ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (CCPEC)

FISCAL/PROCUREMENT WORKGROUP MEETING

Hybrid Meeting

Tuesday, February 3, 2026 · 3:00 PM – 5:00 PM

MEETING MINUTES

Present:

Conner, Shauna (Chair)
Louis, LD (Co-Chair)
Barua, Francesca
Belowich, Steven
Boyd, LaShante
Brisco, Annette
Brooks, Rodney
Bruton, Jenny
Chambers, Adrienne
Chan, Loretta
Conner, Shauna
Gisposn, Sylvia
Gonzalez, Rezsin
Grigsby, Janene
Jayde, Woolery
Joe, Sarah
La Forcade, Christina
Laurente, Lovell
Lee, Corrine
London, Danielle
Long, Ian
Lott, Yesenia
Louie, Jill
Louis, LD
Madeiros, Barbara
Ng, Samantha
Oberes, Jabez
Ogundare, Michael
Pascal, Pujya
Pedrotti, Christian
Philips, Anna
Pola, Ruben
Saporito, Zarlasht
Singleton-Banks, Shannon
Smith, Shadeequa
Soriano, Connie
Stewart, Darryl
Taylor, Tatiana
Temporal, Gina
Valrey, Carolyn
Wallace, Faris
Williams, Denesha
Wu, Qinglin
Yi, Jun Chao
Yoon, Danny
Young, Alexa

1. **Call to Order and Introductions** – The meeting was called to order at 3:10 PM
2. **Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as "Discussion" Only** – There were no public comments
3. **Allocations Spreadsheet Overview** (Discussion) – *Janene Grigsby*
   A. AB 109 Allocation
      a. FY 26/27 remaining unallocated CBO Funds = $43,672,107 (Line 93, Column R)
      b. Funds previously allocated but unused and available to reinvest =$668,326 (Line 93, Column S)
      c. Total available AB 109 CBO Funding for Realignment Clients = $44,340,433 (Line 95, Column S)
4. **Contracts Update** (Discussion) – Gina Temporal
   A. Active Procurements
      a. AB 109 Mental Health and Wellness via AC Behavioral Health (New RFP)
   B. RFPs in Development
      a. Housing Pathways Program (New RFP)
      b. AB 109 Evaluation Services (New RFP)
      c. Domestic Violence/ Batter's Intervention & Reimbursement Program (New RFP)
      d. Faith-Based/ Local Community Partnerships – Fund Administrator for the Local Impact Funding Initiative (New RFP)
   C. New Programs
      a. Pretrial Expansion Program
5. **AB 109 Reconciliation: Designation Account Update** (Discussion) – Sarah Joe
   A. FY 25/26 (Cognitive Behavior Interventions & Incentives, Line #10) $1,154,880 moved from

commitments to actual (BOS approved, 11/18/2025)

B. FY 25/26 (Center of Reentry Excellence – CORE, Line #11) $6,000,000 moved from commitments to actual (BOS approved on 12/16/2025)

C. FY 25/26 (Pretrial Navigation Services, Line #20) $3,000,000 moved from commitments to actual (BOS approved on 1/13/2026)

D. FY 25/26 (Off the Street Ministries, Line #21) $250,000 moved from commitments to actual (BOS approved on 1/27/2026)

6. **An Introduction to the CCPEC Funding Process** (Discussion) – Janene Grigsby
   A. In total this year, we have $36,242,265 we can allocate, which is 50% of last year's base allocation that came from the state. In addition to that, we have $7,429,842 we're carrying over from last fiscal year and we have $668,326 of funds that we previously allocated but were unspent and are now available to reinvest. In total, we have $44,340,433 to allocate.
   B. The annual funding request will be broken up between two meetings, February and March. Today's requests total $5,397,964, and March's total is $18,047,041 (subject to change).
   C. In total, the annual funding request for FY 26/27 is $23,445,005
   D. Discussion:
      a. *For clarity, these funding requests are for funding for contracts that have been negotiated; will we be asked to review any new contracts or scopes of services?* Response: All of these requests are for services we are currently funding; approval of these funds will keep these services available, except for the CCP Subcommittee Meals, which is a new request. You will not be asked to review any scopes of services.
7. **Annual AB 109 Funding Requests** (Discussion & Action)
   A. Alameda County Health, Alameda County Behavioral Health Department (ACBDH)
      a. **Recovery Residences Services** (Discussion and Action)
         i. Request to approve the annual allocation of $429,447 for Recovery Residences
         ii. Discussion:
            1. *The contract term is listed as July 1 through June 30, 2027, with a budget of $171K for CURA and $257K for Options. With this contract in place, will you need to come back each year to secure funding for the contractor?* Response: Contracts are typically encumbered for a three-year period, which aligns with the timeframe noted in the AIR application. Each year, we assess spend-down and service delivery for each contract, but changes are rare unless there's a significant transition or contract modification. Generally, there are no issues with spend-down; however, if challenges arise, we provide support services and technical assistance to help providers stay on track and fully utilize their allocated funds.
            2. *You indicated that the original contract term is July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2027, with an allocation of $429,000. Is this amount intended to be annual, or does it cover the entire three-year term? If it is not annual, does this mean the original term was established as three years, or have amendments been made each year to add $429,000?* Response: Yes, the contract term is three years and we awarded them the full three-year amount, but since the County operates on a one-year budget cycle, we have been requesting funding annually.
            3. *To clarify, are we permitted to request funding for the entire contract term upfront instead of returning each year? We were under the impression that annual requests were*

