

ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Monday, November 15, 2021· 5:30 PM – 9:30 PM
via “Microsoft Teams”

MEETING MINUTES

Present:

Marcus Dawal, Interim Chief Probation Officer (Chair)
Gina Anderson, Chief of Police, Newark
Richard T. Lucia, Undersheriff, Designee
Judge Charles Smiley, Superior Court

Dr. Karyn Tribble, Alameda County Behavioral Health
Terry Wiley, District Attorney
Brendon Woods, Public Defender

Attendees:

Baker, Karen	Conner, Shauna	Lee, Corrine	Oddie, Sarah	Toro, Jason
Banks, Raymond	Dickey, Scott	Mason, Joey	Perez, Margarita	Tu, Patricia
Brooks, Rodney	French, Nancy	Mitchell, Kelly	Smith, Shadeequa	Weddle, Andrea
Chavez, Laura	Grigsby, Janene	Motley, Ocean	Smith, Tim	Zatcoff, Tyler
Chen, Howard	Jones, Yvonne	O’Neill, Gavin	Temporal, Gina	Additional Guests: 2

1. **Call to Order and Introductions** – The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM
2. **Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below for "Discussion Only"**
 - a. Community members had asked for evening meetings so those working during the day can attend; it took 2 years, but they are glad to see it happen
3. **Review and Adoption of [September 20, 2021](#) and [October 19, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)** – The minutes were approved as written
4. **Determination of Ongoing Need for Virtual Meetings Under AB361, Filed 9/16/2021** – Continuation of virtually held meetings for 30 days approved by the CCPEC
5. **Reimagining Adult Justice (RAJ) Ad Hoc Subcommittee/Workgroup – Chief Dawal**
 - a. This action item is to follow-up on the motions passed at the September 19, 2021 Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC) meeting in response to Supervisor Valle’s RAJ Memorandum: an ad hoc committee will be formed to determine the RAJ subcommittee membership and to define the scope of work that will be done
 - b. Per County Counsel, Scott Dickey:
 - i. Any time the CCPEC meets and has a quorum (majority of members present), it is a meeting of the CCPEC and a [Brown Act](#) body; therefore, the ad hoc committee can be no more than 3 of the 7 CCPEC members
 - ii. For it to be an ad hoc committee, it must also be made up of the actual CCPEC members and not a designee; it becomes a new Brown Act body if it is a hybrid of CCPEC members and the public
 - iii. The difference between forming an ad hoc committee and a Brown Act body is the ad hoc committee can form the RAJ subcommittee in a timely manner, whereas a Brown Act body would take more time
 - c. Terry Wiley, Dr. Tribble, Brendon Woods, and Chief Dawal expressed interest in serving on the Ad Hoc committee; Brendon Woods and Terry Wiley offered to step down due to the importance of Dr. Tribble and Behavioral Health being involved; *a motion was made to have Dr. Tribble, Brendon Woods, and Chief Dawal form the ad hoc committee; motion seconded*
 - d. **Discussion:**
 - i. There was a discussion between Community Advisory Board (CAB) members, CCPEC members, and Scott

Dickey on why the CAB will not be involved in the ad hoc committee: (a) the CAB is an ex officio member of the CCPEC, so they do not have a vote and would not count towards the quorum; (b) the ad hoc committee will give the CCPEC recommendations for the subcommittee's membership; (c) the ad hoc committee can get input from other agencies and non-CCPEC members to help form the framework of the actual subcommittee; and (d) the subcommittee can include system-impacted individuals

e. Roll call taken; *motion passed with majority vote*

6. **Proposed Evaluation of AB 109 Programs and Services** – Shauna Conner and Dr. Laura Chavez

a. In March 2021, the California State Auditor recommended that the County evaluate the effectiveness of AB109 funded programs and services every three years to assess if the local implementation of AB109 has been successful in reducing recidivism and other associated costs; the County is committed to a response by December 2021

b. Dr. Chavez, Probation's Chief of Research and Evaluation, drafted a plan that can serve as a framework for the recommended evaluation, and outlines the breadth, scope, timelines, and overall approach

c. The proposed plan was presented to the CCPEC; if approved by the CCPEC, next steps will be:

i. Submission to the California State Auditor

ii. Initiation of Phase 1: (a) Probation's Contracts and Research teams will begin the process of identifying an independent research partner and conduct preliminary data collection; (b) utilize a Request For Information (RFI) to gain information about the appropriate research methods to use, including how the research partner intends to engage the community; and (c) the RFI will also assist in determining the actual evaluation cost

iii. The proposed plan will come back to the CCPEC after the RFI process

d. The CAB reviewed the proposed plan at their November 2 meeting and did not approve it for various reasons which Dr. Chavez highlighted; the proposal was updated to reflect some of their concerns

