

SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

Hall of Justice
400 County Center, Redwood City
(650) 363-4123



John L. Maltbie, Acting County Manager
Lee Thompson, County Counsel

Members

Stuart Forrest, Chair*
Chief Probation Officer

Adrienne Tissier
Board of Supervisors

Steve Wagstaffe*
District Attorney

Grace Nelson
District Attorney's
Office: Victims
Representative

Jean Fraser
Health System
Department

Beverly Johnson*
Human Services
Agency

Stephen Kaplan
Behavioral Health and
Recovery Services

John Joy
Human Services
Agency: Employment
Services

Beth Freeman*
Superior Court

John Digiacinto*
Private Defender

Susan Manheimer*
Chief, San Mateo
Police Department

Mike Nevin
Service League

Greg Munks*
Sheriff

Anne Campbell
County Office of
Education

*Executive Committee
Members

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP February 23, 2012, 3:00 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

Manuel La Fontaine

Betty Bernstein

Dorsey Nunn

3. ROLL CALL

4. OLD BUSINESS

Motion was made by John Joy and **seconded** by John Digiacinto to postpone approval of the minutes for the 02/09/2012 CCP meeting. **All ayes.**

5. NEW BUSINESS

Resource Development Associates (RDA)

The RDA consultants facilitated a discussion on moving forward with the process of developing the draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP). They moderated the discussion by reviewing the items of consensus from the February 9 meeting as well as those items requiring further discussion.

- Beth Freeman expressed concern with the timing of the single point of entry MDT for 1170(h) cases, and the timely completion of the pre-sentencing report by the probation officer. The pre-sentencing report is instrumental in aiding the judge's decision in reaching the proper split between incarceration and supervision time based on recommendations contained in the report.
- Chief Forrest stated that it is important that the time sensitivity of getting the reports to the Court should be factored into the process. He said the current population AB109 population of 144 along with the MDT's ability to mobilize will look differently when that population increases significantly; that operation is going to require some customization in order to get the work done. Additionally he stated that as practical a matter, the one 1170(h) officer may not be able to efficiently handle the growing caseload in timely manner.
- Stephen Kaplan commented on having a broader view of the 1170(h) process after the Court's decision, and how to provide the case management transition; assessment while they are in custody; hooked to services in custody and moved to the community. He said that process needs to be spoked out in greater detail in the plan based on the conversations from the last CCP meeting.

- Beth Freeman commented that the CCP is lacking a consensus on a philosophy. She stated that she envisions the plan to be front loaded significantly. She stated that the CCP will benefit from a sentencing judge's ability to authorize the Sheriff's Department to move someone into alternative sentencing options at some stage during the incarceration.

In response to a question from Chief Forrest, Beth Freeman indicated that in terms of philosophy, she is referring to 1170(h) population. She stated that the judge does not control the terms of PRCS supervision. Secondly, these individuals are scattered all over the state until they arrive.

- Stephen Kaplan commented that philosophy can tolerate changes in how the operation is implemented.

Andy Riesenberg facilitated a discussion on the guiding philosophy of San Mateo County's plan.

- Mr. Riesenberg referred to the ½ Day CCP Workshop on November 30 where there was discussion related to the mission, principles and values of the CCP. During the final half of the workshop, there was a discussion related to "How can public safety and services work together to effectively meet the goals that align to reduce recidivism?" Throughout the discussion at the workshop, RDA determined that the CCP must have a philosophical statement that becomes the foundation for the strategies that are in the plan, and also help communicate budgetary priorities.
- Mikaela Rabinowitz reiterated that based on the discussions around mission, vision, values of the CCP at the workshop, RDA has worked on a plan that San Mateo County would operate on a philosophy that would use a mix of services and sanctions to reduce recidivism and ensure public safety.

Mikaela Rabinowitz posed the question "What else do people think a philosophy should encompass?"

- John Maltbie – A philosophy has to be to assist people that are in a program to succeed, and to apply the resources available to decide when and where they will achieve the best results. Identifying the appropriate performance matrix and be willing to review and make adjustments in the program.
- Chief Forrest – Without compromising public safety, to look first for non-detention solutions. He stated that a cursory reading of AB109 clearly focuses on non-custody solutions as well as evidenced based solutions.
- John Joy – There needs to be some tolerance for failure in system so that people are given the opportunity to succeed.
- John Digiacinto – Any fair reading of AB109 clearly points to business has to be done differently as opposed to stacking people up in custody situations. He stated that the philosophy has to focus on looking elsewhere first—understanding that you have to pay attention to public safety—there are other ways to do things.
- Beverly Johnson – Community involvement, community engagement, community based services. Community involvement primarily because as these individuals are returning to their communities, the community needs to offer support and services should be provided close to home.
- Stephen Kaplan – Support the community—recognition of issues of culture/language differences. Not all evidence-based practices are applicable across different groups—not everything the CCP does is going to be evidenced based.