required. Response: Yes. Since funding is not guaranteed, I would not award a three-year contract unless I had secured funding for the entire three-year term.

4. *Could you provide a detailed breakdown of the $171,780 allocated for CURA and the $257,667 allocated for Options? Is the entire budget allocated to program costs, or is any of the funding allocated to personnel, indirect, or direct participant support?* Response: We need to speak to each of our providers to get the breakdown. In my experience, the budgets are not broken down that way. For Options Recovery Services, AB 109 funding covers bed days, utilities, partial food costs, and includes a house manager who resides in each home. The funds are divided among these expenses across multiple residences. Each house accommodates 10–15 men, and we also have apartment buildings for women. Costs vary by location due to factors like mortgage and PG&E rates. On average, the cost is $72 per night across all houses, which is the standard rate we charge. Currently, we operate 11 residences where AB 109 clients can be placed.
5. *Comment:* Evaluating this request may be challenging because we typically need to review the funding breakdown and understand how the money is being invested. Last year, we had discussions with ACBH about how to introduce funding requests for the new fiscal year.
6. *We previously discussed rightsizing due to underutilization in prior years, yet this funding request does not appear to reflect that—what specific strategies will you implement this year to address rightsizing?* Response: We are still working with our providers to finalize strategies. We recently identified key challenges during discussions. The next step is to put plans in place to determine what those approaches will look like, in collaboration with providers. Some issues—such as improving tracking and ensuring proper spend-down—were only brought to our attention this year, so changes are being developed to address these and ensure funds are utilized appropriately.
7. *You mentioned program outcomes and touched on recidivism. How is recidivism defined in this context, especially since your presentation noted that you don't track when individuals return to custody?* Response: When we talked last year, concerns about recidivism and tracking came up. In follow-up conversations with providers, they shared that recidivism, meaning going back to incarceration, isn't tracked. What they do track is how often someone returns to the program. So, if we want to track incarceration-related recidivism, that's probably something we'd need to partner with probation on. We're definitely open to having that conversation and figuring out what that could look like moving forward."
8. *Behavioral Health conducts intake assessments for every individual in jail, so there is recidivism-related data within Behavioral Health's own records. For example, it should be possible to report how many clients have returned to jail or John George within the last year without needing external data like rap sheets. Why aren't we seeing this type of information included in these presentations, given that it could be pulled from your own data systems?* Response: What we've noticed in working with partners like Forensic Health and others at Santa Rita Jail is that our systems don't easily communicate with each other. It's not impossible to get that information, but it will require planning, strategizing, and collaboration. I recognize this is an ongoing concern for the committee, and addressing it is taking longer than expected. We'll take your comments under advisement and begin those conversations so that, hopefully, next time we meet, or when we provide future updates, we can share some of that data.