e. Discussion:

i. Community members asked (a) for the definition of Theory of Change; (b) why George Mason University was used instead of historically black colleges; and (c) will stipends be given to justice-impacted participants in the 6-month training

a. Probation responded (a) if there is an intervention intended to improve an outcome (like reduce recidivism), the Theory of Change is the explanation for what mechanism is going to lead to that change; (b) George Mason University is a separate project and was only being provided for background information, but they are not contracted to do any work for this evaluation plan; and (c) the 6-month training was also just for background information and not a part of this plan

ii. The CAB questioned why economic alternatives to crime have not been presented, and requested to be included earlier in the process when the framework is being developed; Judge Smiley referred to the [CAB Operating Guidelines](#) requirement that information be provided in a timely manner (pg. 2, Section 3) and asked the members what timeframe they would like; members responded as soon as Probation has the material, or at least 2-4 weeks for action items and a month for presentations

f. *Motion was made to approve the presented framework for the proposed evaluation; motion was seconded; motion passed with majority vote*

7. **Community Advisory Board Update** – Tim Smith

a. **Current CAB Vacancies: District 1: (2), District 2: (0), District 3: (0), District 4: (0), and District 5: (1)**

b. The CAB asked for the status of the web-based application; it is going through the ITD work order process and Probation should have an update in two weeks

c. A request was made on the status of workgroup evening meetings; the evening meetings have taken place for this year and all workgroup meetings are posted on Probation's calendar, including those in the evening

8. Workgroup Updates

a. **Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup – Marcus Dawal**

i. Contracts Update – Gina Temporal

- a. Employment Vendor Pool – Round 9: One bid was received
- b. Housing Vendor Pool – Rounds 2 and 3 contracts are being negotiated; Round 4 bids due 12/14/21
- c. Adult Residential Multi-Service Center – Splitting this project from the grant received and will be moving forward with the Request for Proposal (RFP)
- d. Education / Family Reunification: Legal & Therapy Services / Cognitive Behavior Intervention Services / Client Resource Forum Coordinator / Leadership & Entrepreneurship / Kinship Reentry Workforce – RFP being developed with General Services Agency (GSA) for all of these
- e. Faith-Based/Local Community Partnerships / Women and Mother’s Services / Transition Aged Youth Services and Support / LGBTQ Services and Resources / Restorative Justice Circles for Adults / Father Services / Prison Pre-Release Planning and Case Management / Clinics for Reentry Legal Barrier Removal – The Scope of Work (SOW) is in development for all of these
- f. Reentry Client Access Communication and Service Portal / Opioid and Alcohol Use Prevention Programs – SOW needs to be researched

ii. AB 109 CBO Designation Account Update – Howard Chen

- a. FY16/17 – FY18/19 Available Funds = \$160,465 (amount includes \$110,217 of unallocated funds and \$50,248 of funds available for reinvestment) (pg. 1); no changes from last month
- b. FY19/20 Available Funds = \$715,862 (funds available for reinvestment; no unallocated funds) (pg. 2, line 21); no changes from last month
- c. FY20/21 Available Funds = \$7,088,862 (Unallocated funds; no funds available for reinvestment) (pg. 3, line19); no changes from last month
- d. FY21/22 Remaining Unallocated Funds = \$2,986,907 (pg. 4, line 17); \$150,000 moved from Commitments to Actual for Career Technical Education (pg. 4, line 4); \$50,000 added to Funds Available for Reinvestment for Career Technical Education (pg. 4, line 4)
- e. FY2020-21 to FY2021-22 Remaining Unallocated Funds = \$10,075,769 (pg. 4)

b. **Process and Evaluation Workgroup – Rodney Brooks**

- i. The workgroup has been assisting with developing the framework for the above proposed evaluation plan; they have also been revising the Agenda Item Request (AIR) form to incorporate more data and information when requests for funding are presented to the CAB and CCPEC for new or existing contracts; the draft has gone twice to the Process and Evaluation Workgroup, once to the Programs and Services Committee, and once to the CAB; it will go to the CAB again and then to the CCPEC for approval

c. **Programs and Services Workgroup – Janene Grigsby**

- i. There was no meeting in October; a Special Meeting will be held on November 18th from 10:00 AM-12:00 PM to discuss Restorative Justice Circles and building out that program

9. Public Comment

- a. CAB members reiterated they requested awhile back that each workgroup hold an evening meeting and that it is still not being done; they also stated being misquoted from the last meeting and that institutionalized racism still exists within the executive board

10. Next Meeting

- a. Monday, January 24, 2022, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

11. **Meeting Adjourned at 7:20 PM**