important. Once we have effect size and track people and outcomes over time, then we can do a cost benefit analysis of the program. We need to answer the question, "Are we meeting the needs of the people we serve" while thinking about capacity or how we meet the needs of all the other people that are not in the program but who need the services from the program. We need to analyze the cost savings gained by obtaining specific outcomes. This data can then be used to justify expansion of the program for example.

From my experience from being a researcher for over 20 years on both a state and local level, I have learned a great deal about administrative data. Also, there is all these things that people don't know about administrative data and a great many things that they don't know that they don't know about administrative data. I mention this to say that if we are thinking about hiring an outside researcher, which I think is a fantastic idea, but that person needs to express to us that they are willing to take the time to learn what our administrative data does and what it does not say. Departments must commit in their budget to have people come help code, qualify, and clean that data. Administrative data is collected for administrative purposes – not research purposes. So the person we hire must commit to understanding the administrative data and any questions that departments might raise.

Kathy Johnson stated that the Sheriff's Department already has a complete list of services for its various sites, including its largest jail with information on "Dosage Amounts" which allows them to adjust programs based upon individual differences, acknowledging that individuals learn and comprehend things at different levels. They publically produce recidivism data for people in their program. They do this as part of their metric data for the Controller's office. It is an efficacy approach. She further stated that however we decide to do this report, we need to analyze how crime is impacting victims and our community members. We need to address ways improve the outcomes of victims – especially victims of violent crimes. She will send documentation of their inventory so we can share with the other members.

Stephanie Garcia stated that she wanted to underscore the issue of dosages. We assess individuals for risk level and needs level and then match them to services based upon the risk and needs assessment.

Tara Anderson said that we really need to look at the scope of work of an evaluation project. One component of the scope was narrow and the other was quite expansive. She is in favor of the expansive, but questions how achievable that is. Creating an inventory is possible, but then doing the subsequent analysis of the entire portfolio across the city and county may be a very large undertaking. Tara Anderson asked for Tara Agnese's thoughts on how we reach our target goal while making sure



that we do not duplicate evaluations that have already been done, instead leverage them for the more comprehensive view.

Tara Anderson agrees that looking at the scope is important. She stated that to do a comprehensive inventory does sounds more limited and sounds like a discreet task that we could accomplish in a given amount of time. Tara said that is correct to some degree, depending upon the level of detail required and the purpose that the inventory will serve. Such an inventory would be beneficial to many sitting at the table and others who are not at the table. Moving toward an evaluation or a cost benefit analysis of the programs would require much more detail and assessing if all of the components of the program adhere to the literature on what the specific evidenced based practice is. There are steps that we could take even before the inventory is completed. One step we could take is the data we capture about the participants of the programs, even the referrals to the program and tracking those individuals with respect to dates and events over time, ensuring consistency of definitions. If definitions change over time, documenting those changes. She stated that we have data limitations in the Probation Department and that is why we are moving to a different case management system so that we can capture all of the data from our service providers in a more consistent way.

Tara Anderson stated that we will be pushing a public facing dashboard (from the innovation grant) showing criminal justice contact for 3 cohorts 2013, 2015, and 2016 looking at arrests and convictions. One key part of our conversations has been what is going on with that success rate. I see this as a great opportunity to tell that story. She raised some questions. Is there funding to pursue this? Is there funding to pursue a small chunk of it? Is there an RFQ that can be used to generate a qualified list of researchers? She continued by stating that way when funding does come through they will be ready to move forward. She would love for Agencies then work off of that qualified list. Strides have been made because analysts have been hired to look specifically at the data in the Sheriff's Department and for Superior court – criminal division cases. This would result in more deliberate and targeted interventions.

Sonny Schwartz agrees that it is important to take a gutsy look at all the initiatives. She wanted to underscore the issue regarding survivors. It is not about punishment; it is about equity and feeds into the racial equity discussion. In her opinion people of color – women of color have not received the comprehensive services of survivors. It is important to include the voices of those who have been harmed, community involvement, and accountability to heal. This is very critical for everyone's dignity and safety. She also stated that the dosages made her think of the concept that one size fits all. With regard to programs – one size does not fit all. Thirdly, she wanted to bring up mandated programming. It is about getting people into programming that lifts them up.

