

Process and Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Minutes

October 1, 2025

In attendance:

- **Rodney Brooks**, Alameda County Public Defenders
- **John Lam**, Founder, Cre8Innovations
- **Shawn Rowland**, Our Road Prison Project
- **Andre Christian Sr.**, Rubicon Programs
- **Charlie Eddy**, Urban Strategies Council
- **Janene Grigsby**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Kelly R. Glossup**, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
- **Jean Moses**, Interfaith Coalition for Justice in Our Jails
- **Rezsín Gonzalez**, Alameda County Probation Department
- **Dieudonne Brou**, Urban Peace Movement
- **Than Tran**, Filmmaker
- **Darryl Stewart**, Alameda County Supervisor Nate Miley's Office

A recap of the September meeting was provided, participants were asked to review the those meeting minutes and the supporting documents for the October meeting.

It was suggested that future agendas include a “discussion question” to clarify the expectations of meeting participants and provide some context for the documents included in the meeting materials.

A review of what the workgroup initially requested from the Sheriff to assist in developing proposed amendments to the Santa Rita Jail clearance policy was provided:

- What is the number of people with lived experience working on AB 109 contracts who requested clearance to enter the jail?
- How many of those individuals were allowed to enter the jail upon their initial request?
- How many people with lived experience working on an AB 109 contract were initially denied entry and were granted admission upon appeal?

- How many people with lived experience working on an AB 109 contract were ultimately denied clearance to enter the jail?

A summary of the responses to the initial information requested of the Sheriff and other issues raised during the September meeting are listed below:

- Sheriff's staff were able to obtain a copy of the clearance policy and the denial letter (both were made available during the meeting.)
- The clearance data will be difficult to collect; the Sheriff is short staffed and has other data requests necessary to comply with the Babu settlement. While there are some challenges, the Sheriff is strategizing and committed to providing the requested information.
- The sheriff's staff is receptive to many of the issues raised at the September meeting; and is open to having applicants submit a letter with their original clearance request, expressing the mitigating circumstances related to their prior convictions.
- The Sheriff is committed to having a higher ranking officer than the deputies assigned to review clearances to secondarily review applications from certain individuals, including people working on AB 109 contracts. The goal is to approve applicants that may be denied according to the policy but are actually suitable for clearance.
- Changing policy is an involved and lengthy process, the Sheriff is open to discussions about changing processes and practices which are easier to implement than policy changes.

Meeting attendees expressed their appreciation and began to refine their request of the Sheriff in response to the update. That discussion is summarized below:

- Refining the request to an accounting over the past six months for people with lived experience working on AB 109 contracts who have requested clearance to enter Santa Rita Jail would provide us with what we need to know.
- Some suggested we should stick with the original request of three years and that six months is insufficient.
- It was noted that there have been new staff reviewing the applications, and the request should include their time to reflect the change in practice since they started working.
- The question was raised, what more would a year of data tell us than six months?

- After some debate of the time frame, it was decided to include a number of people. It was ultimately agreed to request the clearance information for six months prior, starting with August 31, 2025; and a total of no less than 75 applicants. If 75 applications have not been identified in the six month period, staff will continue to collect applications until they reach a total of 75.

Next the discussion moved to how the CBO employer can assist the applicant. A summary of the discussion is below:

- It was suggested that Probation provide a tool kit during the kickoff meeting the department hosts with CBO's awarded an AB 109 contract.
- Suggested items for the tool kit included a digestible version of the Sheriff's policies; potential topics to be included in the mitigation letter; and instructions about how to obtain and include an applicant's conviction history.

Numerous people joined the meeting at approximately 10:45. Everyone attending the meeting introduced themselves.

Next the discussion moved toward suggestions for amending the appeal process for people initially denied clearance to enter Santa Rita Jail which is summarized below.

- It was suggested submitting three character letters, which is part of the current appeal process, is too onerous.
- One proposal was the Sheriff employ a "a look back period" recognizing the time between the conviction and the time of application.
- Alameda County's Ban the Box ordinance potentially puts clearance applicants in a difficult spot, by asking them to disclose a conviction they may not have shared with their employer.
- There was support from the group for applicants writing a letter about why they want to enter the facility.
- If we endorse the idea of the applicant writing a letter, it needs to be effective, the tool kit can be helpful in that process.
- The question was raised if the self-written letter can replace the three character reference letters.
- The current draft of the denial letter does not mention the appeal process, including that in the denial letter would be helpful.

- Is there an actual list or scope of convictions to let people know what may generate an initial denial and what could be done. It is important for applicants to be more informed about the process.
- Directly listing the types of offenses that trigger a denial would mean the staff reviewing applications would not have the flexibility to admit someone who is genuinely qualified.
- Would the Sheriff object to making the policy available to applicants, so they are more informed about the process. If so, where in the process would that work best?
- It was raised that the language in the policy may discourage people from applying for clearance.
- The policy says you need to wait for a year to re-apply, can that be amended.
- Is it possible to change the language so it is more affirmative, for example: "...you may be approved with a prior felony conviction."
- If the Sheriff doesn't want to include the "look back" period can the applicant add their age at the time of conviction, which is significant if they were a juvenile.

Meeting attendees reviewed and approved the minutes.

The group agreed to develop materials to flush out the suggestions discussed at the meeting, including suggested topics for the mitigation letter. Sheriff's staff committed to keeping the meeting participants updated, in addition to bringing back ideas about what the Sheriff would like to see in the appeal letter.

The meeting adjourned at 11:52