

2013

**Reentry & Reintegration Forum:
New Hope**

Convened by Senator Loni Hancock (SD9)

Co-Hosted by Assemblymember Bill Quirk (AD20)

Assemblymember Nancy Skinner (AD15)

Assemblymember Rob Bonta (AD 18)



Thursday, October 3, 2013

Elihu Harris State Building Auditorium

1515 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612



Loni Hancock SENATOR, NINTH DISTRICT

October 3, 2013

Dear Colleague:

Now more than ever, it is critical we take the appropriate steps to end the cycle of incarceration and recidivism in California. Keeping that in mind, we would like to welcome you to our 2013 Reentry & Reintegration Forum.

During the morning session, Reentry and reintegration: New Hope, you will hear from policy and data experts, community based organizers, and formerly incarcerated individuals on the best practices for ending the cycle of incarceration and policies needed to support evidence-based strategies for successful reentry.

The afternoon session, Coming Home: Addressing, Violence, Trauma and Physical Health, will be convened by Centerforce, a well-known organization that has dedicated more than 30 years of service to the lives of currently and formerly incarcerated people. They will discuss the challenges within the incarcerated and reentry populations relating to health, mental health and their overall well-being.

Thank you for joining us for this important discussion.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Loni Hancock in black ink.

LONI HANCOCK
Senator, District 9

Handwritten signature of Bill Quirk in black ink.

BILL QUIRK
Assemblymember, District 20

Handwritten signature of Nancy Skinner in black ink.

NANCY SKINNER
Assemblymember, District 15

Handwritten signature of Rob Bonta in blue ink.

ROB BONTA
Assemblymember, District 18

Reentry & Reintegration: New Hope

9:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. Morning Session Program

Convened by Senator Loni Hancock, and Co-Hosted by Assemblymembers Bill Quirk, Nancy Skinner and Rob Bonta:

9:00 **Opening Remarks and Overview: Senator Loni Hancock and Assemblymember Bill Quirk**

9:10 – 10:20 **Best Practices: Overview of Reentry and Realignment Research and Successful Strategies for Reducing Recidivism**

Perspectives from formerly incarcerated individuals providing insights on the challenges they face:

Facilitator: **Linda Evans**, *All of Us or None*

Manuel La Fontaine, *All of Us or None; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children*

Eddy Zheng, *San Francisco Reentry Council; Staff, Community Youth Center*

Panel 1:

Ryken Grattet, *Research Fellow, Public Policy Institute of California*

Barbara Bloom, *Professor, Sonoma State University*

David Ball, *Assistant Professor, Santa Clara University School of Law*

Caneel Fraser, Esq., *Senior Policy Analyst, Urban Peace of the Advancement Project*

10:20 – 10:30 **BREAK**

10:30 – 11:20 **Making It Real: Successful Implementation Strategies**

Perspectives from formerly incarcerated individuals providing insights on expectations of government agencies:

Facilitator: **Linda Evans**, *All of Us or None*

Tamisha Walker, *Contra Costa County Project Safe Return*

Panel 2:

Wendy Still, *Chief of Probation, San Francisco County*

Adam Christianson, *Sheriff-Coroner, Stanislaus County*

Carlos Morales, *Clinical Services Manager, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, San Mateo County*

Ronald Davis, *Chief of Police, East Palo Alto*

11:20 – 12:20

Working Together: Building Comprehensive, Multi-faceted Systems

Perspectives from formerly incarcerated individuals providing insights on expectations from the community:

Facilitator: **Linda Evans**, *All of Us or None*

Michael Hamilton, *Small Business Owner*

Gary Scott, *Founder of K.I.D. Cat at San Quentin Prison*

Panel 3:

Meredith Desautels, *Staff Attorney/Reentry Coordinator, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area*

Rebecca Brown, *President, Further The Work; Director, Reentry Solutions Group*

Pastor André Harris, *Community Mentor/Worker, San Mateo County Criminal Justice Realignment Program: Service Connect*

Javier Aguirre, *Director of Reentry Services, Santa Clara County*

12:20

Wrap Up: Senator Loni Hancock

12:30 – 1:20

Lunch will be made available in an adjoining room

1:20 –5:00 p.m.

Afternoon Session (Program follows)



Coming Home: Addressing Violence, Trauma and Physical Health

October 3, 2013

Elihu Harris State Building, Auditorium

(Directly following lunch)

1:20 Opening Remarks

Carol F. Burton, Executive Director of Centerforce

1:25 Keynote

Chrisfino Kenyatta Leal, Intern, RocketSpace Inc. and Founding Member of The Last Mile

1:45 Panel Discussion 1: Understanding Past & Present: Trauma & Violence

Moderator: Carol F. Burton

- *Markita Mays*, Clinical Social Worker, UCSF/SFGH Child Trauma Research Program
- *Arnold Perkins*, Ijichi Perkins and Associates, Former Director of the Alameda County Public Health Department
- *Pastor Raymond Lankford*, Co-Founder and Executive Director, Healthy Communities, Inc.
- *Tracy Hazelton*, Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services
- *Mark B. Henderson*, Interim Manager for Oakland Unite Programs

2:45 Call to Action: HIV Prevention, Treatment & Linkage to Care

Rob Newells, Imani Community Church/AVAC PxROAR/Black Treatment Advocates Network/East Bay HIV Faith Collaborative/National Minority AIDS Council Positive Leadership Working Group

3:00 Panel Discussion 2: Inside & Beyond - Innovations in Healthcare

Moderator: Muntu Davis, M.D., Public Health Director & County Health Officer, Alameda County

- *Harold Orr*, M.D., Regional Medical Director for Corizon Health, Santa Rita Jail
- *Diana Sylvestre*, M.D., Executive Director of O.A.S.I.S. Clinic
- *Shira Shavit*, M.D., Director of Transitions Clinic-San Francisco

4:00 Legislative Update

Jim Oddie, District Director, Office of Assemblymember Rob Bonta

4:10 Affordable Care Act and the Impact on Returning Citizens

Alex Briscoe, Director, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency

4:40 Closing Remarks

Carol F. Burton

REENTRY & REINTEGRATION FORUM

Panel 1

Best Practices: Overview of reentry and realignment research and successful strategies for reducing recidivism

Perspectives from formerly incarcerated individuals providing insights on the challenges they face

- **Manuel La Fontaine**, *All of Us or None; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children*
- **Eddy Zheng**, *San Francisco Reentry Council and Staff at Community Youth Center*
- Facilitator: **Linda Evans**, *All of Us or None*

Panelists:

- **Ryken Grattet**, *Research Fellow, Public Policy Institute of California*
 - Measuring Performance and Outcomes of California's Public Safety Realignment
 - Realignment in California: The Story So Far
- **Barbara Bloom**, *Professor, Sonoma State University*
 - Guiding Principles for Gender-Responsive Practice
 - Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint (Excerpts)
- **David Ball**, *Assistant Professor, Santa Clara University School of Law*
 - Tough on Crime (on the State's Dime) (Abstract)
 - E Pluribus Unum (Abstract)
 - Justice Information Sharing (Abstract)
- **Caneel Fraser, Esq.**, *Senior Policy Analyst, Urban Peace, the Advancement Project*
 - Urban Peace Guiding Principles

RYKEN GRATTET is a Research Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California and a Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Davis. He previously served as Assistant Secretary of Research in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. His current work focuses on California correctional policy at the state and local levels. He is the author of *Making Hate a Crime: From Social Movement to Law Enforcement* (with Valerie Jenness, Russell Sage Foundation Press, 2001 [Paperback 2004]), *Parole Violations and Revocations in California* (with Joan Petersilia and Jeffrey Lin, National Institute of Justice, 2008), and numerous articles in professional and policy publications. His scholarship and public service contributions have been honored by the American Sociological Association's Section on the Sociology of Law, the Law and Society Association, the Pacific Sociological Association, the Society for the Study of Social Problems Crime and Delinquency Section as well as the UC Davis Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award and the College of Letter's and Sciences Dean's Innovation Award.

Contact: <http://www.ppic.org/main/bio.asp?i=531>



Measuring Performance and Outcomes of California's Public Safety Realignment

March 2013

Background and Need

California is pursuing historic changes to its adult corrections system. In October 2011, the state shifted significant corrections responsibilities to its counties—including authority over most non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders. Motivated in part by rulings from the federal courts, this unprecedented policy shift—known as “realignment”—has generated enormous interest and concern at the state, county, and community levels.

This is the biggest shift in corrections policy in decades, affecting tens of thousands of prisoners and public safety of all Californians. But there is no funding earmarked for data collection, research, or evaluation to assess the effects of the change on recidivism, costs, and crime rates. As a result, documenting the effects of the change is challenging. There have been laudable efforts to collect summary data on a handful of measures for all 58 counties by the Chief Probation Officers of California and the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). These efforts are useful but quite limited. And although some counties have contracted or otherwise enlisted the assistance of researchers to do evaluations or help develop measurement systems, these efforts are largely uncoordinated and are not leading to consistent data collection across counties. Without improved efforts at documentation, the effects of realignment—both positive and negative—will remain hidden from view. Worse, in the absence of good data these effects are apt to be characterized by anecdote, spurious correlations, or political beliefs.

Project Description

California's counties are responding to public safety realignment in a variety of ways. PPIC is in the unique position to standardize both data collection and evaluation to help shed light on successful local policies and practices. PPIC has offered both the state and the counties help to a) develop realignment-relevant data to aid the BSCC in meeting its reporting obligations and its responsibility to support counties in the implementation of realignment; b) assist counties in identifying data that will enhance county decisionmaking in the short term and management of community corrections populations in the long term; and c) provide an empirical basis for evaluating various policies in relation to public safety and other outcomes.

We will assist the BSCC in collecting data at the individual level and will track offender behavior and system responses in custody and in the community. Some data will come from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the California Department of Justice, and some will come from county sources. PPIC has drafted a codebook on the specific measures to be collected in each category.

The proposed project will be undertaken in ten counties, which PPIC will select to be representative of the state as a whole. We have not yet finalized our selection (other than Los Angeles), but we have been in contact with a number of possible candidates. PPIC will provide all counties, regardless of their participation, access to the codebook, the supplementary instruments, and the technical knowledge gained from the project.

County Selection

The first phase in this project involves selecting counties for analysis based on their representativeness of the state as a whole and the diversity of their approaches to realignment. As a group, these counties should capture the majority of the California population and the majority of the projected realignment population. This group of counties should also approximate the state population well in terms of demographic and economic characteristics, as well as the regional and urban/rural diversity of the state.



Data Collection

The second phase of the project involves identifying the data elements needed to assess the impacts of realignment policy at the county and state level. We will seek assistance from selected counties and statewide data holders (e.g., CDCR and DOJ) in assembling an individual level dataset that includes the following data elements:

Individual Identifier: The individual identifier allows us to keep track of individuals over time and as they move through systems. The most common individual identifier is the Criminal Investigation and Identification number (CII number). However, different agencies and departments may use different individual identifiers. In the process of preparing the dataset for analysis, we may need to retain other forms of individual identifiers (such as name or address) to allow for matching across systems. Once the matching is completed, the data will be stripped of any personally identifying information.

Demographic Characteristics: The inclusion of demographic characteristics in the dataset will allow us to control for differences in population composition across counties, as well as allow us to conduct subgroup analysis. Commonly collected demographic characteristics include date of birth, gender, race and ethnicity.

Criminogenic Characteristics: Criminogenic characteristics include criminal histories and current offenses, as well as assessed risks and needs related to the likelihood of recidivism. The inclusion of criminogenic characteristics, like demographic characteristics, allows us to control for differences in population compositions across counties. We will also use criminogenic characteristics to analyze the match between the risks and needs identified and the sanctions and services received.

Sanctions and Services: Given the size of the realigned population relative to jail capacity, many counties are utilizing alternative sanctions and services to mitigate the potential risk to public safety induced by lower levels of incarceration. In addition to the time held in custody for the current offense, we will also collect any alternative sanctions imposed on the offender and any services received by the offender during the period of incarceration and/or supervision.