Simin Shamji stated that she wanted to piggyback on what Tara said. Simin expressed concerns about the scope and focus of an evaluation project. She stated that it will take a great deal of time and she thinks that it is more appropriate for this to come out of the Reentry Council. They can get updates and ensure programs are evidence based and are in a better position to ask the hard questions regarding outcomes and risk assessments and is current. Simin continued that with the realignment of 2011, a great infusion of money and it has been well spent. San Francisco invested most of these funds on services. We need to follow the money to see how each department spent their realignment funds and what have we seen since then. If we can do both types of evaluations, that is great. If we can only do one or the other, I think we should follow the money. That way we can see what we have done as a City and as individual departments that have received this funding and what has happened with the people who have come through the criminal justice system. What does success look like? Chief Fletcher stated that every evaluation done through the CCP is specifically limited to the money allocated through AB109 and reporting out what we did responsibly with that money.

Many other counties put the money into jail personnel. We want to be able to highlight the great work that we have done for our clients. Although personnel is a part of that, in order to serve the population both in custody and out, we need to find a way to really focus on how we took responsibility of this money and how we spent it as a team. All of the other stuff that goes beyond that would be great to capture, but it is also a very huge endeavor.

Lauren Bell suggested a facilitated discussion of what the scope of an evaluation project could look like with regard to a few specific programs. Tap into each of the departments and find out what evaluation is already taking place to do sort of a meta analysis of what is already available. What are a few initiatives that we want to evaluate and come up with a template of what could be done over the course of many years. Put on the table to follow up with a facilitated conversation geared towards a scope of work or an evaluation of some set of services.

Simin Shamji stated that the discussion could help answer what questions we want answered and what questions we can answer with regard to AB 109 funding.

Kathy Johnson reiterated we need to look at what are those outcomes and have we reduced number of victims and reduced crime rate. How have we been spending these AB 109 funds to reduce crime in our communities and to prevent new victims from emerging and what are we doing for current victims to help them transition into survivors?

Chief Fletcher stated that you do hear in the news all the time that there was a client released from custody under realignment and gets involved in a high profile shooting and with all due respect to law enforcement agencies, the point becomes that we released this person from custody. We need to be sure to make people understand that those individuals would have been released anyway. The supervision of those people is different, but they would have been in our communities anyway. So I think police chiefs are often saying that it is causing more crime, but I do not know that the data really shows that.

Lauren Bell stated that there must be a balance between dignity of the person going through the system and the safety of the people impacted by it.

Simin Shamji stated we are talking about victims and survivors and we often make it binary. But, it is not binary. There is often not a line between the two. A person could be a survivor on Day 1 and might be a perpetrator on Day 10. Really, about those that are system impacted and how we work together, including public safety. We tend to silo ourselves, but we really have more in common with the people that we serve. It is important in my office that we have the conversation about victims and survivors in the forefront. Where is the accountability for all different departments?

Lauren Bell stated that we have those discussions in our department as well. Also with San Francisco being such a small city. What does it mean when we have a person who is a perpetrator of crime and also a survivor in his or her own community? The ripple effect in a city so small and feeling safe whether you are a perpetrator of crime or a survivor of crime.

Chief Fletcher concluded that we need to orchestrate a facilitated discussion about a scope of work and next steps forward about what we want to evaluate and how we would go about that.

Geoffrea Morris said that more discussion of this issue will occur when the Executive Body meets in November.

There was no public comment.

**7. Women's Gender Responsive Initiative (discussion only).**

Chief Fletcher stated that in July of 2019, we were very fortunate to be able to hire our second Women's Gender Responsive coordinator, Victoria Westbrook. She has a great deal of experience and I feel very fortunate to have snagged her as a representative of our group.

Victoria Westbrook expressed how excited she was to join the Reentry Division and work in this role. She said that she is justice involved and knows firsthand the types of barriers that justice involved women face. Victoria further stated that previously she ran Code Tenderloin, a workforce development non-profit, which served many justice involved individuals. Victoria believes that her lived experience and extensive contract management background will help her to do a great job.

There were no comments from the CCP members.