9. *Comment:* The DA raised concerns about recidivism last year, and we approved these programs with the expectation that Behavioral Health would track it. Behavioral Health already has jail data and a data department, and the Mental Health Advisory Board has accessed similar data before. Recidivism tracking is critical for demonstrating that these investments improve public safety and for addressing community concerns. It's important that this is included in the next CCPEC meeting, ideally with a slide showing recidivism data for program participants.
10. *How does ACBHD verify reimbursements? Are you verifying AB 109 eligibility, and if so, how?* Response: Most of Options' referrals come from Probation, the jail, or collaborative courts. At intake, our staff verifies AB 109 eligibility immediately, often by contacting Corrine if there's any question, because we don't want to place someone in an AB 109 bed if they should be in another one of our recovery residence beds. This verification happens at the program level, and if the referral is from collaborative courts, the individual automatically qualifies for AB 109 funding.
11. *Behavioral Health, how do you verify AB 109 status, and how are you reimbursing the programs?* Response: Recovery Residences reimbursements are based on a daily bed rate.
12. *In the fiscal impact section of the AIR, it states that staff salaries are not paid through AB 109 funds. Does this mean that, because funding is based on a daily bed-night rate, staff are not directly paid, but their costs are included as part of the overall services provided?* Response: There are staff required to run the recovery residence program. When we say 'no staff,' we mean no County staff costs are included in managing that program. Once the funds are with the provider, we consider those expenses as direct program costs rather than staffing costs. We may need to revise the AIR to reflect this distinction.
13. *Since you have data on referrals from the jail, courts, probation, and collaborative courts, would it be feasible to provide a breakdown by referral sources, including any from outside those primary channels?* Response: At Options, we don't have any other referral system. The only exception is the call center, when they're working in the jail and identify someone under AB 109, they conduct assessments to connect those individuals with programs. These are the only referral sources we use, ensuring that participants meet AB 109 eligibility requirements. If there's ever a question about eligibility, our intake director communicates directly with Corrine at the Probation Department to clarify.
14. *What about CURA?* Response: Unfortunately, CURA does not have any representation at this meeting today. We're currently working with CURA to increase referrals from Probation and through our Centerpoint portal. Recently, there's been a disconnect with a few of our Probation partners, so we're trying to understand what's causing the issue and troubleshoot it. For now, the primary sources of their referrals remain our Centerpoint portal and our Probation partners.
15. ***Action Item:*** ACPO Shauna Conner recommended that the Recovery Residences request be presented again in the Fiscal & Procurement Workgroup meeting in March to allow the team to address the questions asked and provide clarification on referral sources to understand need and AB 109 eligibility, a clear breakdown of fund utilization, including how rollover funds impact annual requests, and details on the extra contract year that was not included in today's request.

16. Assistant DA LD Louis agreed and emphasized the time allows for improved recidivism reporting, referral breakdowns, and a budget breakdown that shows the percentage of money that is being directly allocated to the program recipients versus the CBO to allow for proper assessment of the program. This clarity will also make the subsequent CCPEC meeting more straightforward and resolve questions for the rest of the Board.

b. **Annual Allocation for Substance Use Treatment and Mental Health Services** (Discussion and Action)

   i. Request to approve the annual allocation of $4,943,097 for Substance Use and Mental Health Services

   ii. Discussion:

      1. *Slide 13 mentions a $10 Million gap that Medi-Cal did not cover. Can you explain how AB 109 funds were specifically used to address this gap, and what medical services were not covered by Medi-Cal?* Response: We try to leverage as much revenue as we can, if there is any possibility of claiming to Medi-Cal, we do that to stretch AB 109 dollars. We also use MHSA, Measure A and whatever funding is available to cover the gap. A lot of services are not Medi-Cal billable: Recovery Residences, locked subacute facilities, such as Telecare, case management services and other services provided to individuals who are not Medi-Cal eligible.
      2. *Slide 20 states that 77% of clients who remain engaged in treatment have no further incarceration at Santa Rita. Of the 1,522 clients in the program, how many remained engaged, and what distinguishes them from those who did not?* Response: This refers to clients continuing to see their provider after release, with the level of engagement varying by service type. Full-service partnership programs offer more robust support with multiple monthly contacts, while traditional case management typically involves one or two monthly contacts, depending on client needs. About 77% of clients (1,166 clients) remain engaged and continue participating in services.
      3. *Comment:* It looks like that number was reported on the AIR under program data #10. It appears that just under 4,000 individuals were served, of whom 1,522 (39%) remained engaged.
      4. *How were the decreases in incarceration calculated?* Response: The numbers drill down to those who need a higher level of care. Individuals engaged in our specialty mental health services, specifically full-service partnership programs, 20% experienced a decrease in incarceration as compared to those who did not participate in programming.
      5. *What is the baseline for the 20% decrease—does it represent 20% of 700 people or 100 people? Can you include raw numbers alongside percentages for clarity?* Response: I don't have it with me, but we will look into it for the next presentation.
      6. *Last year, we requested that you provide a list of the 111 contracted mental health providers and aggregated data showing how many clients were matched to those services.* Response: We did share that list internally. We'll go back and look at the type of services and which were not billable, and make sure it gets to you.
      7. *Comment*: It appears there may have been an oversight in responses to the AIR Background question 7, where Felton SMI was listed. Felton SMI receives a separate AB 109 allocation, so including it here could be considered supplanting, as it should not receive this behavioral health allocation.
      8. *Comment:* Given that this year there was an expectation that the additional data

discussed today would be provided and understanding the work involved to connect system data, if data cannot be obtained in time for the presentation, the presentation should at least outline a specific strategy that will be used to gather that data for future requests.

iii. **Action**

1. This item will move forward to be heard by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC).

B. **Community Advisory Board** (CAB) (Discussion and Action) – Janene Grigsby

a. **CAB Member Training and Engagement** (Discussion and action)

i. Request to approve $10,000 for CAB Member Training and Engagement

ii. Discussion:

