

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

DRAFT MINUTES

Tuesday, May 14, 2013
10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.
Main Auditorium
Milton Marks Conference Center
455 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Members in Attendance: Simin Shamji (co-chair, alternate for Public Defender Jeff Adachi), Cristine Deberry (co-chair, alternate for District Attorney George Gascon), Paul Henderson (co-chair), Sheriff Ross Mirkarimi (co-chair), Tina Gilbert (co-chair, alternate for Chief Wendy Still), Kim Courtney, Leslie Levitas, Chief William Siffermann, Gerald Miller, Jo Robinson (replaced by Annette Quiet at 11:00am), Mike Ngo, Karen Roye, Joyce Crum, Eddy Zheng, Robert Bowden, Steve Lin, Max Rocha.

Members Absent: Rhonda Simmons, Chief Yador Harrell, Roger Mac, Chief Gregory Suhr, Superior Court representative, representative of the Board of Supervisors.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

Paul Henderson called the meeting to order at 10:06 am and initiated a meeting of the Reentry Council. Henderson, Deputy Chief of Staff for the Mayor's Office, introduced himself and the Reentry Council co-chairs. Henderson extended a special welcome to Robert Bowden, the newest member of the Reentry Council, who was appointed by the Board of Supervisors on March 19th 2013. Henderson asked other Council members to introduce themselves. He followed this by acknowledging and welcoming members of the public.

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

Henderson reviewed the agenda and explained that the Council would like to take public comment on any items of the agenda which are listed for discussion only. He acknowledged that there would be more time for public comment later. There were no items for discussion at this time.

3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of December 4, 2012 (discussion and possible action).

Henderson asked members to turn to Agenda Item 3 to review the meeting minutes from December 4, 2012. Chief Siffermann moved to adopt the minutes, Steve Lin seconded. The motion passed with 17 ayes and 0 nays.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

4. Staff Report on Council and Subcommittee Activities and Membership (discussion only).

Henderson asked Jessica Flintoft to provide a report on recent activities and to give any updates of subcommittees and staff. Jessica indicated that subcommittees had not formally met since November. She further explained that Veronica Martinez, with San Francisco Adult Probation, transitioned from the position of Reentry Policy Coordinator into another position within APD and that this vacancy has resulted in a reduced meeting schedule for subcommittees but that the position is expected to be filled soon.

Previously, members of the Subcommittee on the Policy and Operational Practices had identified a need to survey individuals being released from jail after business hours. The goal of this survey was to reduce this problem and identify the needs of those individuals released at night and to ask them about their experience and to find ways to improve this system. The findings are currently being looked at, as are any trends about late night releases. Jessica commended the Sheriff and his department for being an outstanding partner in this effort and supporting the survey team's work. The data collected from this survey will be presented at a future Reentry Council. Currently, the Reentry Division has partnered with a graduate student at UC Berkeley who has conducted a policy analysis of the issue.

Jessica gave a brief update on the "Getting Out & Staying Out" Resource Guide, reiterating its success in helping people as they transition back to their communities. The resource guide remains a tremendous resource to incarcerated people, service providers, advocates, family members, and individuals being released from jail or prison. Over 15,000 copies have been distributed and it is also available online at <http://sfreentry.com/resource-guide>. Jessica thanked everyone for their efforts on commitment and distribution of this guide.

Jessica reminded everyone that the California Reentry Council Network has been hosting monthly conference calls with 14 other reentry councils in the state and the next call is June 6th at 10:00 am. These calls happen the first Thursday of each month and are a chance to find out how other counties are organized and working. The network maintains <http://calreentry.com> as a resource and serves as a place for networking opportunities among reentry councils and similar bodies across the state.

Jessica welcomed Robert "Fleetwood" Bowden to the Reentry Council. He was selected by the Board of Supervisors and was appointed on March 19th 2013 to fill a vacancy for the unexpired remainder of the two year term of Seat 4. Eleven people came forward to apply for this seat and the Board was lucky to have had many successful applicants to choose from. Jessica thanked everyone who applied and congratulated Robert once again. She announced that July 17th 2013 will be the expiration date of all 2 year appointed seats of the Reentry Council. Individuals

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

appointed by the Board or Mayor will need to reapply and prior to this, staff will be reaching out to all departments to recommit department heads or their designees to the Reentry Council.