Recidivism Outcomes: This study captures the following three measures of recidivism: arrest, conviction and return to custody (jail or prison). The data will permit measurement on any time period (6 months, 1-year, 3-year) or any type of offending (e.g., violent, property, drug, or sexual). As a result, individual counties can select their own recidivism measures for use locally and the BSCC can create a standardized measure.

Why PPIC?

PPIC's reputation for high-quality, independent, and timely information on a range of key policy topics has made us a go-to source for engaged Californians and decisionmakers across the state and in the nation's capital. Our publications and outreach related to corrections have facilitated strong relationships with key policy communities at the state and local level, including the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation the Board of State and Community Corrections, California State Sheriffs' Association, Chief Probation Officers of California, California State Association of Counties, and the County Administrative Officers Association of California.

Findings from the research will be disseminated in a variety of ways through PPIC's strong communications program, including briefings, targeted meetings, publications, and web outreach.

Project Team

The team for this project includes policy researchers Mia Bird, Ryken Grattet, Joe Hayes, Dan Krimm, and Sonya Tafoya, communications professionals (Abby Cook, Linda Streaan, and Lynette Ubois), and government affairs staff (Dave Leshner).

THE CRIME REPORT

YOUR COMPLETE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESOURCE

Inside Criminal Justice

SPECIAL REPORT

Realignment in California: The Story So Far

July 22, 2013 06:33:00 am

By Ryken Grattet

October of this year marks the two-year anniversary of the introduction of California's historic corrections reform known as public safety realignment.

Realignment shifted significant corrections oversight and funding from the state to its counties—including authority over most non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders. Motivated in part by rulings from the federal courts to reduce prison overcrowding, this is the biggest shift in California corrections policy in decades.

It affects tens of thousands of prisoners and the public safety of all Californians.

The promise of realignment was that it would relieve pressure on the state prison system and produce better results by placing authority for incarcerating and supervising offenders closer to home. Eighteen months on, both the intended and unintended consequences are coming into focus.

Realignment has successfully shrunk the "incarceration footprint" of the state. The prison population has dropped 17 percent from 144,000 on the eve of realignment to 119,000 today. However, this decline will not be sufficient to satisfy the federal courts, falling roughly 9,600 inmates short of the reduction target.

While the state is appealing the court order to release more inmates, corrections officials are continuing to sort through alternative methods to comply with the cap, such as early release of aged and infirm inmates, a slowdown in the return of inmates housed in private prisons out of state, and expansion of "good time" credits.

Growth in Jail Populations

As expected, jail populations have grown as the prison population has plummeted, as almost all non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders—along with parole violators—now serve time in county facilities.

But the decline in the prison population has been much greater than the increase in county jails. For every three fewer inmates in prison there has been an increase of only one in jail, according to Magnus Loftstrom and Steven Raphael in [Impact of Realignment on County Jail Populations](http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=1063) (<http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=1063>). In addition, the amount of time that can be served in a parole revocation has been reduced to six months.

The bottom line: more offenders have more time on the street than was the case before realignment.

With fewer offenders behind bars, realignment critics have forecast increases in crime. Here the picture is less clear.

Increase in Property Offenses



California State Prison in Mule Creek Photo via California Department of Corrections

TCR at a Glance

How Street Stops Influence Police Legitimacy

NEW & NOTABLE SEPTEMBER 27, 2013

Interviews with over 1,000 New Yorkers between the ages of 18 and 26 found that police behavior during stops can alter perceptions of leg...

Holding Child Sex Traffickers Accountable

NEW & NOTABLE SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

A new report from the Institute of Medicine and the National Research Council recommends that laws target "exploiters, traffickers, and s...

Boots on the Ground

SEPTEMBER 25, 2013

Local officials call for more focused preparation for gun violence and other mass tragedies

BJS: Black Drivers Less Likely to Trust Police Stops

NEW & NOTABLE SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

An annual survey by the Bureau of Justice Statistics reveals that black drivers are more likely to be pulled over and less likely to cons...

Guns + Domestic Violence Offenders: Deadly Combination for Police

SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

Forty-two police officers around the U.S. were killed while responding to domestic disturbance calls in the first decade of the century. ...

California Prison Strikers: The Next Step

COMMENTARY SEPTEMBER 23, 2013

The Crime Report asked former California legislator Tom Hayden to comment on the recently suspended two-month-old hunger strike at Califo...

When Speeding is Worse Than Violence

NEW & NOTABLE SEPTEMBER 20, 2013

A study of thousands of Immigration and Customs Enforcement hold requests finds that those accused of non-violent violations are more lik...

The FBI recently released [data \(http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2011/crime-in-the-u.s.-2011/property-crime/property-crime\)](http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2011/crime-in-the-u.s.-2011/property-crime/property-crime) that show a nationwide increase in property offenses in large cities in the first half of 2012. Some portion of these increases began before realignment took effect—and because they took place in other states as well, parsing the impact of realignment is challenging.

However, the California Department of Justice is scheduled to release crime data for all California counties through 2012 in the next two months, which will allow researchers to more effectively tie changing crime patterns to realignment. If it turns out crime is up, and the increase can be tied to realignment, a political debate about “reforming the reform” is likely to ensue.

Realignment was expected to achieve better results because offenders would be supervised in the community. A report recently released by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation suggests recidivism patterns are largely unchanged.

The data show that offenders released after realignment have roughly the same high rate of recidivism as those released before. Sixty percent are rearrested within one year of release. This is not the last word on recidivism, however, as the data only cover offenders released from prison and not those released from county jails who would have previously done time in prison.

What is clear is that violations of parole are no longer a large driver of the prison population.

Counties did not undertake realignment on equal footing. Prior to realignment, some counties relied heavily on the state prison system to handle felony offenders while others tended to use local jails and alternative sanctions.

Some had well-developed probation and social services systems; others did not. Realignment gave counties complete authority to determine how they would deal with the new influx of offenders.

As a result, realignment is being implemented in very different ways. Many officials throughout the state are now clamoring for a more coordinated approach, with common measures of performance and more resources to support the staff, physical plant, and services needed to achieve better results than the state did.

Making the Change Visible

While the story of realignment continues to unfold, a particular challenge is simply the invisibility of what is happening in communities.

Realignment highlights the lack of systematically collected data that would allow the state to gauge the success of the counties’ different approaches and identify practices that reduce recidivism.

After neglecting to include funds for data collection, research and evaluation in the original realignment legislation, many policymakers in Sacramento—joined by a chorus of counties and other groups throughout the state—are beginning to push for data that can provide an assessment of realignment and guide the state in building safer communities and better systems for aiding reentering offenders.

Ryken Grattet, Ph.D., is a Research Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. His research and [writing \(http://www.ppic.org/main/bio.asp?i=531\)](http://www.ppic.org/main/bio.asp?i=531) focuses on California corrections law and policy. He welcomes readers’ comments.

BARBARA E. BLOOM is a Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies at Sonoma State University. She is the Co-Director (with Dr. Stephanie Covington) of the Center for Gender and Justice. Dr. Bloom has directed a range of research projects focused on gender-responsive interventions and services for justice-involved women and girls. She has provided assistance to federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies, including the National Institute of Corrections, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Alameda County Sheriff's Office, City and County of San Francisco Adult Probation Department and various community-based agencies serving women and girls throughout the U.S. Dr. Bloom is a past President of the Western Society of Criminology and, in 2007 she was honored by the National Council on Crime & Delinquency with the Donald Cressey Award which recognizes individuals who have made outstanding academic contributions to criminology, promoting programs that are fair, humane, effective, and economically sound.

Contact: bloom@sonoma.edu

Links: <http://nicic.gov/>
<http://www.centerforgenderandjustice.org/>

Barbara Bloom:

Guiding Principles for Gender-Responsive Practice

1. Gender	Acknowledge that gender makes a difference.
2. Environment	Create an environment based on safety, respect, and dignity.
3. Relationships	Develop policies, practices, and programs that are relational and promote healthy connections to children, family, significant others, and the community.
4. Services and Supervision	Address substance abuse, trauma, and mental health issues through comprehensive, integrated, culturally relevant services, and appropriate supervision.
5. Socioeconomic Status	Provide women with opportunities to improve their socioeconomic conditions.
6. Community	Establish a system of community supervision and re-entry with comprehensive, collaborative services.

Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint

*A Gender-Responsive, Family-Focused Approach to Integrating
Criminal and Community Justice*

Adult Probation Department and Sheriff's Department
City and County of San Francisco



April 2013

Thank you

Many thanks to Zellerbach Family Foundation for providing the funding to make the Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint possible. Special thanks to Community Works West for its support of this project.

This Blueprint was authored by Barbara Bloom, PhD and Barbara Owen, PhD with input from the following agencies and partners:

Community Works West

Five Keys Charter School

HealthRIGHT 360

Leaders in Community Alternatives

Legal Services for Prisoners with Children

San Francisco Adult Probation Department

San Francisco Collaborative Courts, Superior Court of California

San Francisco Department of Child Support Services

San Francisco Department of Public Health

San Francisco District Attorney's Office

San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium

San Francisco Public Defender's Office

San Francisco Sheriff's Department

The Bridging Group

University of California San Francisco, Citywide Case Management Forensic Program

University of California San Francisco, Department of Ob/Gyn

Zellerbach Family Foundation



Introduction

The Women’s Community Justice Reform Blueprint, authored by Barbara Bloom, PhD and Barbara Owen, PhD offers a gender-responsive, family-focused approach to integrating criminal and community justice systems in San Francisco. Building on the growing body of evidence that demonstrates that the majority of female offenders can be more effectively managed in community settings that provide women-centered and gender-responsive services and programs, this Blueprint outlines multiple strategies to reduce recidivism and break the intergenerational cycle of crime and incarceration. Given the nonviolent nature of most women’s crimes and their low level of risk to public safety, this approach is consistent with the values of public safety, community investment, restorative justice and rehabilitation. With the opportunities created by state criminal justice realignment, the history of collaboration within the unique context of the City and County of San Francisco, and the emerging evidence that supports gender-responsive planning and programming, this Blueprint outlines an innovative approach to contemporary criminal justice policy and practice for women.

This Blueprint is organized into six sections:

- Section 1: *An Overview: Developing a Women-Centered Approach*
- Section 2: *The San Francisco Context*
- Section 3: *A Profile of Justice-Involved Women in San Francisco*
- Section 4: *The Evidence for Gender-Responsive Policy and Practice*
- Section 5: *The Blueprint: Strategies, Analysis, and Implementation*
- Section 6: *Appendix*

An Overview: Developing a Women- Centered Approach

Approach

Prioritizing alternatives to incarceration that promote community integration is a common goal of all San Francisco criminal justice efforts. Given the role of gender in pathways to and from crime and criminal justice involvement, this project specifically examined the situation of female offenders in developing a women-centered approach. Future projects should develop a separate analysis to explore the needs of male offenders.

This approach is grounded in San Francisco's commitment to improving justice for all offenders in two overlapping areas: 1) Promotion of the least restrictive alternatives to custody consistent with public safety by utilizing community services and placements first, and 2) Use of incarceration as the option of last resort. A women-centered approach for female offenders seeks to improve outcomes for justice-involved women and their children, with an additional goal of breaking the intergenerational cycle of incarceration by emphasizing community resources rather than criminal justice sanctions.

Addressing women's pathways to offending and structuring a safe and productive rehabilitative environment are essential to reducing recidivism and improving outcomes after custody or supervision. These non-custodial and community-based placements offer a number of advantages to our communities. Integrating the dual systems of criminal and community justice has the potential to serve women, their children and their families well beyond the limits of criminal justice custody and supervision. This approach offers the advantage of helping to break the cycle of intergenerational incarceration by serving women in the community, thus strengthening their bonds with children and family. Emphasizing community services—rather than criminal justice system programs—also strengthens communities by enhancing community resources available to all community members. Deemphasizing custodial placements has obvious cost-savings and promotes larger values of social and community justice. The principles of restorative justice are also embedded in this approach. Restorative justice recognizes that crime hurts everyone—victim, offender and community—and creates an obligation to make things right. The victim's perspective is central to deciding how to repair the harm caused by the crime. Accountability for the offender means

accepting responsibility and acting to repair the harm done. In reducing the reliance on all forms of incarceration, this strategy will expand community alternatives, and thus improve outcomes for justice-involved women and their children.

