COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP
February 9, 2012, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
455 County Center, Room 101, Redwood City

MINUTES

1. Call to Order
   Meeting was called to order.

2. Public Comment
   Speakers recognized by the Chair
   Jay Laefer, ACLU, North Peninsula Chapter
   Martin Fox, Veterans Advocate

3. ROLL CALL

4. OLD BUSINESS

   A. On Partnership consensus, minutes for the 01/26/2012 CCP meeting were
      approved as submitted.

5. NEW BUSINESS

   A. Resource Development Associates (RDA)
      Andy Riesenber/Mikaela Rabinowitz
      Andy Riesenber moderated a discussion on the draft Local
      Implementation Plan (LIP)—the discussion focused primarily on expressed
      disagreements and/or concerns including budget related issues.
      Fiscal Worksheets were distributed to aid in the decision-making discussion
      to develop a budget that supports the LIP.
      Mr. Riesenber outlined three domains in which strategies would be
      implemented: 1) Systems-Level Strategies; 2) Post-Release Community
      Supervisee (PRCS) Strategies; 3) Locally-sentenced (1170(h)) Strategies
      for Individual Interventions.
      John Maltbie commented that the LIP lacked a single point of entry that is
      based on an evidenced based model—the plan has four points of entry.
      Mr. Maltbie stated that there needs to be discussion on an electronic data
      system to collect, monitor, track and evaluate participants in the program.
      Mr. Riesenber announced that the public comment period had been
      extended due to the revised CCP meeting schedule.
      John Beiers, County Counsel, stated that if it is the intent of the CCP to
      extend the public comment period, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) would
      like to review comments prior to making any decisions or
      recommendations.
      John Joy suggested vocational rehabilitation services be added to the list.
Beth Freeman emphasized that there has been debate on whether judges have the authority to modify sentences after it has been imposed—the plan should not rely entirely on the belief that modifiable is allowed.

Supervisor Tissier expressed the importance of avoiding duplication of services, and emphasized the necessity of a coordinated multi-disciplinary effort.

John Beiers suggested that the CCP look at the legal authority as it relates to separation of powers should the body move towards a model of having law enforcement involved in supervision including compliance checks and home visits.

Stephen Kaplan suggested that the CCP clarify the functionality of the single point of entry.

Andy Riesenberg polled the CCP on the following questions:
1. Do all supervisees get MDT’s?
2. When do MDT’s start?
3. How often does MDT’s meet?

Chief Forrest recommended that the budget and the LIP be submitted to the Board of Supervisors as separate documents at the same time.

Motion made and seconded. All ayes.

6. Adjournment