1. *We know that the CAB wants to do more community engagement, and there are specific events they've discussed that have allowed us to approximate costs for those events. Additionally, CAB's previous average annual CAB member training and engagement spend was approximately $5,000. And, there is some rollover from their previous allocation, so altogether they'll have about $15,000 to spend.* Response: Yes.
2. *Are there other community-led committees that our body has?* Response: No.
3. *Is this the dollar amount they will be asking to renew year to year?* Response: The last time they asked for this funding was in Fiscal Year 22/23. Previously, the CAB held a retreat annually, moving forward, the CAB not only wants to hold retreats, but they really want to engage community. They want to hold community events where resources are available, they want to have CAB swag and table at events to increase awareness of the CAB, and help people be more informed and connected to the work the CAB is doing. We've received feedback from our subcommittees and workgroups that they want more to increase community engagement at their meeting. This funding should carry them through Fiscal Year 27/28. The funding is not meant to be just a one-year allocation. Their previous allocation of $25,000 lasted them four years. We expect this funding to last as well.

iii. **Action**

1. This item will move forward to be heard by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC).

b. **CAB Meeting Meals** (Discussion and Action)

i. Request to approve $10,200 for CAB meeting Meals

ii. Discussion:

1. I*s this amount going roll over if unused*? Response: Yes.
2. *Comment*: This is something we want to call out. At times, this funding source supports individuals who have supported the reentry community and are themselves part of it. They have been very strategic in how these funds are utilized.
3. *Comment*: Community engagement and incentivizing the public to participate in various spaces can be very costly. I understand the challenges involved, especially when people are coming right after work or dealing with other commitments. That's why I think this approach is a good idea, as it helps remove barriers. Naturally, that will require resources.

4. *Comment*: I will say it's very helpful, in assessing this request, to know that you're coming in slightly below historical asks. That was useful for me to hear because it shows you're being thoughtful about how tight upcoming budgets will be when deciding how to allocate these dollars.

iii. **Action**

1. This item will move forward for consideration by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC).

c. **CAB Web-Based Application** (Discussion and Action)

i. Request to approve $420 for CAB Web-based Application

ii. Discussion

1. *Comment*: At one point, the CAB application process involved a paper application that passed through several hands. Eventually, we shifted to technology to streamline the process, which is where this change originated. This web-based application ensured timely handoffs, allowed people the opportunity to review, and helped avoid barriers.

iii. **Action**

1. This item will move forward to be heard by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC).

d. **CAB Notetaker** (Discussion and Action)

i. Request to approve $1,200 for CAB notetaker stipend.

ii. Discussion:

1. *Does the notetaker receive this stipend on top of their stipend?* Response: Yes.
2. *Has the notetaker role turned over*? Response: No. It's the same notetaker.
3. *Do they vote on who the notetaker is going to be*? Response: Not at this time, as the secretary is willing to serve as the notetaker. If they have a secretary who does not have the capacity to take the minutes, then they would vote on who would hold the role. When this was first instituted, they voted to have a community member to take the minutes.

iii. **Action**

1. This item will move forward for consideration by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC).

C. **Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Subcommittee Meeting Meals** (Discussion and Action) – Janene Grigsby

a. Request to approve the request of $3,600 for FY 26/27 for the Subcommittee Meeting meals.

b. Discussion:

i. *Are both subcommittees meeting at the same time?* Response: Yes, both subcommittees meet from noon to 2 p.m. on alternate months.

ii. *Comment*: Just for context, we also have meetings for different commissions and subcommittees, not on the adult side, but on the juvenile side, that are required. Because of the demands of work, these meetings often happen during lunchtime, and refreshments are provided.

iii. *Do we anticipate any issues with the CAO regarding the provision of meals?* Response: This is a community-based meeting, similar to our CAB. Since it's focused on community engagement and is for community members, not county employees, refreshments should be able to be

provided. We will make sure we are in compliance with County rules and regulations.

iv. *Is this meeting in-person*? Response: These are hybrid meetings. At the last meeting, there were at least 15 in-person attendees.

c. **Action**

i. This item will move forward for consideration by the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC).

8. **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, March 3, 2026, from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Discussion)
9. **Public Comment**

A. *Do you still need a youth chair for the CCP Subcommittees?* Response: We are currently interviewing youth for the position. If you know any youth who may be interested, please share the information with them, and feel free to contact me with any questions at jagrigsby@acgov.org.

B. *Comment:* I oversee our adolescent SUD programs and serve as a liaison with our children's mental health programs. These providers work directly with youth, so I'd be happy to share this information if the application process for the youth co-chair in our subcommittees is still open. I can drop my email in the chat, and if you have any details you'd like to share, I'd be glad to pass them along.

10. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:42 PM.