This approach is also based on the community reinvestment model by emphasizing community placement where relationships and social support are prioritized. Confinement or other custodial settings are not the first choice in this model. When custody is necessary, it should be invoked in the short-term and as a step toward moving women into community-based supervision and programming. A community reinvestment model strengthens communities and creates new opportunities for collaboration and public-private partnerships.

Developing the Blueprint

With its history of innovative policy and practice, San Francisco provides an ideal context and structure for this approach to integrating criminal and community justice. Collaboration between the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and the Adult Probation Department, in conjunction with other public and community organizations, provides a working framework for integrated collaboration across agency lines. Within this framework, several existing women-centered programs and services provide further foundation for this effort. This approach is conceptually grounded in current gender-responsive theory found in prior research supported by the National Institute of Corrections¹, and emerging empirical evidence that supports gender-responsive practice. This context specific to San Francisco and the theoretical and empirical foundation are detailed in *Section 2* of this report.

Section 3 summarizes available descriptive data on justice-involved women in San Francisco. The Appendix (*Section 6*) provides more detail on the descriptions.

Section 4 provides the rationale for gender-responsive policy and practice. This section outlines the foundation for gender-responsive approaches drawn from evidence-based practice and gender-responsive principles that have been found to be essential to improved outcomes for women enmeshed in the criminal justice system.

Section 5 summarizes our analysis of the processes, programs and services intended to address women's offending through rehabilitation and reentry efforts in San Francisco. This information was collected through observation and interviews in programs and at the women's jail; document collection and review; interviews with staff, providers and other related stakeholders; group interviews and discussion; and solicitation of written comments across the criminal justice system. Based on these findings and background, this Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint focuses on five strategies that can accelerate San Francisco toward the goal of further decreasing reliance on the criminal justice system, reinvesting in communities, breaking intergenerational cycles, reducing costly incarceration and improving criminal justice and other outcomes for women by:

.....
¹ Bloom, B., Owen, B. & Covington, S. (2003). Gender-Responsive Strategies: Research, Practice, and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

1. Integrating criminal justice and community services and programs through a collaborative leadership structure that plans, coordinates and oversees the development of an evolving women-centered multi-agency system. This process should be jointly led by the Adult Probation and the Sheriff's Departments, and overseen by the Community Corrections Partnership².
2. Developing sentencing and pretrial alternatives by expanding non-custodial and community alternatives including mother-child alternative sentencing programs.
3. Creating an intensive and coordinated case management system that follows women through every phase of the criminal justice process and into the community.
4. Expanding and enhancing programming that creates a continuum across custodial, residential and non-residential settings that combines criminal justice and community services and programs that support women during and after successful discharge from criminal justice supervision.
5. Designing an integrated data collection, evaluation and oversight process to monitor and improve system wide supervision and interventions.

.....

² The Community Corrections Partnership is created by California Penal Code § 1230, as added by Senate Bill 678. The community corrections program must be developed and implemented by probation and advised by a local Community Corrections Partnership, which is chaired by the chief probation officer and comprised of the following membership: the presiding judge of the superior court, or his or her designee; a county supervisor or the chief administrative officer for the county; the district attorney; the public defender; the sheriff; a chief of police; the head of the county department of social services; the head of the county department of mental health; the head of the county department of employment; the head of the county alcohol and substance abuse programs; the head of the county office of education; a representative from a community-based organization with experience in successfully providing rehabilitative services to persons who have been convicted of a criminal offense; and an individual who represents the interests of victims.

The Blueprint: Strategies, Analysis, and Implementation

This section summarizes our analysis of the processes, programs and services intended to address women's criminal justice involvement in San Francisco. This analysis is based on observations and interviews in programs and at the women's jail; document collection and review; interviews with staff, providers and other related parties; group interviews and discussion; and solicitation of written comments across the criminal justice system. Based on these analyses, this Women's Community Justice Reform Blueprint focuses on five strategies that can move San Francisco toward the goal of further decreasing overreliance on the criminal justice system, reinvesting in communities, breaking intergenerational cycles, reducing costly incarceration and improving criminal justice and other outcomes for women:

1. Integrate criminal justice and community services and programs through a collaborative leadership structure that plans, coordinates and oversees the development of an evolving women-centered multi-agency system. This process should be jointly led by the Adult Probation and the Sheriff's Departments, and overseen by the Community Corrections Partnership.
2. Develop sentencing and pretrial alternatives by expanding non-custodial and community alternatives, especially for pregnant and parenting women.
3. Create an intensive and coordinated case management system that follows women through every phase of the criminal justice process and into the community.
4. Expand and enhance programming that creates a continuum across custodial, residential and non-residential settings that combines criminal justice and community services and programs that support women after successful discharge from criminal justice supervision.
5. Design an integrated data collection, evaluation and oversight process to monitor and improve system wide supervision and interventions.

As highlighted above, many programs and services are available to women involved in the San Francisco criminal justice system. Key to these systems is a framework for collaboration in established relationships between the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and the Adult Probation Department.

Strategy 1

Create a collaborative leadership structure that plans, supports and monitors an integrated system of criminal justice and community services and programs through gender-responsive multi-agency collaboration.

ANALYSIS

While San Francisco is a service-rich locale where many effective programs and services are available to women involved in the San Francisco criminal justice system, our analysis found that disconnections and lack of integration between programs and services create and sustain a fragmented system for women. We found evidence of excellent programs and models, but the continuum itself is incomplete. This fragmentation impedes the development of a comprehensive and integrated system of services for women from arrest and pre-trial through re-entry and community supervision. Although a commitment to this goal exists throughout the City and County of San Francisco, we observed a critical need for coordinated leadership, collaboration and service delivery that integrates standalone programs, services and agencies.

Specifically, the Realignment Initiative could benefit from staff dedicated to oversee the implementation of women-centered services and programs proposed in this Blueprint. While the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and the APD have an excellent working relationship, there is need for a clearly defined mission and comprehensive approach to the development and oversight of women's services in San Francisco.

We also identified a need to better coordinate the resources and service deployment across the multiple grants and budgetary resources that exist across agencies and organizations.

IMPLEMENTATION

- > Define the mission and roles of the APD and the Sheriff's Department in implementing and revising the Blueprint.
- > Appoint a Women's Community Justice Reform Coordinator within the APD and the Sheriff's Department.
- > Place the authority for overseeing the implementation of the Blueprint within the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP).
- > Formalize collaborations toward meeting common goals in inter-agency agreements/ MOUs.
- > Develop a process for data collection, planning and evaluation.

Strategy 2

Further develop local sentencing alternatives by expanding non-custodial and community alternatives for women.

ANALYSIS

Our analysis found a promising, but unevenly distributed system of non-custodial sanctions/sentencing options for justice-involved women. Although we observed a willingness to develop a continuum of options throughout the system, especially in light of the realignment to local supervision under AB 109, there has been little awareness of gender at the beginning of the sanctioning process. Although some alternative sentencing options for women exist, judges, public defenders and prosecutors appear to lack a comprehensive understanding of these current options. Non-residential sentencing options are less available. Furthermore, there is little or no outcome data available to assess the impact of these options.

IMPLEMENTATION

- > Develop, through the Sentencing Commission, women-centered options in areas of pretrial, sentencing, custodial and non-custodial options, and residential and non-residential treatment.
- > Place a primary emphasis on community supervision (probation) and less on secure custody, e.g., non-custodial and treatment based-sanctions. This should include options such as intensive community supervision (e.g., Community Assessment and Service Center) with and without GPS and electronic monitoring.
- > Develop and utilize community residential alternatives to custody (e.g., CDCR Female Residential Multi-Service Center, Iris Center, HealthRIGHT 360). There is an overall need for alternative sentencing housing for pregnant and parenting women, in addition to housing for single women with wraparound services.
- > Repurpose the Women's Resource Center as a program site for women in custody as a step out model with programming to include survivor services during the day and evening programs in the jail.
- > Educate judges, prosecutors and public defenders in best practices for justice-involved women, including gender-responsive, trauma-informed programs and services that take into consideration families and children, when appropriate.
- > Include oversight and evaluation in the development of sentencing alternatives.

Strategy 3

Develop and enhance an intensive, coordinated continuum of care through integrated case management that follows women through every phase of the criminal justice process and into the community.

ANALYSIS

The present configuration of programs and services has great potential for completing an integrated continuum of care. Many programs, such as the With Open Arms Initiative and the Gender-Responsive Program at the Women's Resource Center and the Jail, contain the fundamental elements of gender-responsive/women-centered practice. Our analysis of the available data suggests that these programs, while promising, may be underutilized within a coordinated (integrated) continuum of care. Other programs may contain essential elements but may not provide a continuum of services and support to women within the criminal justice system and beyond. Other services appear to be fragmented and duplicated in the actual experience of women under supervision. In the midst of these services, there is a lack of coordination and collaboration across the various programs that serve justice-involved women. Programs and services are often site- or status-specific, rather than client-centered. There is a marked need to establish a client-centered case management model to reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication of services. Disconnection among the variety of services and programs creates gaps in service provision and undermines aftercare and follow up in the community. Excellent models for case management services exist but most are program-specific and thus somewhat limited. As such, they do not serve women's needs through a coordinated continuum throughout her involvement in the criminal justice system. That is, case planning appears to be duplicated across multiple agencies and multiple systems with little follow-through and updating. Also missing is a process that integrates women into community programs and services once they complete their criminal justice obligations. This fragmentation also impacts funding. In some cases, funding (and thus participation) may be limited by a woman's criminal justice status (e.g., state parole services terminated upon discharge from parole). Conversely, criminal justice status may be a barrier to receiving community services.

Related to the need for integrated case management is the need for a consistent assessment process and tool. Women are not consistently being properly assessed before leaving the jail or prisons. While there are numerous assessments conducted by various departments and programs, currently there is no consistent assessment tool that is being used system wide which could be used to connect justice-involved women with appropriate services. This results in duplication and does not contribute to a single comprehensive treatment plan for the client.

IMPLEMENTATION

- > Create a coordinated (seamless) multi-disciplinary continuum of care based on case planning.
- > Begin integrated case management at the contact with the criminal justice system through pre-trial services and continue case management throughout criminal justice involvement and community reentry.
- > Focus on gender-responsive plans and recommendations at probation presentence investigation assessment and case planning.
- > Create an integrated case planning process to target services based on women's needs, not based solely on their location in the system or criminal justice status.
- > Ground case planning in shared assessment and cross-system communication and integrated service plans and delivery.
- > Employ the Northpointe Womens COMPAS as a first step in integrated case planning for all participant's/agencies in case management.
- > Develop an integrated case plan through probation-based case management that follows women through criminal justice supervision and connects them to community services both during and after the supervision period.
- > Use a tool such as the Women Offender Case Management Model (WOCMM) for integrated case planning.
- > Tie service delivery to community-based programs and services at every stage of integrated case planning.
- > Remove barriers to accessing community services through MOUs, flexible funding streams and ongoing communication.

Strategy 4

Expand and enhance programming that creates a continuum across custodial, residential and non-residential settings that combines criminal justice and community services and programs that support women, while under supervision, through successful community reentry and integration.

ANALYSIS

San Francisco has created women-centered, gender-responsive and trauma-informed interventions throughout the system. The availability of these interventions, however, is not evenly distributed at every stage of the system (arrest, pre-trial, custody, probation, reentry, etc.). Many program models have excellent potential to create pathways away from criminal offending and towards community integration (e.g., With Open Arms Initiative, Community Assessment and Service Center).

IMPLEMENTATION

- > Expand access to and continuity of medical and mental health care through leadership by San Francisco Department of Public Health.
- > Expand and enhance transitional housing for women and children that provide safe and therapeutic environments.
- > Provide services that support parenting at every stage of the continuum (e.g., parenting education, contact visits, reunification services, and child care).
- > Expand Alternative Sentencing Programs at each stage of the criminal justice process.
- > Design and implement a “reentry pod” to bring women back from CDCR 90 days prior to their release to engage in reentry planning.
- > Expand residential programs for pregnant or parenting women or women in the process of reunification with their children.
- > Secure additional post-residential housing (sober living/satellite) for continued aftercare.
- > Employ principles of gender-responsive, trauma-informed practice at every stage of the criminal justice system; include models, staffing, training and curricula that reflect these principles.