Jessica instructed people to turn to the back of the Staff Report and refer to the section entitled “Recommendations by San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst”. In the February 2013 Performance Audit of San Francisco’s Implementation of Public Safety Realignment, the Budget and Legislative included a recommendation that the Board of Supervisors should integrate the functions of the City-mandated Reentry Council and Sentencing Commission with the State-mandated Community Corrections Partnership when they sunset in 2014 and 2015, respectively. A hearing by the Government Audit and Oversight Committee occurred on May 9th and they did not ask that any action be taken on the recommendation due to the fact that each entity has differing mandates, leadership, and membership.

The Reentry Council legislation purposefully included such a clause to provide an opportunity to end, adapt, or improve its structure. The Reentry Council shall expire on June 1, 2014 unless the Board of Supervisors adopts an ordinance continuing its existence. The council shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors no fewer than six months prior to the this date, recommending whether the Council shall continue to operate, and if so, whether the Board of Supervisors should consider legislative changes that would enhance the capacity of the Council to achieve its goals.

Jessica acknowledged upcoming Reentry Council meetings, 10am-12pm, with locations to be announced: July 16, 2013; September 17, 2013; December 10, 2013.

Sheriff Mirkarimi reiterated the good work that the Council is doing, especially in light of the audit. He acknowledged the vast contrasts and thought that the presentation reflected well on the Council. Mirkarimi stated that he is not in support of the reintegration the Council. He reminded the Council that he is the legislator who created the Reentry Council, while adding to the conversation that although he feels the Council has grown, it still does not have the capacity to advise on budgetary matters. He wants the Council to eventually become a full City Commission and this might be something for members to consider. He indicated there are pros and cons to this idea.

Gerald Miller thanked Jessica and the subcommittee for gathering all of the late night data pertaining to the late night releases.

Paul Henderson, followed the Sherriff’s lead and complimented the hearing. He stated that a lot of work went into make sure it went well. He encouraged the public to watch the hearings in order to get a better understanding of where the City is at present.

5. Regular Update on Reentry Related Funding, and Update on Implementation of the Second Chance Act funded projects (discussion only).

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

Paul Henderson moved to discuss where the City and County of San Francisco is, as it competes for federal funding to address reentry. He acknowledged the memos in the packet pertaining to funding and Second Chance Act Funding Programs. Paul invited Jennifer Scaife, from San Francisco Adult Probation, to give an overview of the currently funded projects.

Jennifer explained the chart that was included in the memo. The chart represents the five subject areas of reentry and the components of each area, as outlined in the 2010 Annual Report and the various ways the city is addressing each of these needs. Jennifer called special attention to Page 8, as she indicated that one reentry related grant was awarded to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and sub-granted to the Juvenile Probation Department. She explained that this grant was awarded in order to provide staff training and related activities to achieve full PREA-compliance throughout all local detention facilities. She acknowledged that this is a significant and critical award. The floor was then opened for comments about the awarded grant.

Chief Siffermann reiterated the importance of this grant. He pointed out that this is a major change in course that both the jail and juvenile detention centers needs to pay attention to and take very seriously. He acknowledged and thanked the Federal Government for helping to implement the changes. He further explained that by enhancing safety, we are ahead of the curve. Finally, he expressed his gratitude to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department for taking the lead and said that he is hopeful that the efforts will enhance the safety of our institutions.

Jennifer indicated that Page 9 of the memo represents pending applications. Sheriff Mirkarimi asked if he could talk about the Second Chance Act Careers Training Program, a grant that would fund a Technology Training Program for individuals incarcerated in the San Francisco County Jails and six months of follow-up services. Jennifer explained that San Francisco has sought this grant several years in a row and hopes that it will be awarded this year.

Sheriff Mirkarimi said that he was honored to be in a position to receive this grant from the Department of Justice. He then acknowledged that the primary collaborator is 5 Keys, and that the other partnering agencies are Goodwill Industries, the Public Defender's Office, and Community Works. He indicated that all collaborators are providing hard and soft skills in a vocational setting. He stressed the importance and value in keeping up with the changing (tech driven) society- being able to offer re-entering folks not only construction jobs or typical vocations (re-entry post release) but allowing for a greater range of options.

