

SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

Probation Department
222 Paul Scannell Drive
San Mateo, CA 94402
(650) 312-8816



John L. Maltbie, Acting County Manager
John C. Beiers, 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

REVISED CCP HALF-DAY WORKSHOP MINUTES November 30, 2011, 1:00-5:00 p.m. City of San Mateo Main Library, 55 West 3rd Ave., San Mateo, CA

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m.

2. Public Comment

Speakers recognized by the Chair

Martin Fox, Veterans Advocate

Sara Matlin, ACLU, Chair North Peninsula Chapter

Linnea Nelson, ACLU, Northern California Affiliate

3. Roll Call

4. Presentations and Information

Andy Riesenberg/Mikaela Rabinowitz – Resource Development Associates

Overview of Objectives

Andy Riesenberg gave an overview of the workshop objectives and established the ground rules for the discussion. To explore and analyze how to successfully achieve the goals for realignment in developing the Local Implementation Plan (LIP); to determine the mission of the CCP, and the principles to guide the plan; to establish the top priorities of the CCP for realignment; to understand the recommendations of the non-profit service providers and their needs; to have a guided discussion on how public safety and social services work together to successfully develop and implement the LIP.

Workshop goals: To discuss key substantive issues that will be used to guide the LIP. Andy Riesenberg stated that the workshop is not meant for making policy decisions or voting on action items.

Definition of Recidivism

Mikaela Rabinowitz stated one of the goals of AB109 is to reduce recidivism—recidivism can be measured in different ways. The definitions and data measures regarding evidence-based practices (EBP) in probation were developed by the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC).

The evidence-based practices requirements in Probation are uniquely different than the tracking and reporting data standards adopted by CPOC. The CCP must define the management of systems and services utilized locally in order to track outcomes that measure success based on local standards. Utilizing the Crime Analyst offers the best opportunity for the County to gather data that will facilitate the reporting requirements for all departments or agencies.

According to the CPOC, recidivism is defined as: A subsequent criminal adjudication/conviction while on probation.

Judge Beth Freeman expressed concern that the terminology used in the definition whereby the conviction date would be used as the measure—if probation were revoked—the recidivism rate could be zero. She mentioned that if you are dealing with the date that the alleged crime was committed, and a subsequent conviction then that works. She also expressed concern with the use of probation because 1170(h) sentences have no probation, and people coming out of state prison on PRCS supervision have no probation, thus, the recidivism rate under this definition would be zero. Judge Freeman felt the definition unworkable, and that every county can define what they want to manipulate the numbers.

Beverly Johnson asked under what definition the 70% recidivism rate was determined.

Mikaela Rabinowitz clarified that the CDCR reported that 70% of the individuals released from the CDCR returned to the CDCR.

Chief Forrest stated that the Probation recidivism rate has never been 70%, and that that reference only refers to the State of California prison system.

Mikaela Rabinowitz suggested that the CCP may want to consider an internal definition of recidivism.

Review of Evidenced-Based Practices

Mikaela Rabinowitz introduced the three (3) principles of EBPs:

- **Risk Principle** (Who) – The level of supervision or services should be matched to the risk level of the offender.
- **Needs Principle** (What) – The targets for interventions should be those offender characteristics that have the most effect on the likelihood of re-offending.
- **Treatment Principle** (What works) – The most effective services in reducing recidivism among higher risk offenders are cognitive behavioral interventions based on social learning principles.

Lee Thompson – County Counsel

Role of CCP

Lee Thompson stated that it is important for the CCP to understand that the Board of Supervisors controls the finances, and that the Board can separate the financial decisions from the plan itself.

Mr. Thompson's last comment was in regards to whether the four-fifths (4/5) no vote was required on both the plan and the budget—he reiterated that the four-fifths (4/5) no vote requirement was only applicable to the Board's approval of the plan. The budget approval process remains within the purview of the Board's normal approval process, which does not require a four-fifths (4/5) no vote to be rejected.

The on-going function of the CCP is to advise the Chief Probation Officer, and another task is to recommend the plan—the Executive Committee also votes on the plan.

1170(h) versus PRCS Population

Greg Munks stated that his staff fully intends to engage the in-custody population, and that the Sheriff's Department is working closely with the partners including Probation to ensure inmates are getting programming on both the inside and outside. He reiterated that one of the challenges is that the 1170(h) population's sentences are non-modifiable.

Stephen Kaplan emphasized that the success of the Achieve 180 Program is attributable to staff working directly with participants while they are incarcerated on their reentry planning. Additionally, to the extent that the CCP can capitalize on that for that population is only to the good, and the testimony from the actual people is the evidence needed to encourage us to look at that same model or a similar model.

Andy Riesenber/Mikaela Rabinowitz – Resource Development Associates

Proposed Mission Statement

Andy Riesenber introduced the proposed mission statement and solicited feedback on the accuracy of the statement.

“The San Mateo County Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) is a body of governmental and community leaders collaborating to develop a comprehensive and coordinated plan for public safety realignment. We meet regularly to engage in action-oriented conversations for developing a plan, while listening and learning from each other’s expertise and experiences in protecting health, life and property; preserving the public peace; preventing crime; and promoting social and economic justice.”

The overall consensus of the CCP is that the mission statement should be in plain language and should simply state the core values of the CCP.

Priorities for Inclusion in the LIP

Chief Forrest stated that there are various levels of accountability in the partnership, and even when an individual is not under Probation's supervision, Probation is often times held accountable. This was most evident with a recent incident of a failure-to-report PCRS person in San Diego whereby prior to apprehension, he shot into a moving car that resulted in injuries. However, in the coverage of that incident and the public's point-of-view, Probation was responsible.

The CCP recognizes the importance of preparing in advance collectively when and if bad incidences happen so that the CCP would have a collective response to stand behind Probation.

Mikaela Rabinowitz emphasized that the Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) must be respectful of the accountability of the partner agencies.

The CCP recognized the importance of evaluating how services are delivered to the community and to minimized duplication of services in order to contain costs. The County must assess the services it must provide to the community and not duplicate those services that are already provided by other organizations.

CBO Forum Update

Over 50 participants attended the November 3rd workshop representing 38 community based organizations that provide substance abuse services, mental health care services, housing, education, job related services and homeless prevention services.

How to Achieve the Goals of AB109

Each member of the CCP was given a three-minute time limit to present their perspective on achieving the goals of AB109 by specifically reducing recidivism.

RDA charted the responses, which were categorized under various headings such as improving process, funding, public safety, health services, etc., Andy Riesenbergh emphasized that the goal is for the participants to respond to the question as opposed to responding to a person.