IMPLEMENTATION (CONTINUED)

- > Design culturally and community appropriate services to address the disproportionate representation of women of color in the criminal justice system, particularly African-American women.
- > Address needs of the transgender population through additional research and policy efforts.
- > Increase and expand programs and services in these areas:
 - * Mentorship/peer support
 - * Life skills, job training and job placement
 - * Educational options as provided by Five Keys Charter School and higher education
 - * Victim/survivor groups
 - * Parenting programs for pregnant women and women with children
 - * Family-focused services and counseling
 - * Additional services for children that are developmentally appropriate
 - * Reunification services
 - * Outpatient wraparound services
 - * Sober living/satellite housing
 - * Transportation services or support

Strategy 5

Design an integrated data collection, evaluation and oversight process to monitor, inform and improve systems.

ANALYSIS

Although some programs have a formal evaluation component (e.g., With Open Arms through the Department of Public Health and an outdated SISTERS evaluation), few process or outcome studies were available for review. Therefore, no statement about program or service effectiveness can be made. This finding points to a critical need for evaluation of programs, services and system-wide efforts. In this era of evidence-based practice, evaluation data supporting a women-centered approach is crucial. These data should be used for program design and planning and serve as a guide to “real time” implementation.

As described in Section Three, the limitations of the data direct attention to the need to collect and analyze a wide range of data pertaining to justice-involved women. The COMPAS assessment has the potential to provide these descriptive data about women’s pathways to the criminal justice system, particularly in terms of programs, services and other interventions. Specifically, more information is needed about women and their children, including children’s ages, living situations, caregivers, etc. This data can provide a basis for family-focused community services.

IMPLEMENTATION

- > Partner with evaluation experts who have a proven track record in conducting research on women’s programs within criminal justice and the community.
- > Explore and encourage public/private partnerships to enhance resources for services and evaluation.
- > Pursue funding for both specific program and system-wide studies.
- > Establish process/action research and evaluation, including intermediate outcomes to improve programs during the evaluation process.
- > Conduct a “data-informed needs assessment” of women and their children.

Going Forward

These strategies can serve as a first step in the process of reducing women’s incarceration, expanding alternative sentencing options, developing a collaborative case management system, and enhancing programs and services for justice-involved women across the criminal justice and community continuum. In order to go forward, we suggest that the APD and Sheriff’s Department jointly create an implementation plan which will include a map of the existing programs and services for women in San Francisco, a description of programs that need “repurposing” (e.g., WRC), service enhancement, new programs/services that should be created, and specific policies and practices that need to be put in place in order to develop a continuum of care for women. The collaborative nature of the City and County of San Francisco provides the foundation for these efforts in developing a robust community justice model for justice-involved women.

DAVID W. BALL works primarily in the field of criminal justice, writing and teaching in the areas of criminal law, criminal procedure, sentencing and corrections. He is currently Co-Chair of the Corrections Committee of the American Bar Association's Criminal Justice Section. His articles have been published in the Columbia Law Review, the American Journal of Criminal Law, the Stanford Law and Policy Review, and the Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy. In 2013, he was voted 1L Professor of the Year. Prior to becoming a full time member of the Santa Clara University School of Law faculty in 2009, Ball served as a Social Justice Teaching Fellow at Santa Clara, a Research Fellow at the Stanford Criminal Justice Center, and a law clerk for the Honorable John T. Noonan, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco. He graduated with highest distinction from the University of North Carolina, where he was a Morehead-Cain Scholar, and got a second BA from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar.

Selected papers:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1871427

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2220028

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1474105

Tough on Crime (on the State's Dime): How Violent Crime Does Not Drive California Counties' Incarceration Rates - And Why it Should, 28 Ga. St. L. Rev. 987 (2012)

Abstract:

California's prisons are dangerously and unconstitutionally overcrowded; as a result of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Plata v. Schwarzenegger*, the state must act to reduce its prison population or face court-ordered prisoner releases. The state's plans to reduce overcrowding are centered around what it calls criminal justice "realignment", whereby California will divert some sentenced offenders away from state facilities towards county facilities. The plan faces opposition from county officials, who argue that the state is pushing its problem onto the counties.

But what if the counties are actually responsible for state prison overcrowding? I argue that California's prison overcrowding is due in large part to county decisions about how to deal with crime. Using data from 2000-2009, I will show that California's counties use state prison resources at dramatically different rates, and, moreover, that the counties which use state prisons the most have below-average crime rates. Viewed this way, the state is simply returning the problem to its source, and forcing counties to pay for their sentencing decisions.

The contribution the Article makes, then, is twofold. First, it suggests that incarceration in state prisons is one policy choice among many, not an inexorable reaction to violent crime. Counties can and do make different choices about how to respond to violent crime, including the extent to which they use state prison. Second, the Article demonstrates why localities are crucial—and critically underexamined—contributors to state prison populations. Decisions are made at local levels about prosecution, investigation, plea bargaining, and sentencing, and these decisions are made by officials who are either elected locally (such as DA's, judges, and sheriffs) or appointed locally (police and probation officers). Local policies and policymakers affect the state's corrections budget, even though the state has no say in designing or implementing these policies. State officials must take these local differences into account, and create incentives for counties to behave differently.

The problem is that it is difficult to distinguish between justifiable, crime-driven incarceration and optional, policy-driven incarceration. I propose a new metric for distinguishing between these two types of incarceration, one which defines justified incarceration in terms of violent crime. This would allow the state to manage local usage of state prison resources without either penalizing crime-ridden areas or rewarding prison-happy ones.

This Article is the first of two articles dealing with the state/county prison relationship. While this Article quantifies the ways in which the extent of local prison admissions is not necessarily a function of the violent crime rate, a second Article will examine whether, given these differences, it makes sense for the state to subsidize county commitments to prison.

(available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1871427)

E Pluribus Unum: Data and Operations Integration in the California Criminal Justice System, Stanford Law & Policy Review, Vol. 21, p. 277, 2010

Abstract:

The Stanford Criminal Justice Center (SCJC) recently completed a series of Executive Sessions with state and local officials about integrated criminal justice in California, exploring the ways in which the hundreds of disparate criminal justice agencies across the state might share information and coordinate activity, cooperating across jurisdictional and agency lines to promote common public safety goals.

An integrated criminal justice system, one where information is readily available to agencies when they need it, has several potential

advantages: it can promote more efficient use of resources by avoiding duplication of effort; provide greater transparency to policymakers, regulatory agencies, and the public; and produce the evidence necessary to illustrate ways in which existing policies can be improved.

While integration is a crucial part of the future of criminal justice, integration itself is an increasingly important issue in its own right, particularly as governments tackle complex problems that do not confine themselves to particular geographic or jurisdictional areas (e.g. environmental pollution). As with criminal justice, tackling these problems also requires massive amounts of information and inter-agency and inter-jurisdictional coordination. Some lessons from the integrated criminal justice context might be relevant here: the importance of agreeing on common metrics, the challenge of getting individual agencies to think about how their information and interventions might be reused, and the importance of ensuring that any proposed changes take ordinary business practices into account. Integrated criminal justice can, at a minimum, illustrate the issues that are likely to arise.

(available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1474105)

Justice Information Sharing: A Legal Primer for Criminal Justice Practitioners in California (with Robert Weisberg), Stanford Public Law Working Paper No. 2141523

Abstract:

California criminal justice agencies need access to data in order to provide security, health care treatment, and appropriate programming, as well as to coordinate these activities with other agencies. By the same token, outside agencies — whether criminal, social service, or non-governmental — could often do their jobs more effectively with access to information generated or retained within particular criminal justice agencies. Criminal justice realignment under AB 109 has only heightened the need for inter-agency data sharing and cooperation, yet there continue to be misunderstandings about the legal framework surrounding information exchange.

This article aims to provide a basic, practical background on the legal rules relevant to information exchange, highlighting under what circumstances — and with whom — criminal justice agencies may share, must share, or must not share their information. The Article's basic conclusion is that criminal justice data sharing is enabled by the existing legal regime.

(available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2141523)

CANEEL FRASER is a Senior Policy Analyst, Advancement Project. Her work within the Urban Peace team focuses on juvenile justice, criminal justice, and reentry issues. Prior to joining the Advancement Project, Caneel maintained her own practice representing indigent criminal defendants in state and federal courts. In addition to her trial and appellate work, she provided pro bono legal services to children in immigration proceedings and legal support to organizations working with at-risk youth. Her previous experience includes serving as a Deputy Public Defender in both Los Angeles and Alameda Counties, representing public housing tenants as an attorney with Bay Area Legal Aid, and working on workforce and equal opportunity issues at the San Francisco Human Rights Commission. She holds a B.A. in Political Science and an M.A. in Sociology from Stanford University and is a graduate of Harvard Law School.

Contact: cfraser@advanceproj.org
(213) 406-9124

Links: Urban Peace: <http://www.advancementprojectca.org/?q=ap-ca-urban-peace>
<http://www.advancementprojectca.org/?q=Community-Violence-Reduction-Model>

THE CHART BELOW PROVIDES A COMPREHENSIVE CHART OF THE CVRS'S THREE GUIDING PRINCIPLES, FIVE ELEMENTS, AND TEN ROOT COMMUNITY CONDITIONS OF VIOLENCE.

URBAN PEACE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

COMMUNITY-BASED & CULTURALLY COMPETENT SERVICE DELIVERY

DATA-DRIVEN POLICY MAKING

BUILT-IN ACCOUNTABILITY

FIVE KEY ELEMENTS TO COMMUNITY VIOLENCE REDUCTION

Prevention

Intervention

Suppression

Reentry

Equitable Distribution Of Resources

10 ROOT CONDITIONS OF COMMUNITY-LEVEL VIOLENCE

Lack of Targeted Suppression that Follows a Community Policing Model

Lack of Comprehensive Primary Prevention Infrastructure

Normalization of Violence

Lack of Community Economic Investment, Workforce Development, and Family Economic Success

Poor Access to Quality Health and Mental Health Care Services

Lack of Effective Reentry Strategies and Support

Inadequate Government Coordination and Accountability

Early Academic Failure and Lack of School Attachment

Lack of Community Cohesion to Improve Public Safety

Family Isolation and Lack of Access to Support Structures

REENTRY & REINTEGRATION FORUM

Panel 2

Making It Real: Successful implementation strategies

Perspective from formerly incarcerated individuals providing insights on what they need from government agencies:

- **Tamisha Walker and LaVern Vaughn**, *Contra Costa County Project Safe Return*
- Facilitator: **Linda Evans**, *All of Us or None*

Panelists:

- **Wendy Still**, *Chief of Probation, San Francisco County*
 - Public Safety Realignment in San Francisco
- **Adam Christianson**, *Sheriff-Coroner, Stanislaus County*
 - Sheriff's Custody & Community Institute of Life Skills Helps Change Lives
- **Carlos Morales**, *County Behavioral Health Services, San Mateo County*
 - Getting Ready, Coming Home, Staying Home
- **Ron Davis**, *Chief of Police, East Palo Alto*
- **Judge Gordon Baranco**, *Alameda County Superior Court, Reentry Court (invited, not confirmed)*

WENDY STILL is the Chief Adult Probation Officer of the City & County of San Francisco. Chief Still has worked in State Government for over 33 years and specialized for 26 years in Adult and Community Corrections in the State of California. Chief Still's experiences include developing gender responsive, trauma informed offender prison and community rehabilitation programs and strategic master plans designed to improve outcomes and reduce recidivism for California's offenders and parolees. Chief Still has served as Director, Activation Management and Rehabilitation Programs with the California Federal Prison Health Care Services, and Governor appointed Associate Director-Female Offender Programs & Services, Southern Regional Prison Administrator for 10 prisons, Chief of Regulation and Policy and Chief Financial Officer for the California State Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Chief Still is a Peace Officer and Criminologist.