Andy Riesenbergs commented that the majority of the strategies are in the draft LIP. The PRCS and 1170(h) populations are very individually oriented—the CCP challenge is to find the right balance between individual level and community based strategies.

- Grace Nelson requested clarification on “tolerating failure.” She stated that to relapse is one thing, but somebody committing a new crime is completely different. “Tolerating failure” needs to be better defined.
- Bob Lotti commented that there needs to be a victim’s perspective captured in the philosophy especially when considering the types of programs.

Mikaela Rabinowitz suggested that the philosophy contain a statement regarding an appropriate response to non-compliance issues such as missing appointments.

Andy Riesenbergs commented that the list of suggestions for reentry is not very specific to the AB109 population—the CCP needs to dig deeper in developing the philosophy for AB109.

- Chief Forrest commented that he thinks there is an assumption that most people coming back to the community via AB109 are somehow special. The bottom line is the state needed to reduce the prison population. Of the 144 people returned to San Mateo County, many of them have not been gone very long—they are really probation failures. They are, in fact, of the 5500 regular probationers, more unstable and violent than people on regular probation that the county has seen so far. A significant difference is that 50% of regular probationers are substance abusers versus 90% of the AB109 population are substance abusers.
- Beverly Johnson commented that the feedback she is getting from the returning population is that they have never before experienced an immediate connection to a coordinated one-stop service approach that has helped them to launch more successfully.

Mikaela Rabinowitz suggested that the CCP philosophy state that custodial time should include an opportunity for rehabilitative services.

Andy Riesenbergs facilitated a discussion on the role of local law enforcement and multi-disciplinary teams (MDT) based on the feedback from the February 9 CCP meeting. That meeting revealed that overall the CCP supported local law enforcement participating in the MDT’s.

- Bob Lotti reiterated that the Police Officers Association (POA) does not want to be involved in the MDT’s as designed right now—the POA needs some sort of connection with the services that are being provided. He stated that there must be a structured avenue to get information about the offender back to the probation officers very quickly and vice versa.
- Grace Nelson commented that Chief Manheimer had previously stressed the importance being a part of the intelligence aspect of the population released by CDC. This would be important because the officers have knowledge of those individuals and their families.
- Bob Lotti stated that the operations group would be best poised to disseminate valuable intelligence to probation and vice versa.

Andy Riesenbergs facilitated a discussion on the use of the term “client” to define the AB109 population.

- Beth Freeman stated that she would like to find a word that is more appropriate—she would be happy with the term “supervised person” because that is their role in this program. Judge Freeman reiterated that a large aspect of what [the CCP departments do under AB 109] is non-voluntary for the “supervised person”.

On partnership consensus, for the purposes of the LIP, the term “supervisee” will be used to refer to the AB109 population.

Andy Riesenbergr facilitated a discussion on the LIP, which RDA had streamlined in terms of defining the AB109 population within San Mateo County, funding for AB109, the philosophy, the mission, the values, the goals, and the strategies. Mr. Riesenbergr reiterated that the revised LIP (version 2.0) will be posted online on March 2. He stated that the information has not changed, it has been repackaged to include the strategies in the main part of the document. The action steps have been moved to the appendices.

In response to a question from Stephen Kaplan, Andy Riesenbergr stated that the example before the CCP is to indicate where there is a lead agency and/or a supporting agency; the specific agency and/or agencies will be identified in the LIP.

Mikaela Rabinowitz reported that to date RDA has received 85 public comments on the draft LIP. The comments breakdown into various categories, however, the most prevalent category was related to alternative sentencing/alternative custody—that was for both the pretrial population and/or the sentence population. She stated that there were a number of comments asking that the plan put a greater emphasis on providing more alcohol, drug, mental health, and treatment services as well as crime prevention.

- John Digiacinto suggested that new information/edits to the plan be displayed via the track changes feature or highlighted to minimize the reading time for future updated reports.
- RDA agreed to post a log of the edits in future reports.
- RDA stated that the revised LIP will reflect the current conversation and will be posted on March 2.
- The public comment period will continue to remain open.
- The next CCP meeting on March 8 will be a full CCP discussion on the plan and budget.
- CCP will meet on March 15 and March 29.
- The final plan will be presented to the Board of Supervisors on April 24.

6. Adjournment