Jennifer pointed out that there are four other pending applications that San Francisco has applied for. The Police Department applied for one, while the Public Defender's Office submitted for two. Adult Probation submitted a Smart Probation grant, which would provide benefits coordination, emergency housing, and related reentry services to individuals being released from county jail. Jennifer further stated that 5 million dollars was allocated for Smart Probation Programs and APD hopes to receive one of these. She also indicated that four Second Chance

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

Act grants are set to end this year and everyone is hoping to replace the important projects with other projects, like Smart Probation and the Technology Training grant. Jennifer asked if there were any questions and there were none. She then encouraged any corrections or updates to be emailed to her.

6. Regular Update on Implementation of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative, and Consideration of the Data Guardianship Statement (discussion and possible action).

Paul Henderson introduced Agenda Item #6. He stated that at the last meeting, three strategies were prioritized.

Jessica Flintoft came to the podium and thanked Paul for the introduction. She then asked the audience to refer to the two items in the packet: 1) The Regular Update - Justice Reinvestment Initiative and 2) Data Guardianship Statement - Justice Reinvestment Initiative.

Jessica then gave an overview of Justice Reinvestment Initiative and reminded the Council that Justice re-investment is meant to be a data driven approach to reduce corrections and criminal justice spending and to reinvest into strategies that will improve public safety. She explained that while looking at the data in August and September, three priorities were identified: Reducing the disproportionate incarceration of African Americans, shortening the length of probation, and maintaining and expanding pretrial alternatives to detention. Jessica indicated that the Reentry Council, along with other City partners, will consider the development and implementation of appropriate policies in order to reduce criminal justice costs and increase public safety in the City and County of San Francisco. Further analysis of drivers and potential savings is needed to quantify the expected cost-savings that would result. Multiple assumptions must be developed so that economists can come back with these cost estimates. Jessica stated that these would be brought back at a future meeting.

Next, Jessica asked that members turn to the Data Guardian Statement, indicating the hard work and combined effort of the Sheriff's Department and Adult Probation pretrial diversion in order to pull together individual data to share with the Justice Reinvestment Initiative consulting team. She explained that once the data was collected, it was then turned into a dataset. She invited Leah Rothstein, from San Francisco Adult Probation Department, to talk about the next steps for this dataset and the opportunities to continue with this dataset locally.

Leah explained that, as part of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative project, all departments providing data signed data use agreements with The Crime and Justice Institute (CJI). The data collected was deidentified, analyzed separately, and after this was done, it led to presentations Reentry Council heard and was then returned data to each department. CJI agreements did not specify who would become the guardian and would have dataset. Eventually, all data was returned individually and in order to have one final dataset, the Council needs to designate a final guardian of the final dataset. She instructed the Council to turn to the memo in the packet and

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

explained that it would allow APD to be this guardian. If approved, it would allow APD to continue working and analyzing the data set.

Karen Roye stated that she thought allowing the dataset to be kept by APD would be the natural course to take. In granting APD guardianship, it would allow for continuity in the work being done, research, and recommendations would be made swiftly. She stated that she was in favor of the strategy. Sheriff Mirkarimi stated that he would also support this measure to give the APD Reentry Division guardianship of the data. He then asked if any formal findings were made on the inconsistency with data. Leah pointed out that these inconsistencies come up every time data is collected across systems due to the inability for the data to talk. Paul Henderson asked for a motion granting APD guardianship of the dataset. Leslie Levitas agreed with the motion and William Siffermann seconded it. Henderson called for a vote on the data guardianship data. The motion passed 16-0.

7. Consideration of Local Efforts to Reduce the Impact of an Arrest or Conviction History on Access to Employment and Housing (discussion and possible action).

