

# **Process and Evaluation Workgroup**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**September 7, 2022**

In attendance:

**Rodney Brooks**, Alameda County Public Defender's Office  
**Janene Grigsby**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Jenica Wilson**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Shadeequa Smith**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Tyler Zatcoff**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Nancy French**: Alameda County Probation Department  
**Rhody McCoy**, Rubicon Programs, Inc.  
**Alexia Young**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Shawn Rowland**, Our Road Prison Project  
**Veronica Rios-Reddick**, Alameda County District Attorney's Office  
**Charlie Eddy**, Urban Strategies Council  
**Richard Speigman**, Interfaith Coalition for Justice in Our Jails  
**Gina Temporal**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Steven Belowich**, Alameda County Probation Department  
**Chris Pedrotti**, Alameda County Probation Department

Attendees agreed to approve the July meeting minutes.

### **Discussion on Expanding the Eligibility Requirements to Receive AB 109 Services:**

- An overview of how Contra Costa County provides AB 109 services was presented; focusing on their tiered system which allows individuals who are not identified in the AB 109 legislation to receive assistance.
- Members of the Justice Reinvestment Coalition (JRC) Re-Entry Workgroup initially brought the issue of expanding the eligibility criteria for receiving AB 109 services in Alameda County to the Process and Evaluation Workgroup. The Re-Entry Committee proposes that expanded eligibility include people on parole, individuals recently released

from supervision, and others. The Re-Entry Committee would like the Process and Evaluation Workgroup to make a recommendation to the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCP-EC) and ultimately the Board of Supervisors.

- Rhody McCoy, a Member of the Quality Assurance Committee of the Community Corrections Partnership in Contra Costa County which recommended the creation of a tiered system summarized their discussions and decision-making process.
  - Staff at Rubicon, a provider of AB 109 services in Contra Costa County realized that their employment services were underutilized by the end of the fiscal year and wanted to know if other providers had the same issue.
  - The question of expanded eligibility was framed as a public safety issue, an equity issue (county departments were using the money for non-AB 109 activities), and an issue of alignment with the overall AB 109 plan.
  - It was discovered that a few other Contra Costa providers' services were being underutilized as well.
  - Contra Costa's Quality Assurance Committee concluded that people were coming to service providers who needed assistance and working with them would be an overall benefit to the community.
  - The list of tiers used by Contra Costa County was posted on the screen so members of the workgroup could compare it to the eligibility criteria in Alameda County.
  - Rhody noted that there was push back on providing assistance to people on parole; their research uncovered that the state was inadequately funding parole services; therefore, they decided to include that population. The Committee also thought it was important to include people who are on pre-trial status.
  - The system in Contra Costa is an "opt-in process". Organizations experiencing underutilization during a portion of the fiscal year are allowed to enroll people outside of the identified AB 109 population. Since the organizations are required to expand utilization within their existing allocation, some organizations decide to use additional non-AB 109 funds to make services available to individuals.
  - Contra Costa County developed a process for measuring underutilization of capacity.
  - Alameda County has committed to having a larger array of services than what is being provided in Contra Costa.
  - Alameda County Probation staff shared their eligibility criteria and talked about their expansion in recent years:
    - In 2018 the County expanded eligibility to all people charged under 1170(h), individuals on formal probation, people on pre-trial status, and people who are in specialty courts with felony convictions; in 2020 they expanded the criteria to include people who have had their probation terms shortened because of AB 1950.
  - The population of clients eligible to receive services in Contra Costa County who are ineligible in Alameda County are: people on informal probation and people on parole.

### Group Questions and Discussion After the Presentation:

- Contra Costa wanted to focus on the populations with high recidivism rates.
- **Question:** The State has expanded their allocations for parole, has there been a re-evaluation and how much does Contra Costa spend vs. Alameda County?
- **Answer:** That is a good question, it has not been examined.
- **Question:** How do you track people who are not referred by Probation.
- **Answer:** Contra Costa has a shared data system where everyone enters information.
- **Question:** If there is an issue with a client, who addresses the issue?
- **Answer:** Providers try to address most issues in house, without the assistance of law enforcement.
- **Question:** For clients who are not under probation supervision, when a client walks into a Contra Costa service provider what is reported to Probation?
- **Answer:** That the person is enrolled; if the client was placed in employment; and employment retention. They report on all outcomes and outputs – no name is identified. Clients sign a release of information document.
- Alameda County has a list of the services they want to provide and has developed a process to introduce those services as long as the funding allows. In Contra Costa, before the tiered system was introduced there was no process for deciding what to do with unused revenue.
- Perhaps Alameda County staff should revisit the list of services we plan to offer in the future to see if they are still relevant?
- How do we incorporate other funding sources into the discussion of serving clients outside of the traditional AB 109 legislation.
- Coordination and the centralization of services may increase the utilization rate.
- It was suggested that the information presented supports the need for expanded eligibility.
- Others suggested there is a need to examine more data on utilization.
- What we know is:
  - Twenty percent of Probation clients utilize the services; we know that mental health, employment, and housing are over utilized.
  - The target population receiving AB 109 services in Contra Costa County not receiving services in Alameda County are: people on parole and individuals on informal probation.
  - The State has increased the resources to support clients on parole; many of the service providers who have our contracts are in line to secure the new parole contracts. The question is how we get people into services through county and other government portals.

- Currently Probation is utilizing all their funding. The expanded eligibility in Contra Costa is significantly funded with outside revenue. Alameda County does not have excess funding. While four million dollars is left in this fiscal year, there are services in the RFP process that will utilize those funds. Finally, the County will be pushing to have more people in the specialty courts utilizing AB 109 services.
- The goal of Realignment was to keep people from recidivating, by giving them access to family support and essential services. County services provided by other departments are not designed for the unique needs of the re-entry population and are therefore inaccessible.
- Alameda County has approximately sixty contracts and twenty pending RFPs, Contra Costa has approximately 10 contracts for AB 109 services.
- Probation's data system does not allow organizations to communicate with each other, which is an issue that would need to be addressed.
- Expanded eligibility may exclude CAB members from voting on contract approvals, by increasing the number of conflicts.

#### **Discussion of Next Steps on Eligibility:**

- We need to make a decision; if we are going to recommend this to the CCP EC; we need to see if our programs would work for people on parole. If we don't recommend, do we do a better examination of utilization.
- We don't have an idea if the current sixty contractors will want to opt in; or if they have the capacity to serve an expanded population. We need to survey the contractors about their interest to serve an expanded population within their existing allocations, including the capacity to serve people on parole. We need to see if expanding eligibility would realistically provide access to services for more people.
- A suggestion was made to ask CAB to weigh in once we have collected some data about capacity.

#### **Discussion About the Evening Meeting:**

- The group agreed to have the yearly evening meeting in December.
- It was suggested that Brendon Woods attend the meeting.
- The agenda in October will include developing a strategy for more community members to attend the evening meeting.

Adjourn, 11:56