Chief Still earned her Masters of Advanced Studies, Criminal, Law & Society from the University of California, Irvine. She earned her Bachelor of Science Degree in Organizational Behavior from the University of San Francisco. Chief Still is a member of the American Probation and Parole Association, the American Correctional Association and the American Society of Criminology and has held civic positions within the State of California.



Public Safety Realignment in San Francisco

The First 12 Months

December 19, 2012

Presented by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee:

Wendy Still, Chief Adult Probation Officer (Chair)

Jeff Adachi, Public Defender

Barbara Garcia, Director of Health

George Gascón, District Attorney

Ross Mirkarimi, Sheriff

Gregory Suhr, Chief of Police

San Francisco Superior Court

“

The changes to the criminal justice system brought by Realignment, along with the innovative and authentic partnerships we've established in San Francisco, have provided the City and County with an opportunity to redefine community corrections and reentry to create a system that aligns our Citywide public and private partners' commitment to protecting the community and victims of crime, changing lives, and breaking the inter-generational cycle of crime.

Chief Adult Probation Officer Wendy Still

”

“

While realignment efforts have produced some success stories, much more work needs to be done if we are to ensure that all former inmates returning to San Francisco have the tools they need to lead productive lives and remain crime free.

Public Defender Jeff Adachi

”

“

Our efforts to provide an integrated health and human service approach to serving those leaving our prison system is essential to ensure their success. It's been an honor to work with the leadership of Adult Probation, who has paved the road in new and effective service approaches.

Director of Health Barbara Garcia

”

“

Realignment challenges us to think differently at a time when the criminal justice system is failing us. We must rise to the challenge; take on the serious policy changes that are needed to do our job effectively.

District Attorney George Gascón

”

“

California's Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 has provided the San Francisco Sheriff's Department a framework from which to review and evaluate the programs and services we offer to all of our prisoners as well as the manner in which they are provided. Close collaboration with our criminal justice partners allows us to leverage resources for the benefit of all. An increasing emphasis on reintegrating all offenders—not only the AB109 population—into the community will benefit all stakeholders.

Sheriff Ross Mirkarimi

”

“

The San Francisco Police Department has been an active member of the Community Corrections Partnership since its inception, as part of the Public Safety Realignment Act. The Department fully supports the concept of rehabilitation for low-level, non-violent offenders hoping that these individuals will make the best of this second chance to return to our community as productive and law-abiding contributors. However, those who are on post-release that do not make the best of this second chance and choose to continue to pursue a life of crime; especially violent crime, are not welcome in San Francisco.

We look forward to our continued partnership in Community Corrections which we believe will make for a safer San Francisco.

Chief of Police Gregory Suhr

”

Public Safety Realignment in San Francisco

The First 12 Months

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Section One: Report	
Introduction	5
Legislative Background.....	5
Impact and Response	6
Interventions	27
Preliminary Outcomes	31
Looking Ahead to Year Two	31
Conclusion	35
General Implementation Process and Flow Chart	36
Section Two: Data and Dashboards	39

CHARTS & TABLES

Chart 1: San Francisco’s Probation Revocations Sent to State Prison, 2009-2012	7
Chart 2: Individuals Newly Processed Under AB109 Countywide	9
Table 1: City and County of San Francisco Realignment Budget Detail Fiscal Years 2011-12 and 2012-13.....	10
Chart 3: Most Common Need Factors of PRCS and PC § 1170(h) Clients Supervised by APD	11
Chart 4: PC §1170(h) Straight and Split Sentences by Month, Oct 2011 - Sept 2012	15
Table 2: PC §1170(h) Sentence Lengths, Oct 2011 - Sept 2012	16
Table 3: APD’s AB109 Service Partnerships, Referrals, and Enrollment, Oct 2011 – Sept 2012	22
Chart 5: Post Release Community Supervision Compliance	28
Chart 6: Post Release Community Supervision Sanctions: Reasons for Flash Incarcerations.....	29
Chart 7: Post Release Community Supervision Sanctions: Reasons for PC § 3455a Violations	30
Table 4: PC § 3455 Violations Resulting from New Arrests: Reason for Arrest	30
Chart 8: Individuals Newly Processed Under AB109 Countywide	40
Chart 9: Average Daily AB109 Population (Oct 2011 - Sept 2012).....	41
Chart 10: Average Daily AB109 Population by Month	42
Chart 11: AB109 Population by Department.....	43
Chart 12: Individuals Processed Under AB109 as Part of Jail Population	44
Chart 13: Actual vs State-Projected PC § 1170(h) Sentences	45
Chart 14: Length of PC § 1170(h) Straight Sentences Ordered vs Actual Length of PC § 1170(h) Straight Sentences to be Served	46
Chart 15: Length of PC § 1170(h) Split Sentences Ordered vs Actual Length of PC § 1170(h) Split Sentences to be Served.....	47
Chart 16: State Parole Violators Average Daily Population in County Jail pre- and post-AB109 Implementation.....	48
Chart 17: State Parole Violators in Local Custody	49
Chart 18: Length of State Parole Violator Sentences Ordered vs Actual Length of State Parole Sentences to be Served	50
Chart 19: AB109 Men in County Jail - Participation in In-Custody Programs	51
Chart 20: In-Custody Program Participants by Type of AB109 Sentence	52
Chart 21: Post Release Community Supervision Active Clients vs Successful & Returned to Custody Completions	53
Chart 22: Post Release Community Supervision Compliance by Month	54
Chart 23: Post Release Community Supervision Compliance (Oct 2011 – Sept 2012).....	55
Chart 24: Post Release Community Supervision Sanctions: Reasons for Flash Incarcerations Issued.....	56
Chart 25: Post Release Community Supervision Sanctions: Reasons for PC § 3455a Violations	57
Table 5: Characteristics of AB109 Individuals, October 2011 through September 2012.....	58
Table 6: Characteristics of 1170(h)-Sentenced Individuals	59
Table 7: Characteristics of Parole Violators in Local Custody	60
Table 8: Characteristics of Post Release Community Supervision Clients.....	61

CCPEC Members

Wendy Still

Chief Adult Probation Officer
(Chair)

Jeff Adachi

Public Defender

Barbara Garcia

Director of Health

George Gascón

District Attorney

Ross Mirkarimi

Sheriff

Gregory Suhr

Chief of Police

San Francisco Superior Court

The Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee would like to thank its members, the Human Services Agency, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and Mayor Edwin Lee for their commitment to the successful implementation of Realignment and for their contributions to this report. This report was a collaboration of CCPEC partners and was authored by Leah Rothstein, Research Director for the Adult Probation Department's Reentry Division.

For more information, please visit:
<http://sfgov.org/adultprobation>

Executive Summary

Prior to the Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 (AB109) taking effect on October 1, 2011, the City and County of San Francisco had already begun to establish authentic partnerships between its criminal justice partners, health and human services partners, and community based organizations. The City/County therefore recognized the historic changes brought about by Realignment as an expansion of the criminal justice reforms that City/County partners had been engaged in for years. These reforms have aimed to provide effective community supervision, reduce recidivism, prioritize appropriate alternatives to incarceration, provide comprehensive reentry services to individuals coming out of state or local custody, and engage formerly incarcerated individuals, their families, and victims in local planning processes. Prior to October 2011, with strong leadership in key agencies, the local success of the Community Corrections Performance Incentive Act of 2009 (SB678), and Realignment legislation pending, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors recognized that San Francisco needed a comprehensive community corrections strategy for its criminal justice system, with the Adult Probation Department at the helm of developing this strategy. Each local partner committed to integrating this community corrections framework into its agency's strategy in order to effectively implement Public Safety Realignment in San Francisco.

Though San Francisco was well positioned to implement Realignment, the challenges it posed were significant. Public safety agencies, individuals, and community partners worked together to develop, implement, and monitor the City/County's comprehensive Realignment implementation strategy. With this strong foundation of collaboration, focused determination, and a keen understanding of the systems approach required to make the intent of Realignment a reality, the City/County has seen initial successes in Realignment implementation.

As both a City and a County, the Mayor as Chief Executive and the Board of Supervisors have supported the robust planning and implementation of Realignment. The Court has continued to draw upon its innovative and successful Collaborative Courts in supporting appropriate alternatives to incarceration and connection to treatment for individuals newly sentenced under PC § 1170(h). The District Attorney committed his office to pursue sentences that will reduce recidivism and protect public safety in the long term, including consideration of alternative sentences. The Public Defender—the State's only elected public defender—assisted in the local creation and implementation of due process for individuals on Post-Release Community Supervision who may be sanctioned under the

newly created PC § 3454 flash incarcerations. The San Francisco Police Department continues its excellence in policing by serving warrants issued by the Adult Probation Department and partnering on AB109 issues and joint operations. The Sheriff's Department has successfully managed the jail population to safely keep some of its jails empty and closed, with the total jail population at a remarkable low. The Adult Probation Department launched its Realignment strategy on the foundation of the evidence-based strategies already infused throughout the department. By the time AB109 was implemented, San Francisco's Adult Probation Department (APD) had reduced the number of felony probationers revoked to state prison by almost half (48 percent since 2009), in response to the implementation of the Community Corrections Partnership Incentives Act of 2009 (SB678).

As AB109 transferred many lower-level felony offenders from state to county jurisdiction, San Francisco was poised to build upon its previous successes and to improve upon the State's outcomes with this population, which include a three-year state parole recidivism rate in San Francisco of nearly 78 percent¹. San Francisco's criminal justice agencies responded to Realignment implementation by building on what has worked as well as instituting new programs and establishing and building upon inter-agency collaborations. These responses include:

- incorporating findings from a validated risk and needs assessment into case planning and supervision for AB109 clients;
- implementing risk-based community supervision practices;
- providing extensive training to probation officers in evidence-based supervision practices;
- creating a high risk caseload for AB109 clients as well as a pre-release unit within the Adult Probation Department to work with clients prior to their release from state prison;
- providing in-custody programming in the county jails including educational, substance abuse, and violence prevention programs;
- creating an Alternative Sentencing Planner position within the District Attorney's Office to review cases and provide alternative sentencing recommendations based on individual needs and risks;
- establishing procedures for providing due process protections to AB109 clients on community supervision when sanctions are imposed;
- offering case management and service referrals through the Public Defender's Reentry Unit; and,
- establishing and strengthening partnerships between the Adult Probation Department and the Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency, the Office of Workforce and Economic Development, and other County agencies to provide over \$2 million annually for comprehensive reentry services to AB109 clients on community supervision including housing, health, mental health, substance abuse, and job training and placement services.

These collaborations and programs, along with many others described in this report, were put in place within the first year of Realignment implementation, making it possible to accommodate more than 2,500 individuals in San Francisco County affected by AB109 over the year. This included 411 individuals released on Post Release Community Supervision, 256 sentenced under PC § 1170(h), 91 of whom received PC § 1170(h) split sentences and started Mandatory Super-

¹Recidivism is defined as a return to state prison within the three-year time period. 2012 Outcome Evaluation Report, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Office of Research, October 2012.

vision terms within the year, and over 1,800 parole violations booked into county jail during the first year of Realignment. These numbers are well over the State's projected AB109 impact on San Francisco—22 percent higher than the State's projections of Post Release Community Supervision clients and 47 percent higher than its projections of PC § 1170(h) sentences. The State made no projections regarding the number of parole violators in local custody due to AB109.

While it is too early to report fully on the outcomes and impacts of Realignment in San Francisco, preliminary outcomes include: a jail population that remains well below capacity, a majority (60 percent) of active Post Release Community Supervision clients who are successfully engaged with their supervision plans and have had no formal sanctions imposed over the year; over 600 referrals of AB109 clients on community supervision to services through APD-funded and established service provider partnerships and over 270 clients enrolled in those services; ten individuals on Mandatory Supervision under PC § 1170(h) split sentences who successfully completed their terms (11 percent of those on Mandatory Supervision over the year); 15 Post Release Community Supervision clients who successfully completed their terms (4 percent of the active clients over the year); and 32 of the active AB109 clients on community supervision who were convicted of new crimes over the first year of Realignment, or seven percent of the total active Post Release Community Supervision and PC § 1170(h) Mandatory Supervision clients.