Jessica Flintoft was introduced once again by Paul Henderson and asked the Council to direct its attention to Agenda #7 in packet (3 items). Jessica acknowledged the three speakers who were present and would be speaking on the efforts to reduce the impact of an arrest or conviction history on access to housing and employment in San Francisco. Jessica updated us on the strides that have already been made on this issue. She explained the lifelong collateral consequences of having a record of arrests and/or convictions, which include barriers to accessing employment and safe affordable housing. She explained that the Reentry Council's Annual Report contains two recommendations directly related to reducing these unnecessary barriers based on arrest or conviction history.

In regards to employment, she stated that individuals should to be considered on skills and abilities and asked only about conviction history once they are offered job. Furthermore, in regards to housing, she reminded the Council that it is important to realize how having a record impacts this as well. She restated that the effort is to ensure people with a record would not be unfairly denied housing or employment based on this record. She explained that both the Reentry Council and Human Rights Commission (HRC) have prioritized outreach to all affected stakeholders, including other City/County departments, contractors, businesses, and property owners. The HRC organized a series of targeted outreach sessions, in which the Reentry Council members and staff participated. HRC updated the Reentry Council in July 2012 at the Reentry Meeting and have continued to reach out and receive a wide arrange of community support for this legislation.

On April 25th 2012, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued Enforcement Guidance Number 915.002. Jessica explained that this prohibits employment

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

discrimination. While having a criminal record is not listed as a protected basis in Title VII, she indicated that it could be made as part of the claim of discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Jessica then called the attention of the Council and introduced Meredith Desautels from Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights (LCCR) (working with Jane Kim's office) to update the Council on current efforts being made to address this issue.

Meredith introduced herself as a staff attorney who runs a clinic which provides free legal services for people with convictions and helps them to overcome the barriers they face to employment and housing. She indicated that the legislative proposal would help reduce many of these unnecessary barriers and would help. She then invited the Reentry Council to support this legislative.

Michelle Rodriguez, also from the LCCR, was introduced to speak and explained the intersection between criminal records and employment. She referred to a long list of endorsers, specifically naming Goodwill and the San Francisco Labor Council. She stated that increasing public safety and employment opportunities makes sense.

Meredith then offered to answer any questions, indicating that she wants to move this issue forward, with the support of the Council. She acknowledged her work with Supervisor Kim and Ivy Lee (aide to Kim), both of whom are committed to introducing this legislation. Paul Henderson followed by asking her to talk about the clinic work that they do.

She explained that they partner with the Public Defender's Office and the Clean Slate Program. Lawyer committees offer complimentary services to the Clean Slate Program. They work on expungements and address the fact that many people want to work in a field that requires licensing. She pointed out that even after a person has cleaned his or her record, it can still be a barrier. "Although it's *clean* the fact is, it still remains", she said. A criminal record has the potential to continue being a barrier. She talked briefly about the Second Chance Legal Clinic, which happens monthly. This is an opportunity for individuals with prior arrests and/or convictions to access free legal services. She explained that it is staffed by private bar attorneys who provide not only legal advice but also representation. The Second Chance Legal Clinic to date has served over 200 people.

Gerald Miller asked Meredith to explain how this legislation would be enforced, especially in light of the internet and a person's ability to do his or her own off-site search. She acknowledged that this was an important question and responded by saying: 1) Criminal history inquiry should be delayed until after applicant has been determined qualified. Individuals should not be asked to check a box, indicating their criminal history before they have been determined to be a candidate for the position 2) Legislation should require any conviction that is considered to be directly related to housing or the particulars of the job.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

Meredith then referred back to what Jessica had said regarding the basis for the law in the federal and state law, which lays out best practices. This legislation would avoid liability under Title 7, Fair Credit Reporting Act, and State consumer protection laws that regulates background checks. This legislation brings everything together.

Karen Royce asked if the State of California audits municipalities for hiring practices and whether this legislation could be a part of this practice. She indicated that California Human Resources must have some practice by which they use to audit, especially where state funds are use. Asking organizations how they are hiring and recruiting and what are the retention rates...could this be a point of intersection? Is the accountability there?

Meredith explained that that piece is still being worked out. She acknowledged that they are definitely interested in working with this pre-existing intersection and stated that nine states already have a hiring reform policy in place.

Karen Royce followed by saying that she is in favor of this reform and applauded the work that is being done.

