

ALAMEDA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP FISCAL/PROCUREMENT WORKGROUP

April 4, 2023 from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM
1111 Jackson Street, 2nd Floor, Rooms 226-228, Oakland, CA

Meeting Minutes

Present:

Shauna Conner (Facilitator)	Brooks, Rodney	Gonzalez, Rezsini	Pedrotti, Chris
Royle Roberts (Co-Facilitator)	Chambers, Adrienne	Grigsby, Janene	Temporal, Gina
Ahmadi, Atiqullah	Chan, Loretta	Lee, Corrine	Young, Alexa
Anderson, Deborah	Chen, Howard	Morgan, Victory	Zatcoff, Tyler
Belowich, Steven	Cruz, Ayana	Morimoto, Masanao	Additional Guests: 0
Berdin, Marjorie	French, Nancy	Motley, Ocean	

1. **Call to Order and Introductions** – Meeting was called to order at 3:09 PM
2. **Public Comment** – No comments
3. **Review and Adoption of [March 7, 2023 Meeting Minutes](#)** – Minutes reviewed and approved as written
4. **[Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup Refresh](#)** – Janene Grigsby
 - a. [Workgroup Outlines](#) (Outlines) were created which gives a description of each workgroup and its purpose and objectives; based on the Outlines, there are some things the Fiscal and Procurement Workgroup has not focused much energy on that it should, so there will be a restructure and refocus of this workgroup to cover all necessary areas from a fiscal perspective
 - b. There are three recommended areas to the revamp, and the Agenda Item Request (AIR) form will also be reviewed since there is only one fiscal question on it (“What is the total proposed budget for this program/activity?”)
 - c. **Discussion:**
 - i. We should be exploring opportunities where Probation can do more of its own procurement because it would be the more efficient and effective way to speed up the procurement process. We did our own internal study relative to Probation being able to run its own procurement processes and what we can do differently from the General Services Agency (GSA). We have 5-7 people on our side review and GSA has 5-7 people review on their side, so by just taking away their piece and not having to route it through a new set of people will exponentially decrease the time. They are not very flexible when it comes to certain things and unfamiliar with some of the procurements regarding human services and budgets. We would save additional time being able to release a budget in a project during the negotiation phase. There are also constraints they are not willing to work with us in, so it takes a little longer to negotiate some of those contracts. The review process is long, and they have very strict guidelines for their board letters and how they process them; they go through about 10 people to review a board letter, making it a duplicate effort combined with our board letter review process.
 - ii. ***I know GSA has a set of rules. Are those County rules or are they specific to GSA? Are we able to develop our own procurement rules?*** **Response:** Those are County-specific rules that GSA essentially enforces, so we don’t have a lot of flexibility around being able to change the minimum things we are supposed to do. That is where we have to use flexibility in some of the timelines and the review processes to better streamline it, but you can’t necessarily revamp the procedures; there are certain minimum thresholds that have to be met when doing an RFP.
 - iii. ***How are you planning to evaluate the expenditures in an ongoing process? If the contract is going, will you bring back to the workgroup that they spent X amount to date and X amount is in the***

contract and they have X amount of months left? Response: We have an internal process where every month we do a fiscal forecast and assess how much was allocated, how much is being spent, how much is being spent in a particular line item, and if there are any trends we need to be mindful of that may require additional funding for that contract. We are then able to identify if a contract has approximately eight months of funding left and whether we need to have a Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee action. We can take some of that material and bring it to this group, but the report out or discussion around that area can be whatever this group wants to make it.

- iv. ***I agree with moving through each area, but what I would suggest is to maybe not move through them in this order only because right now we are already at the budgeting process where the budgets are going to be going through the Board of Supervisors (BOS). Maybe jump in at the fund accountable RFP's or the procurement procedures, and then by the time we do some of that work, come back around and we'll be ready for the next budgeting.*** Response: I agree with you. Thank you. To take Royle's suggestion, perhaps next month we can start with Fund Accountable RFP's, and then identify and bring in or invite some subject matter experts to come in to be a part of the conversation. ***I've been told the overall timeline is 12-months. Maybe break that down as to what that looks like: why is it a 12-month timeline? And look at all the different people that go into that process; even if it is just a visual, it would be helpful knowing who that is.*** Response: We can also do some research on our end with our Research and Evaluation team to get information around this area to present along with inviting some guests to be a part of the conversation. We probably will not be able to do one a meeting; two of these will take multiple meetings. And for the most part, it won't be a big dramatic change. You will start to see changes with how we present things and the detail level to which we present them. And perhaps we can have a guide listing the things we would be looking for as a team when funding items are presented to us. The logic model covers a lot of this, but sometimes we don't necessarily get to those things during the presentation. This item will be agendaized for next month and we will work behind the scenes to invite some individuals to participate in the meeting as well as do some research in this area to bring to the group.

5. **Allocation Spreadsheet Overview – Janene Grigsby**

- a. Current Year: Remaining Unallocated CBO Balance = \$1,207,285 (line 79, column M)
- b. Current Year: Funds Previously Allocated But Unused and Available To Reinvest = \$668,326 (line 79, column O)
- c. Next Year: Fiscal Year 2023/2024 Remaining Unallocated CBO Funds = \$7,169,560 (line 77, column N)
- d. Total Available: AB 109 Funding For Realignment Clients = \$9,045,171 (line 81, column O)

6. **Contracts Update – Gina Temporal**

- a. There are four updates for this month:
 - i. The Center of Reentry Excellence (CORE) and Client Resource Forum Coordinator – The contract went before the BOS today and is pending approval
 - ii. Cognitive Behavioral Interventions (CBI) – The contract went before the BOS today and is pending approval
 - iii. Early Intervention Court Program – The Request for Proposal (RFP) has been posted and bids are due April 6
 - iv. Housing Pool – The Round 7 Request for Quote (RFQ) will be released in April, and this may be the last round for the RFP, but it has not been decided yet

7. **AB 109 Designation Account Update – Howard Chen**

- a. There is one update for this month: **FY 2022-23**: \$1,750,000 moved from Commitments to Actuals for Employment (Contract Extension) (pg. 6, line 12); BOS approved the board letter on March 21, 2023

8. **Next Meeting** – Tuesday, May 2, 2023 from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM

9. **Public Comment**

10. **Adjournment** – Meeting adjourned at 3:38 PM