There were no public comments.

**8. LEAD and Proposition 47 Grant Updates (discussion only)**

Chief Fletcher stated that our public health department currently oversees the LEAD program and Proposition 47 funds from the Board of State and Community Corrections. This year, DPH received renewed funding from Proposition 47. With this continued funding, DPH has been afforded the opportunity to launch two new programs. Today, Angelica Almeida, will be presenting in depth on the two new programs that DPH is launching with their renewed Prop 47 funding.

Angelica Almeida of DPH directed members to pages 35 and 36 of their packets and she first spoke about the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Program (LEAD) before speaking about the two new programs. Part of the grant requirement is to focus on a specific geographic region. Consequently, LEAD is restricted to the Tenderloin and Mission areas. It was important for us to contract with a local evaluator to look at specific outcomes within San Francisco, document lessons learned, and determine how best to move forward with LEAD in the future. CSU Long Beach is looking at the overall efficacy of LEAD in California, both in San Francisco and Los Angeles. The program requires that Law Enforcement make referrals at the earliest point of contact. The SFSD, the BART police, and the SFPD are all able to make referrals. The goals of the grant are to reduce recidivism, increase collaboration with community partners, and improve the health and housing status of participants. She stated that they are currently in a no cost grant extension. She highlighted that they have enough funding to go through the end of this fiscal year. There are two types of referrals. There are pre-booking referrals where there is probable cause for an arrest for an eligible offense. She also stated that they have exceeded the number of referrals that they were required to do in the pilot. The second type of referral is called a social contact referral.

She stated that they have had 403 referrals thus far, greatly exceeding their grant goal of 250 referrals. She continued that one of the things that they are always working with law enforcement on is increasing the number of pre-booking referrals. Currently, pre-booking referrals only makes up 34% of the referrals. One area of concern is that when pre-booking and felony referrals are compared with

the booking data from the jail, they do match the demographics of the jail population. However, when comparing to all referrals overall with the jail population with regard to race, there is a discrepancy. Most of the referrals are white whereas, the majority of the jail population is black.

Kathy Johnson asked if LEAD was looking at whether the referrals are SF residents vs. non-residents.

Angelica stated that they had not looked at that, but that data is collected. Her sense is that they are primarily SF residents. She went on to say that recidivism has not decreased, but it has not increased either.

Angelica directed members to pages 36 and 37 of their packets and began presenting about one of the new Prop 47 funded programs - Promoting Recovery and Services to Prevent Recidivism (PRSPR). The PRSPR program cover 32 residential treatment beds (6-month stay), 5 social detox beds, and 60 days of Peer support after completing the program. They are also in a no cost grant extension with this grant. At first they struggled to maintain occupancy rates at Salvation Army Harbor Lights. This was partly due to Salvation Army not accepting medication assisted treatment (MAT). Now because of AB2348, Salvation Army accepts clients who take Suboxone and Vivitrol. Additionally, the Intake coordinator to be trained to do the level of care assessments and go do intake assessments for people while in custody, rather than waiting for people to travel to them to be assessed. Angelica stated that the program is having great outcomes. Of the 109 adults who completed the program, there has been no subsequent contact with the criminal justice system.

Angelica directed members to page 38 of their packets to present about the second new program funded by Prop 47 funds – Supporting Treatment and Reducing Recidivism (STARR) program. Angelica stated that the program has not yet started as they have just signed the contract. She stated that this program would extend the hours of the CASC and ensure that DPH staff were present during the extended hours. The CASC would be open Monday – Friday until 8pm and eventually until 10pm. Additionally, this funding would increase the number of social detox beds from 5 to 10 and would allow for later admission into the program. The funding would also allow flex funds to incentivize individuals into programs. There will also be 70 case management slots.

Angelica stated that one of the things that has often come up with people coming to the CAS is that people often have a lot of property with them when they come to the CASC. She stated that they are addressing this issue by having a POD in a parking space to safely store client items when they are at the CASC. She thanked Lauren Bell for the great idea!

Simin Shamji said that she is really interested in the three different pathways. How is it going to be managing multiple case managers?