Leslie Levitas thanked the speakers and further commended their work on this issue. She followed by asking if there is a way for individuals to report what they are encountering. She wanted to know if there is a way for a potential employer to be checked out or to develop a protocol whereby individuals may file a complaint.

Joyce Crum followed Leslie by inquiring why the list of community endorsers was only a partial list and the why only one housing provider was included. She acknowledged that there are many more housing partners in the city that are less restrictive and these should be included as well.

Meredith responded by saying that the list is partial because it's ongoing and that there is a process started that will begin to work with these groups.

Ivy Lee arrived at the meeting, and indicated that she was in attendance on behalf of Supervisor Kim, who is very supportive of this ordinance. She explained that this "ban the box" legislation would allow individuals who are trying to make changes in their lives, a chance to do so. She stressed the importance of making sure this is something that has teeth and people take it seriously. She invited questions regarding the enforcement.

Sheriff Mirkarimi said that he wanted to hear about the mechanisms of this legislation.

Ivy stated: 1) The chance for employers to learn about ordinance needs to occur, as well as offering employers a way to make it easy for them to comply. She stressed the importance of outreach and education and stated this ordinance is not meant to be a punitive measure 2) Applicants would be able to go to the Human Rights Commission and file complaint and that the HRC would take the first step to resolve the conflict. 3) Another agency, perhaps the Office of

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

Labor Standards and Enforcement would process complaints. 4) When a law is passed, the people who have been treated unfairly should have a place to be heard. We want to make this non litigious and to ensure that applicants, employers, and workers know what their rights are and how to comply. We want to make is easy to comply, indicating that businesses with 5 or fewer employees would be exempt from this ordinance.

On the housing side, she indicated that she foresees HRC as the first step. She explained that eventually, they would like to see the Rent Board become involved as the enforcement agency for the housing piece, but acknowledged that they want to make sure bureaucracy does not get in the way of the ordinance being successful. They want to ensure that units would not be taken off the market during the appeal process and that the timing of appeal is quick. She explained that this process is still being identified.

Sheriff Mirkarimi asked if this can be added to the next agenda to allow for further discussion. He reminded the Council about the 2011 efforts that were not supported. He said that he wants to move forward, he wants to ask questions, and he wants to not be set back. In light of the possibility of changes to the HRC, he voiced concern about its capacity to be a part of this legislation and worried about their ability to support this. Ivy answered that she thinks HRC could be reshaped and be more powerful than it is today and that some changes to the Commission may not necessarily result in worst case scenario, but could be positive.

Simin Shamji urged the Council to support this legislation. She reported that the Public Defender's Office supports no fewer than 500 individuals each month who reach out to the Clean Slate Program and who are facing barriers to housing and employment. "People who have done their time, faced their debts, and still continue to struggle. We now have a different approach that should be supported. This would allow people to work and be housed, reduce recidivism, and increase public safety."

Chief Siffermann stated that although he has a long history of supporting juveniles to be probation officers, he is reluctant to be supportive of this legislation today. He further indicated that he would like to see a list of those being in opposition and would also like to see the language of the proposed legislation. He complimented the excellent draft presented as an early signal of the Council's support and said he would like to see more. In light of this, he reiterated that he was not currently in a position to support advancement of the draft but would like to see more information to consider this issue at future date.

Eddie Zheng asked Jessica about the May 14th letter. Jessica responded by asking the Council if they should move forward on the letter with edits or delay moving on it. She explained that once legislation is introduced, the Council would be able to come back with full legislation. Simin moved that the Council move forward with the letter.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

The Council was requested to reaffirm their support. Jessica explained that if the Council is not ready to do this, that is fine but reassured members that the letter can be changed. She further explained that the vote is not to support this particular piece of legislation but to support the creation and development of such legislation.

Mirkirimi asked if the letter could be left broad and Jessica responds by inquiring about his concerns. Jessica reads of the letter and asks once again for any concerns. She explains again that the letter does not cite any particular ordinance because no ordinance has been introduced.

Simin Shamji and Paul Henderson brought forward this motion. Paul acknowledged this is an ongoing discussion and the vote does not mean one way or the other – it is simply to approve a letter of support for this local legislation. The Sheriff seconded this motion. There was no further discussion on this matter.