The second year of Realignment implementation will bring more partnerships, collaborations, programs, services, and innovations to San Francisco's criminal justice system. The Adult Probation Department will open the first Community Assessment and Services Center to provide day-reporting and one-stop holistic reentry services provision to AB109 clients and probationers; the Adult Probation Department and the Sheriff's Department will open a Reentry Pod in the county jail for individuals to be released from state prison to county jail for reentry planning and assessment purposes; the San Francisco Sentencing Commission will examine sentencing practices in the County to identify opportunities for sentencing reform and reducing recidivism; the Community Corrections Partnership and its Executive Committee will continue to monitor implementation of Realignment and evidence-based probation practices; the Reentry Council will continue to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on policies and programs impacting adults returning from jails and prisons; and the Adult Probation Department will continue to partner with City/County agencies and community organizations to provide comprehensive reentry services to clients on AB109 community supervision.

The City/County will also continue to expand and utilize opportunities for alternatives to incarceration such as electronic monitoring, placement in treatment, work furlough, and day reporting. The Public Defender will continue current efforts to expand eligibility criteria for Collaborative Courts which will allow individuals in the Realignment population, most of whom remain ineligible under current guidelines, an opportunity to participate in evidence-based alternatives. In addition, the City/County will explore opportunities for addressing pre-trial incarceration, with the goal of reducing the currently high proportion of individuals in custody who are being held pre-trial (approximately 70 percent of the population in custody).

The Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee is pleased to present this report on the first year of Public Safety Realignment, detailing the City/County's impacts, responses, successes, and challenges over the past year, as well as outlining plans for building on these experiences in the coming year. Section One contains a discussion of the first year of Realignment in San Francisco and Section Two provides a series of data charts and dashboards to detail the AB109 populations and preliminary trends and outcomes.

ADAM CHRISTIANSON began his career in public safety, graduating from San Joaquin Delta College with a certification in Paramedicine and worked as a paramedic in Stanislaus County for several years including work as a flight paramedic for Medi-Flight of Northern California. Sheriff Christianson started his law enforcement career with the Ceres Police Department and also worked for the Modesto Police Department before joining the Sheriff's Department in 1996. He has worked a variety of assignments including Patrol, the Reservoir Unit, K9 handler and K9 Unit Supervisor, Bailiff, Field Training Officer, Hi-Tech Crimes Detective, Sergeant and Lieutenant.

Sheriff Christianson has a BA degree in Criminal Justice Management from Union Institute & University, graduating in 2006. He is also a graduate of the FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development Course, the POST Executive Development Course, West Point Leadership in Police Organizations and has an Executive Certificate from the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. Adam Christianson was sworn into office as Sheriff-Coroner-Public Administrator on July 11, 2006 and re-elected another four-year term in June, 2010.



[Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department](#)

Sheriff's Custody & Community Institute of Life Skills Helps Change Lives

Modesto, CA – In January of 2012, Sheriff Adam Christianson and Chaplain Michael Atinsky discussed the idea of establishing a comprehensive program for inmates that would prepare them for early release and follow them into the community. The plan incorporated known programs made available to the inmates in the Jail and the Day Reporting Center with the idea that educational, vocational and rehabilitative opportunities would be more effective if community based organizations and the Sheriff's Office worked together as a large collaborative team within a shared framework. Those programs would become more effective if everyone were given the opportunity to work under one roof within the Detention Center. The premise is that a 24/7 environment which emphasizes a positive program culture would encourage progress and change in the mind, emotions, and spirit of the inmates.

The Sheriff's Custody Institute of Life Skills (SCILS) is a comprehensive rehabilitative program that begins while the inmate is in custody and follows the inmate into the community. The name has recently been changed to Sheriff's Custody & Community Institute of Life Skills (SCCILS) to reflect the strategy.

The programs offered through SCCILS while in custody, would also be offered in the community, once released. The SCCILS students would be reunited, after release, finding classes, therapy, support groups, faith and other community based organizations, as well as housing and employment within the fraternity of personal growth outside of custody.

The purpose of SCCILS is to confront the person leading a destructive life with all the building blocks of a lifestyle, leading them to a constructive and abundant way to live that never leads back to crime.

The mission of SCCILS is to use the good forces of the community, involving citizens, bringing change and using their positive influence as role models, trained and equipped by organizations that embrace volunteerism, building a unified, comprehensive community based culture that reaches those who have been captive to a backward evil life and move them forward.

The SCCILS inmates in the first class were selected by the Jail Alternatives Unit. Lieutenant Jim Jacobs authorized Sergeant Ernie Radza to begin the process. The process of selecting candidates began in April 2013.

Twenty men began the classes and eighteen of them finished the first sixty days satisfactorily.

Classes were presented by Enriched Learning, Friends Outside, National Alliance of Mental Illness, Christ Behind the Walls, Anti-Virus, Choosing Civility, Stanislaus Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, Men in Recovery and 2nd Chances along with men and women from the community who volunteered their time and personal stories of triumph.

The Sheriff interacted with the men the second week they were in class and challenged them to put him out of business by not coming back, making good choices and encouraging others not to commit crimes. Staff and deputy sheriffs presented along with others from the community, inspiring the men to consider the type of employment,

education, and/or business available to them. There's much more opportunity for outside motivational and instructional interaction with community leaders and servants.

Graduation occurs on the day they come back to the Detention Center on a Visitor's Pass to tell their story of how they made changes to their lives and are living a law abiding life.

The next class will begin with continuing students on August 8, 2013. We have 13 newly enrolled students. The continuing students will be encouraged to tutor and sponsor the new students. Giving back is a large portion of change and rehabilitation.

As we look to new and creative partnerships in the community with the goal of reducing recidivism, there's great success in delivering classes through the Sheriff's Custody & Community Institute of Life Skills, preparing men to change. Our next challenge is to properly follow the SCCILS alumni into the community and continue to ensure they lead a successful, productive life without returning to a life of crime and incarceration.

Chaplain Michael Atinsky BS,MDiv,DMin is the Programs Coordinator for the Stanislaus County Sheriff's Office.

Contact him at: matinsky@stanislaussheriff.com

Sheriff Adam Christianson
Stanislaus County
www.scsdonline.com

For information about this news release, contact Sheriff Adam Christianson at (209) 525-7216.

CARLOS MORALES is a licensed clinical social worker who helped develop the first peer case management program with severely mentally ill with City Wide Case Management in San Francisco. He was the first coordinator of the San Francisco Drug Court and an in-custody service program. Carlos also managed an assertive community treatment program with Westside ACT in San Francisco. He was the clinical chief for a large non-profit corporation that provided programs in twelve California counties and included several conditional release programs. He also served as a program supervisor for the City of Berkeley. Carlos is currently the Clinical Services Manager II for Behavioral Health and Recovery Services in San Mateo County and oversees their forensic services. He holds a Masters Degree in Social Welfare from the University of California at Berkeley and has been practicing social work for close to thirty years.

ADVANCED NOTICE & PRE-RELEASE PLANNING

PRCS Population: Probation (SMCPD) shares information from CDCR with Service Connect (SvC) staff using a faxed form. CDCR may directly contact the Health System (SMCHS) to discuss high-risk cases, prior to arrival, which may require specialized behavioral or medical attention.

1170H Population: The Sheriff's Office (SMCSO) shares a spread sheet bi-weekly containing all 1170H population being released within 60 days, including their names, sentence date, length of sentence, DOB, last city of residence and quick-CAIS risk level. All cases are discussed at Re-entry MDT to plan for services and reentry into community.

Preliminary joint plan development

SvC staff cross-check their databases for past history with those identified supervisee rosters, and share non-confidential information with SMCPD and SMCSO. All stakeholders participate in PRCS & Re-entry Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) meetings.

SvC works with SMCPD, SMCSO, and Correctional Health (CH) staff to ensure a smooth transition back to the community. CH assists SvC staff in engaging identified inmates for clinical referrals prior to release. CH also provides, prior to release, a clinical hand-off of all relevant medical/behavioral treatment plans and information to appropriate SvC staff. Svc staff works with SMCPD and SMCSO to assess which clients qualify for services and best placement/or housing alternatives for them. Wherever possible SvC visits people in jail to begin MH/AOD assessment, transition planning and also meet with supervisee at point of release to escort him/her to SMCPD. Based on this and other factors, SMCPD creates an initial plan for supervisees. Information is shared in the PRCS and Re-entry MDTs, as appropriate. Human Services coordinates eligibility paperwork shortly before release to ensure smooth transition.

ALL PRCS AND SPLIT SENTENCED 1170H MUST REPORT TO PO WITHIN 48 HOURS OF RELEASE

Transition from in- to out-of-custody supervision

SMCSO facilitates Re-entry MDT mtgs; SMCSO, in collaboration with SMCPD and BHRS, attempts to place qualified inmates in treatment services, or help them develop a plan for reentry. SMCSO gives partners, where possible, at least 60 days' notice prior to release, in order to create a smooth transition.

Orientation and Warm Hand-off

A Probation Officer provides supervisee an orientation to their new supervision status, confirms conditions, and departmental expectations. The PO also develops a supervision plan that includes goals to address their most prominent criminogenic needs, which is then shared with partners. There is then a warm hand-off to SvC on first floor of the Hall of Justice.

Assessment and Referral

All new supervisees that visit SvC are screened and assessed for immediate needs (e.g. food/shelter/employment), MH, AOD, and critical medical. All supervisees are referred for follow-up to appropriate level of care. Any outstanding benefits applications, including medical coverage benefits are completed and plans for the next week and longer term are developed. SvC staff refer to appropriate services as early as possible, or provide urgent care/crisis intervention, if needed.

Engagement and Case Management

SvC staff help supervisees connect with community support/mentorship, assist with family reunification/custody issues, and provide high-risk supervisees with short-term case management. Moderate and high-risk cases are followed regularly through MDTs.

WRAP SUPERVISEE WITH SERVICES THAT WILL ADDRESS HIS/HER NEEDS

Sheriff's Office Role

- Work with other agencies, including SMCPD and SvC staff, to ensure a smooth transition to community-based services that will enable supervisee to successfully reintegrate into community.

Probation Department's Role

- Ongoing supervision, ensure compliance with conditions, determine status of probation, coordinate with Svc staff on follow-up with referrals to treatment & support services.

Human Services Agency's Role

- Ongoing linkage to support services, such as eligibility determination for public assistance programs, short-term housing, access to food, employment, transportation, and family reunification services.

Health System's Role

- Ongoing follow-up and provision of appropriate level of care for mental health, AOD, and other medical services.

Community Partners & Providers' Role

- Provide ongoing and follow-up community-based services and community support to the formerly incarcerated individuals, and their families, as appropriate.

RONALD DAVIS was appointed East Palo Alto Police Chief in 2005. Prior to his appointment, Chief Davis served 20 years with the Oakland Police Department where he rose to the rank of Captain. In East Palo Alto, Chief Davis has led a community-policing effort that has increased public trust and confidence in the police and achieved dramatic crime and violence reductions in a city once dubbed the murder capital of the United States. Chief Davis partnered with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to implement a pilot parole-reentry program that provided programming services and a job program with the California Department of Transportation. The East Palo Alto Police Department was the first and only police agency in the state to operate a state-funded reentry program.

Chief Davis is the co-author of the Harvard University and National Institute of Justice (NIJ) publication, "Exploring the Role of the Police in Prisoner Reentry" and a contributing author to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) publication: "Early Release of Prisoners and Its Impact on Police Agencies and Communities in California." Chief Davis possesses a Bachelors of Science degree from Southern Illinois University (SIU) and has completed the Senior Executives in State and Local Government Program at Harvard University's, John F. Kennedy School of Government.



Exploring the Role of the Police in Prisoner Reentry

Jeremy Travis, Ronald Davis and Sarah Lawrence

Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety

This is one in a series of papers that will be published as a result of the Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety.

Harvard's Executive Sessions are a convening of individuals of independent standing who take joint responsibility for rethinking and improving society's responses to an issue. Members are selected based on their experiences, their reputation for thoughtfulness and their potential for helping to disseminate the work of the Session.