Angelica Almeida stated that they would not necessarily be assigned a Felton Case Manager if they already have a case manager, but that they could access the other services regarding residential treatment.

Simin Shamji asked what the process was for referrals – how do people gain access to the services? Do people just show up?

Angelica Almeida stated that they try to build this as flexible as possible. She thinks it would probably be centralized through the CASC with a DPH assessment or it could be a remote assessment if someone does not feel comfortable going to the CASC for whatever reason.

Simin Shamji also asked what the process would be with partnering social workers from other offices like the Public Defender's Office or another agency.

Angelica Almeida stated that she was sure that they could partner with other agencies and not to speak for Adult Probation, but all clients could come to the CASC.

Chief Fletcher stated that it would be great to partner around that with the Public Defender's Office because they are the same clients. Also getting the Probation Officers involved and everything getting documented in the ITRP (Individualized Treatment Plan) and reporting that back to the court.

Simin Shamji asked about the people who were not connected or not on probation, maybe they are on pre-trial release or they have just left the system – how would those people get services? Is 1380 Howard still an ongoing concern? Do we have treatment on demand? What does that look like and where does this fall in the current system? Access is the problem. Knowing that they options exist and knowing how to access them. Would they need to physically go to the CASC?

Angelica Almeida that they want to remain as flexible as possible. They could work directly with social workers at the Public Defender's Office or people could still utilize TAP to make referrals at 1380 Howard Street or physically at the CASC.

Kathy Johnson stated that when they know someone is going to be released within 72 hours and are not connected to any services. How do we get them connected? She went on to state that the Discharge Planner located at 475 7<sup>th</sup> street for the sole reason to provide direct intervention when someone is being released and they are not otherwise connected to a program. Perhaps case managers can be connected to our discharge planners to be able to serve this population. Angelica maybe you can speak with Allie Riker to work out how our Discharge planner can make a referral.

Stephanie Garcia asked how many beds are for women.

Angelica Almeida stated that they have 32 beds. They beds are not specified as for women or for men. It really depends upon what beds are open at Salvation Army.

Sonny Schwartz asked that they think about how Community referrals could be made by citizens in the community.

Angelica Almeida stated that certainly through LEAD, but that would be involving law enforcement. Angelica does not want to say that it is outside the current scope of the program. There is a task force trying to make recommendations around that. She defers to that.

Chief Fletcher asked for Public Comment.

Veronica Martinez asked why there is only 1 non-binary person in the data.

Angelica Almeida stated that the data shows only the active participants only – not all of the referrals. So there may be other non-binary people referred but were sent to other targeted and specific services for the people that identify as non-binary. In addition, non-binary people may not want to go to Salvation Army because they think that they will not feel comfortable there. Salvation Army has a plan as to how they will serve that population, but we want people to go where they feel most comfortable. Salvation Army is more of a dorm style living, which may also impact those numbers as well.

Chief Fletcher thanked Angelica for her presentation and asked for public comment.

**9. Roundtable Updates on the Implementation of Public Safety Realignment (AB109) and other comments, questions, and requests for future agenda items (discussion only).**

Chief Fletcher introduced the two *Opportunities for All* interns working in the Reentry Division, Collin Kimberlin and Fatimah Campos. Chief Fletcher invited each of them to introduce themselves.

Collin Kimberlan stated that she was a San Francisco State University student majoring in Psychology and minoring in Criminal Justice. She plans to go on to get a Master's Degree in Forensic Psychology. Very excited to work with the reentry Division of Adult Probation.

Fatimah Campos stated that she was also a Student at San Francisco State University. She is a Sophomore majoring in LatinX Studies and minoring in Criminal Justice and Business. She plans to become a lawyer.

Chief Fletcher asked if there were any members who wanted to provide any updates regarding realignment or the criminal justice field. There were none.

Chief Fletcher asked if there were any suggestions about what to include in next year's meeting.

Tara Anderson asked for a local innovation funds update which may be more appropriate in the Executive meeting in November.

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

Chief Fletcher asked for public comment and there was none.

**11. Adjournment.**

The next meeting is set tentatively for August 13, 2020. There was a motion to adjourn by Stephanie Garcia, seconded by Cedric Akbar. Meeting adjourned at 11:39am.