Kim Courtney responds to a call for public comment by introducing herself as someone working in reentry in custody. She explained that her job is to develop reentry plan for individuals coming out of the jail. She tries to get individuals housing, job training, etc. and provide them with resources. She acknowledged that there are many of things that must be dealt with and that networking is key to making things happen. She said that organization must be trained to teach folks how to keep a job, not just get a job. The trauma is outrageous for individuals she indicated. She concluded by saying that providers need more training and acknowledged that these items are important but there is so much more to be done.

Paul Henderson called for a vote for the approval of the letter. 14 ayes, 0 nays, 1 abstain (Chief Sifferman). Jessica explained to Siffermann that he cannot abstain, resulting in 14 ayes, 1 nay (Chief Siffermann, who stated he was in need of more information prior to supporting proposal).

8. Regular update on Activities of the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Sentencing Commission, Workforce Investment Community Advisory Committee, and Community Corrections Partnership (discussion only).

Paul Henderson introduced this item by inviting representatives from each agency to provide additional updates.

Sentencing Commission (Karen Roye) - She indicated that the Commission met on April 3, 2013. She wanted to highlight the celebration of the one year anniversary of the Alternative Sentencing Program (1170 h), which includes supervision as an alternative to sentencing. She explained that half of all sentencing has been through this process in San Francisco and that this is double compared to the rest of the state. She indicated that the District Attorney is moving this program throughout the State to increase this alternative solution and commended the work of San Francisco. She reported that over 60% of individuals on PRCS had remained in compliance and acknowledged that this rate is outstanding.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

Jessica Flintoft provided a brief update on the Community Corrections Partnership which met on April 25, 2013. Thanks to Zellerbach Family Foundation, Community Works, APD, and SFSD who completed and presented the Blueprint. The CCP worked with Drs. Blooon and Owen, national experts in corrections for women. At a future meeting, the CCP will be looking at how to implement findings. Hard copies available.

9. Regular Update on the Implementation of Public Safety Realignment, including the Community Assessment and Services Center

Paul Henderson shared that the Reentry Council will hear regular updates on realignment. The Sheriff was invited to provide an update on how realignment is impacting the Sherriff's Department. Sheriff Mirkarimi responded that grade is how the agencies are working together and working with community partners.

Henderson then invited people to view the reports and progress online.

Jessica Flintoft was asked to provide on update on the Community Assessment Services Center (CASC). She referred to the one page overview of the CASC, provided as Agenda 9. She explained that this is the cornerstone of the city's realignment strategy and it would be opening first week of June. The CASC is a partnership between SFAPD and Leaders in Community Alternatives (LCA), with Melissa Gelber the Center's Program Director, and Lauren Bell APD's lead staff on project. Jessica gave thanks to Lauren Bell and everyone else who worked to make it happen, indicating that it has been a phenomenal process. She acknowledged everything that went into its creation from the RFP process to its readers to finding a site and to picking out colors. The address of the CASC is 564 6th St. (between Bryant and Brannan). The CASC will consist of two floors, with the bottom and top half consisting of LCA, CJCJ, SEOP, Community Works, Anders and Anders, and other community partners. She said that it had been built in a way that would be respectful, comfortable, and able to bring in resources. She said that it will be the one stop reentry center that everyone has been talking about for years. She finished by inviting input from folks about program design, and welcoming people to the CASC once it is open.

10. Council Members' Comments, Questions, and Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion only)

Sheriff Mirkarimi asked if he could take a moment to announce the Birth Justice Project. He acknowledged that many people worked to make this possible: UCSF, DPH, JHS. He then went on to acknowledge the Doula project. He explained that reproductive injustice of incarcerated women not getting same degree of care and stated that the doula system would be implemented in the San Francisco County jails. He said that the SFSD is currently looking for ways to allow newborn babies born to incarcerated women to receive breast milk from the mother and the importance of finding ways to increase the level of contact between a baby and his or her birth

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

mother. He added that the SFSD is working to address this need and to find ways by which to remove this barrier. He concluded by saying that the project was a success and thanked all of the people who attended the special Mother's Day reception at County Jail #2.