In the early 1980s, an Executive Session on Policing helped resolve many law enforcement issues of the day. It produced a number of papers and concepts that revolutionized policing. Thirty years later, law enforcement has changed and NIJ and Harvard's Kennedy School of Government are again collaborating to help resolve law enforcement issues of the day.

Learn more about the Executive Session on Policing and Public Safety at:

NIJ's website: <http://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/administration/executive-sessions/welcome.htm>

Harvard's website: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/criminaljustice/executive_sessions/policing.htm

The past generation has witnessed a number of significant changes in the American approach to the twin challenges of reducing crime and administering justice. Arguably the two most important changes in the American criminal justice landscape have been the evolving role of the police and the use of incarceration as a response to crime, which brought with it the subsequent release of millions of people from prison. Much has been written about modern American policing and prisoner reentry individually, yet the intersection of the two has received relatively little attention. This paper explores this intersection and makes the case that there is a role for the police in the prisoner reentry movement.

An obvious place to begin is with the question: Why should the police care about prisoner reentry? We know that recidivism rates of people returning from prison to their communities remain frustratingly high, we know that people who cycle in and out of prison commit a disproportionate amount of crime, and we know that in a world of declining resources, police departments continue to be challenged to do more with less. For these reasons, among others, the police

should be fully engaged in local prisoner reentry efforts.

Beginning in the 1980s, the nation embraced a new vision of the police as a problem-solving institution with an organizational goal of reducing crime. These crime reduction efforts have been marked by an explicit effort to engage community stakeholders, particularly in high-crime neighborhoods. Captured by the phrases “community policing” and “problem-oriented policing,” this new vision was embraced by police leaders, politicians and academics, promoted by a multibillion-dollar federal funding initiative in the 1990s, and heralded as an effective means for simultaneously bringing crime rates down and improving relationships between police and communities, particularly communities of color.

At about the same time, the nation began to increase its use of incarceration as a response to crime, ultimately increasing the incarceration rate fourfold. As a consequence, the number of people released from prison has increased significantly. These individuals return mostly to the same high-crime neighborhoods where the policing philosophy calls for community engagement. The new reality that large numbers of Americans have spent time in prison has given birth to a new focus on prisoner “reentry,” a policy conversation marked, just as with policing, by a pragmatic, problem-solving ethos, a federal

funding initiative and a commitment to engaging community stakeholders in improving public safety outcomes.

It should be noted at the outset that, for many, this is an uneasy conversation across a deep institutional and cultural divide. Some police practitioners view their role as exclusively enforcers of the law. In this view, the relationship of the police to those in prison is limited: the police investigate crimes, arrest suspects and support the prosecution of criminal cases. Any governmental responsibility for returning prisoners to the community rests with parole and probation, not the police. Consistent with this view, expanding the role of the police to encompass even a shared responsibility for improving reentry outcomes would constitute inadvisable mission creep. On a deeper level, because the police are charged with protecting society against harm, some police find it difficult, perhaps inappropriate, to join those who champion the redemption of individuals who were convicted of crimes. In this view, the commission of crime that is sufficiently serious to warrant a prison term justifies continued vigilance against new criminal behavior, not the supportive “welcome home” offered by many organizations that work with former prisoners.

The challenges of distrust and limited role definitions hamper interest in collaboration on the part of reentry practitioners as well. Some believe that the police are part of a larger, oppressive, racist criminal justice apparatus that is single-mindedly interested in harassing young men and, whenever possible, arresting them to send them

to jail or prison, thereby stifling their chances for successful lives. In this view, collaboration with the police is tantamount to working with the enemy (Asbury 2011). In a less extreme stance, some reentry practitioners fear that involving the police in their work will only expose their clients to unnecessary surveillance, and that the “zero tolerance” stance of some police officials and departments is inconsistent with the view of the reentry process as one that often involves missteps, relapse and minor but perhaps excusable rule violations (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs 2000).

Virtually every major national police organization — the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), the Police Foundation and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) — has begun to participate in the reentry conversation (see “Publications on Police and Reentry”). A survey of best practices by the U.S. Conference of Mayors revealed that prisoner reentry collaborations with local law enforcement agencies are becoming more common (U.S. Conference of Mayors 2009). Despite the foundation for partnership, these collaborative efforts are underdeveloped and the role of the police is evolving.

This paper is organized around two key elements. The first sets forth the basic parameters of the present-day reentry phenomenon in America, with a particular focus on two dimensions that intersect with the work of urban police departments: high recidivism rates and the concentration of returning prisoners in a few neighborhoods. The second explores two rationales for police involvement in

prisoner reentry efforts: the promotion of public safety and the promotion of the legitimacy of the police.

The Realities of Prisoner Reentry in America

Over the last several decades the number of individuals incarcerated in prisons and jails has experienced remarkable growth. Consequently, there has been a parallel growth in the number of individuals who are released from a correctional facility and return home to their communities, as more than 95 percent of all state prisoners will eventually be released from prison (Hughes, Wilson and Beck 2002; Travis 2005). The number of individuals released from state prison in 2010 was 708,677, which is more than four and a half times higher than in 1980 (figure 1) (Hughes and Wilson 2001; Guerino, Harrison and Sabol 2011). Because most — four out of five — individuals released from prison are placed on parole supervision, there has been a commensurate increase in the number of people under community supervision, from 196,786 in 1980 to 735,124 in 2010 (figure 1). The nature of community supervision has also changed, shifting the balance away from support toward surveillance, resulting in a significant increase in parole revocations, from 27,177 in 1980 to 227,311 in 2010 (figure 1). These seismic shifts in American criminal justice practice have created an unprecedented state of the world: every year large numbers of individuals — mostly men — are arrested, incarcerated, released, placed on criminal justice supervision and returned to prison on parole violations. (For an examination of the somewhat different issues surrounding reentry from county jails, see “Reentry From County Jails.”)

Publications on Police and Reentry

Carter, Madeline M., Susan Gibel, Rachelle Giguere and Richard Stroker. *Increasing Public Safety Through Successful Offender Reentry: Evidence-Based and Emerging Practices in Corrections*. Silver Spring, Md.: Center for Effective Public Policy, 2007.

International Association of Chiefs of Police. *Building an Offender Reentry Program: A Guide for Law Enforcement*. Alexandria, Va.: International Association of Chiefs of Police, and Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2007.

International Association of Chiefs of Police and Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. *Offender Re-Entry: Exploring the Leadership Opportunity for Law Enforcement Executives and Their Agencies*. Alexandria, Va.: International Association of Chiefs of Police, and Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, January 2007.

Jannetta, Jesse, and Pamela Lachman. *Promoting Partnerships between Police and Community Supervision Agencies: How Coordination Can Reduce Crime and Improve Public Safety*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, May 2011.

La Vigne, Nancy G. *Mapping for Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Efforts: A Guidebook for Law Enforcement Agencies and Their Partners*. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation and U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, May 2007.

La Vigne, Nancy G., Amy L. Solomon, Karen A. Beckman and Kelly Dedel. *Prisoner Reentry and Community Policing: Strategies for Enhancing Public Safety*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center and U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2006.

Schwarzfeld, Matt, Deirdre Mead Weiss, Martha Plotkin and Laura Draper. *Planning and Assessing a Law Enforcement Reentry Strategy*. Report prepared by the Council of State Governments Justice Center and the Police Executive Research Forum for the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2008.

U.S. Conference of Mayors. *Status of Ex-Offender Reentry Efforts in Cities: A 79-City Survey*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2009.

Community Concentrations

Individuals returning home from America's prisons are not equally distributed across all communities. Rather, they are disproportionately concentrated in urban communities and often the poorest neighborhoods of color within those communities (Clear 2007). Research by the Urban Institute has documented these spatial

concentrations. In Chicago, for example, six of the city's 77 communities account for a third of all returning prisoners. In Baltimore, 36 percent of prisoners return to six of the city's 55 community areas. In Houston, a quarter of all returning prisoners are concentrated in five of the city's 185 ZIP codes (Watson et al. 2004).

REENTRY & REINTEGRATION FORUM

Panel 3

Working Together: Building comprehensive, multi-faceted systems

Perspectives from formerly incarcerated individuals providing insights on what they need from the community:

- **Michael Hamilton**, *Small business owner*
- **Gary Scott**, *KID Cat*
- Facilitator: **Linda Evans**, *All of Us or None*

Panelists:

- **Meredith Desautels**, *Staff Attorney/Reentry Coordinator, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area*
- **Rebecca Brown**, *Project Manager, Reentry Solutions Group*
 - HOW WE DID IT: Moving from individual activities to collective action
- **Pastor Andre Harris**, *Community Service Connect, San Mateo County*
- **Javier Aguirre**, *Director of Reentry Services, Santa Clara County*

MEREDITH DESAUTELS Meredith Desautels is a staff attorney at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area. With a focus on advancing racial justice and civil rights in the criminal justice system, Meredith directs Lawyers' Committee's Second Chance Legal Clinic, which provides free legal services to people with past arrests and convictions in San Francisco. Meredith also engages in community outreach and education, policy advocacy, and impact litigation to promote reentry and criminal justice reform. Before joining Lawyers' Committee, Meredith clerked for Judge Noonan on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco, and worked as a supervising attorney in the Clean Slate Practice at the East Bay Community Law Center. She is a graduate of UC Berkeley School of Law, Boalt Hall.

KNOW YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS: EMPLOYMENT & CRIMINAL RECORDS

Below are tips for applying for jobs if you have prior arrests or convictions.

1. Be honest.

- If you do not honestly and accurately disclose your convictions, an employer can reject your application or fire you from your job for dishonesty.
- Make sure you read the question carefully and answer only the question asked.

2. Be careful. Sometimes you still have to disclose an “expunged” conviction, depending on the type of job.

When your conviction has been “expunged,” that means that the court has dismissed your conviction under Penal Code section 1203.4 or 1203.4a. A “**dismissed conviction**” is not erased, and **sometimes you still have to disclose it on job applications**, depending on the type of job.

- Jobs with Private Companies: When applying for a job with a private company, you do not have to disclose convictions that have been dismissed. So, if you have had all of your convictions dismissed, you can state that you have no convictions.
 - It is possible that an employer will see dismissed convictions in an **improper** background check report. Some employers might view your failure to disclose as “dishonesty,” and deny you the job. **If that happens, contact us to discuss your rights**. To avoid this risk, you may decide to state that you have “dismissed convictions.”
- Jobs with the Government and Jobs that Require a Government Background Screening (aka “Live Scan”): You **MUST disclose dismissed convictions** if you are applying for the following:
 - **A job with any government agency or entity**
Ex: San Francisco City/County, BART, MUNI, SF Public Health
 - **An occupational license**
Ex: nursing, security, teaching, cosmetology, real estate
 - **A job working in hospitals or health facilities**
 - **A job working with sensitive populations**
Ex: working with children, seniors or people with disabilities
 - **A job that requires a security clearance**
Ex: working at airports or banks
 - **A job that involves a government contract**

When applying for these jobs, disclose all convictions. For any “expunged” conviction, write that the conviction was “dismissed under Penal Code section 1203.4/1203.4a.”

3. There are limits on what questions an employer can ask about your record.

Employers CANNOT ask you about:

- Any arrests that did not result in a conviction*
- Participation in a diversion program*
- Misdemeanor convictions that have been dismissed under Penal Code § 1203.4

**Some exceptions apply for law enforcement jobs and jobs in health facilities.*

*Wondering what you
are required to disclose
on job applications?
Fired from a job because
of your criminal record?*

**Visit Lawyers’
Committee for Civil
Rights’ Second Chance
Legal Clinic.**

**Call 415-814-7610
to sign up.**

Clinic is held the last
Tuesday of each month
at 6 p.m. at the West
Bay Community Center,
1290 Fillmore Street
(at Eddy).

KNOW YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS: EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND CHECKS

***WARNING:** The rules below apply only to background checks run by private employers. These rules will not apply if the job requires fingerprinting for a Dept. of Justice background check, for example for occupational licensing or work with the government or with sensitive populations.
Tip: If you do fingerprinting for the background check, these rules probably will not apply.

1. You have a right to see your background check report.

- An employer must ask your permission before running a background check, unless the employer suspects you of wrongdoing.
- The employer must also give you an opportunity to request a copy of the report. Always check the box, and request a copy of your report.
- Before denying you a job because of the background check, the employer must provide you a copy of the report, even if you did not request a copy.

2. The law limits the information that can be reported in a background check.

Under California law, a background check cannot include:

- Any arrests that did not result in a conviction, unless the case is still pending,
- Any diversion programs that were successfully completed,
- Convictions that are older than 7 years,
- Convictions that have been dismissed under Penal Code § 1203.4/1203.4a,
- Any erroneous information

Including any of this information in a background check report is unlawful. Remember, you have to request a copy in order to check the accuracy and lawfulness of the report.

These rules do not apply for occupational licenses or work with the government, in health facilities, or with sensitive populations (children, seniors, or people with disabilities).

3. You have a right to challenge incorrect or unlawful information.

- You have a right to challenge any inaccurate or unlawfully reported information. The employer must give you the contact information for background check company so you can request a correction.
- If the challenged information is inaccurate, it must be corrected within 30 days. You can request that the corrected report be sent to any employer who received the incorrect report.
- Call Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights for help with enforcing your rights: 415-814-7610.

4. Never share your RAP sheet.

Your RAP sheet includes your entire criminal history and is confidential. Your employer is not allowed to ask for your RAP sheet and you should never share it.

REBECCA BROWN is the Founder and President of Further The Work, and has spent more than a decade helping nonprofit organizations and public agencies do their work, and do it better. She is a facilitator, trainer, community organizer, organizational development and strategic planning consultant, philanthropic advisor, and highly experienced social service program designer and grant writer, having served as sole or lead author in developing numerous innovative programs that have become recognized as exemplary in their fields. An early advocate for developing an intentional approach to crime and incarceration, in 2010 she wrote a criminal justice/reentry research brief: *A Closer Look: Issues of Violence, Incarceration, and Reentry in Richmond, CA*, highlighting the importance of developing better and more integrated approaches to transforming this costly cycle.

In 2011, in partnership with Susun Kim of Bay Area Legal Aid, Rebecca formed the Reentry Solutions Group (RSG), a grassroots community engagement, education, and advocacy initiative. RSG's mission is to help create a peaceful, safe, and supportive West Contra Costa County by organizing, educating, and mobilizing our community to prevent and heal the harms related to crime and incarceration. In doing this work, they recognize and value all members of our community, including those who are involved in the criminal justice system, victims, and families. As RSG's Director, Rebecca has played a key role in organizing the community and advising the Community Corrections Partnership on the use of AB 109 funds in Contra Costa County. Rebecca worked in an earlier career as a financial analyst in New York City. A Richmond resident, she holds a Bachelor's degree from UC Berkeley and a Master's degree from Stanford University, where she is a doctoral candidate. She also holds a Certificate in Nonprofit Management from California State University East Bay.

Link for *A Closer Look*: http://furtherthework.com/FTW_Incarceration_0410_r7h.pdf

PASTOR ANDRE HARRIS, SR. has over 20 years of experience in the field of Reentry. He is currently serves as the Community Worker II/Mentor with the San Mateo County Criminal Justice Realignment Program – Service Connect. He is also Pastor of Born Again Christian Center in East Palo Alto, since 1999 and a ordain minister since 1990, and is formerly incarcerated. He attended San Jose Christian College and was a youth pastor at True Light Missionary Baptist Church in East Palo Alto, CA. He is a former Chaplin of the San Mateo County Juvenile Facility, Camp Glenwood in LaHonda, CA and he frequently pays visits to San Quentin State Prison. He is a community activist and an organizer in East Palo Alto and throughout the California. Pastor Harris started The Men On The Wall Mentor Ministry in 2003 to help at risk youth and formerly incarcerated men and women in developing better life skills and helping them to navigate their way through life and by helping them in reconnecting with their families. He was the Community Service Coordinator for the East Palo Alto Re- Entry Program and oversaw the Restorative Justice area of that program. Pastor Harris is certified by Correctional Counseling Inc., as a Moral Reconation Therapy Facilitator --- a Cognitive Behavioral Therapy program that is used to dismantle criminal thinking and behavior.

Contact:

Mailing Address:

PO Box 50873
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Church Site:

891 Weeks St.
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

Bus. Phone: 650.322.7932

Fax: 650.326.0425

Cell: 650.380.9301

Website: www.the-bacc.org

JAVIER AGUIRRE is the Director of Reentry Services for the County of Santa Clara. This position was recently created to manage, plan, direct and coordinate operational activities and projects of the Office of Reentry Services. He is responsible for the operations and day-to-day functions of the County's Reentry Resource Center and countywide coordination and oversight of the Public Safety Realignment Program and Adult Reentry Strategic Plan. A graduate of both Stanford University and Loyola Law School, Javier was recently a Principal Budget and Public Policy Analyst serving as the Public Safety Realignment and Reentry Program Administrator. Javier has over thirteen years of experience working for the County of Santa Clara, including eight years as a Senior Policy Aide to former Supervisor Blanca Alvarado. Javier has also served in this community as a former elected Board Trustee (and President of the Board) for the Gilroy Unified School District. He currently resides in Gilroy with his wife and three children.

Public Safety Realignment Program (AB 109) & Reentry Services

Introduction

Executive Summary

On June 21, 2011 the Board of Supervisors approved the cross-system Reentry Network to identify reentry and recidivism reduction strategies, streamline processes to link inmates to effective in-custody and community-based programming, and prepare Santa Clara County for the realignment of parolees and low-level prisoners. The enactment of AB 109, the Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011, shifted state prisoners to California counties where they will serve their jail sentence. This legislative change created an opportunity for the County to modify systems and protocols to accommodate a new offender population and create new strategies while learning from the experience of the first year of AB 109 implementation.

Public Safety Realignment Program - First Year

The County's Public Safety Realignment Initial Spending Plan and the County's Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Implementation Plan were adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 27, 2011. During the first year of implementation, between October 2011 and September 2012, the total realignment population was 2,498 individuals. Of those 48% were classified as 1170(h) individuals sentenced to local jail instead of state prison, 44% as Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) individuals released from state prison and now supervised by Probation, and 8% as 1170(h)MS locally sentenced under AB 109. It is expected that over time the PRCS population will continue to decrease as the 1170(h) and 1170(h)MS populations continue to increase.

Key Findings and Enrollment Related to Services

Findings and Enrollment to Services	# Oct. 2011 to Sept. 2012
Average length of sentence for 1170(h)	18 months
Custodial Alternative Supervision Program participants (out-of-custody)	103
PRCS Enrolled in Substance Abuse Treatment residential, outpatient, and/or transitional treatment	82
PRCS/1170(h) Enrolled in Cognitive Behavioral Services	84
PRCS/1170(h) Enrolled in Employment, Vocational, and Educational Services	289
Realignment Population Enrolled in Social Services benefits	266

Reentry Services Strategic Plan

After a five month strategic planning effort that commenced in May 2012, the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the Five-Year Adult Reentry Strategic Plan for implementation focusing on the following five service areas and goals:

- Education: Increase educational opportunities for moderate and high-risk offenders in-custody and in the community;
- Employment: Increase the number and percentage of formerly incarcerated individuals successfully participating in and completing job training/preparation programs that will lead to gainful employment;
- Family Reunification & Support: Promote familial support and reunification for moderate and high-risk offenders and reduce the impact of incarceration on their children;
- Health & Well-Being: Enhance the accessibility of mental health and substance abuse treatment services, and needed health care services for all ex-offenders after release; and
- Housing: Improve short and long-term affordable housing for formerly incarcerated individuals who are at moderate or high-risk of recidivating in Santa Clara County.

The five Strategic Priorities Work groups will implement the goals stated above and enhance or expand current services provided through AB 109.

State Funding Allocation Detail

In FY2012 (October 2011 - June 2012) the County received \$13.6 million. In FY2013 the County anticipates to receive \$33.7 million for AB 109 programs and services. In the November 2012 election voters approved the Governor's initiative to constitutionally protect the revenues that fund Public Safety Realignment, a newly dedicated portion of existing state sales tax revenue and Vehicle License Fees.

For FY 2014 the County expects to receive \$40,593,280, of which \$593,280 is mandated for the District Attorney and the Public Defender. To maintain current operations and fund existing activities approved by the



Board of Supervisors as part of the FY 2013 Final Budget and adjustments during FY 2013, \$29.5 million is budgeted with \$10.5 million remaining to be allocated. The Administration is recommending \$9.5 million in new AB 109 programs and services and \$1 million in reserve for unanticipated ongoing program needs for FY 2014 which will bring the total AB 109 program to \$40.5 million. Additionally, the Administration is recommending \$8,871,145 in one-time program needs.

Emerging Issue

During FY 2014 Reentry stakeholders will need to continue to assess the extent to which the County's Realignment Program and Strategic Plan have been implemented and fully develop the data warehouse to enable deeper analysis and a robust outcomes evaluation program. These efforts will enhance cross-departmental collaboration and a better understanding of the services offered by community service providers.

Summary of Departmental Ongoing Allocations for FY 2014 Base and Recommended

Department	FY 2014 Base Allocation		Recommended Change		FY 2014 Total	
	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE
County Executive	\$1,276,296	3.0	\$126,640	1.0	\$1,402,936	4.0
County Counsel	\$128,000				\$128,000	
Employee Services Agency	\$233,860	2.0			\$233,860	2.0
Procurement	\$50,000				\$50,000	
Information Services	\$356,412	2.0	\$475,899	3.0	\$832,311	5.0
Facilities & Fleet	\$658,214		\$109,253		\$767,467	
Criminal Justice System (Reserve)			\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	
District Attorney	\$296,640	2.0			\$296,640	2.0
Public Defender	\$296,640	2.0	\$484,333	2.0	\$780,973	4.0
Pretrial Services	\$582,462	5.0	\$100,000		\$682,462	5.0
Sheriff	\$507,558	60	\$1,411,612	14	\$1,919,170	74.0
Sheriff's DOC Contract (FTE in Sheriff total)	\$6,461,375		\$1,702,050		\$8,163,425	
Department of Correction	\$2,102,660	18.0	\$139,470	1.0	\$2,242,130	19.0
Probation	\$7,421,995	48.0	\$1,706,741	2.0	\$9,128,736	50.0
Mental Health	\$2,287,956	10.5	\$1,688,192		\$3,976,148	10.5
Custody Health	\$3,916,830	17.0			\$3,916,830	17.0
Department of Alcohol & Drug Services	\$3,382,036	4.0	\$1,489,784	4.0	\$4,871,820	8.0
Social Services Agency	\$200,372	3.0			\$200,732	3.0
Valley Medical Center (Base funding in Custody Health)		9.0				9.0
Total	\$30,159,306	185.5	\$10,433,974	27.0	\$40,593,280	212.5

Summary of FY 2014 Recommended Program Enhancements

Program Areas	Highlights and Impacts
Probation Supervision	Increase Probation staff in the High Risk Offender Units and allocate funds to provide oversight and data analysis.
Custodial Supervision & Direct Inmate Services	Increase programming and reentry activities for inmates in Elmwood and enhance vocational programs.
Custodial Alternatives & Programs	Enhance programs, Reentry Center building safety, and outreach to clients in the community.
Health Services and Community-Based Treatment	Increase funding for cognitive behavioral treatment services; offender treatment case management services, faith based re-entry resource center, outpatient clinic, crisis residential beds, treatment services for Parole Reentry Court, and expanded transitional housing units.
Program Administration & Evaluation and Reentry Center	Allocate funds in support of Program Research and Data analysis and for Reentry Center facility maintenance and repair needs.
Program Data Collection & Sharing	Expand Countywide Data Collection and Data Sharing project.
Legal Services & other Support	Allocate funds for expungement and electronic monitoring services.
Reserve and One-time Program Needs	Allocate funds for unanticipated program needs, vocational/educational, employment, rental assistance, housing projects, and correctional upgrades.