Tina Gilbert from Adult Probation thanked Jessica Flintoft and her team for their hard work by commending them on years of perseverance and for "sticking with it". She indicated that people can see a difference that the work had made, due diligence and change. Simin seconded.

Leslie Levitas followed by asking the Council if a future agenda item could be discussion around the responses from the Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint. She complimented it by saying that it is comprehensive and inclusive and commended the work and the result. She closed by saying that it is a rich guide for everyone on what will be the future of women in criminal justice system.

There were no further comments.

11. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Above, as well as Items not listed on the Agenda.

Paul Henderson asked for public comment and gave instructions for any interested individuals to line up at the podium.

Johanna Parodi from Goodwill as a member of the Reentry SF (RSF) team introduced herself. She referenced Agenda Item 5 and wanted to share that RSF has placed 30 of its participants in jobs, with 6 placements having occurred during the current month. She acknowledged that there are many barriers that folks face and it has been a challenge.

Paul Henderson asked Johanna if there are specific businesses that have been easier to work with and more open to employing our population. At this point Johanna introduced Chris Henley, whose role it is to go into the field in order to identify companies willing to work with Goodwill to employ ex-offenders. Chris explained that the most important thing is identifying places that are willing to give people a chance to develop these skills that they are lacking. He stated that external employers can be a double edged sword and there are definite sectors that are more reentry friendly - City and Country, Department of Public Works, and some retailers. Paul Henderson stated that the City needs to support the work and the employers that Goodwill is engaged with. He further stated that there needs to be even more outreach to the private sector in order to make them realize that some of the best employees can be ex-offenders.

Karen Roye asked about the track record with employment and whether the jobs are short term or permanent. Chris answered that some are temporary but others are permanent. He explained that there is a weekly Job Club where RSF participants can come and receive help in applying for jobs. Many people are actively looking for permanent jobs when they are working temporary ones.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

Momodu Fullah, a current RSF participant, addressed the Council in regards to his experience with the program. He stated that RSF has been good helping hand since he was released from prison on 4/17/2012. He said that at the time he had nowhere to go and that RSF pushed him hard and provided him with transportation, clothing, and food when he needed it. He said that if you are willing to put in work, RSF can help. He does not want to see RSF discontinues for or any reason, say thing that it is because of RSF that he has gotten a job and remained there for 3 months. Karen Roye commended Momodu for sticking with it and acknowledged it is not easy and applauded him for sticking with it.

Joanna Hernandez, Program Manager at Goodwill said RSF will be coming to an end on June 30th and she commended her staff and the work they have done to help people overcome barriers to employment and in helping people change the way they have been thinking. She said that moving forward, she would like to see people asking the questions: How are we going to get them there? What training to they need to both get a job and keep a job? Should the City and community partners expand Thinking for a Change? She stated that Goodwill wants to collaborate more with APD on these efforts. Jessica responded by stating that even though Second Chance Act funding is set to cease on June 30th, it is a priority of APD to expand services. Jessica commended RSF and all of its hard work and success.

Michael Sutterman, introduced himself as an ex-felon, who has been in system since early 80's and who is currently on AB109. He said that when he was first released from incarceration early last year, he wasn't doing the right thing but he knew he was also tired of the system. He acknowledged that his APD (DPO) was very proactive and he felt encouraged in taking the right steps. He said that he is currently seeking employment, while working with RSF, going through T4C with LCA, and being involved in HealthRIGHT360. He told the Council that he is currently interviewing with Tenderloin Housing Clinic and several driving companies. He concluded by saying that without HealthRIGHT360, Goodwill's One Stop, and the proactive stance that APD is now taking, he might now be here. The SFAPD was different 5-10 years ago. The revolving door is gone and the attitude and assistance is encouraging he said.

On behalf of APD, Tina Gilbert followed by thanking everyone for so sharing how they are doing individually and how APD is doing as a whole.

12. Adjournment.

Paul Henderson thanked all members and the public who came out. He reminded everyone that the next Reentry Council meeting would be at 10:00am on Tuesday, July 16th.

Kim Courtney makes a motion to adjourn and Tina Gilberts seconds the motion. Meeting adjourned.