

**Community Corrections Partnership Meeting**  
**June 22, 2011**  
**National University, Room 219**

**Attendees:**

Joe Hernandez - **Cal Fire**, Shasta Trinity Unit  
Julie Hope, Principal Administrative Analyst - Shasta **County Administrative Office**  
Stephen Carlton, District Attorney - Shasta County **District Attorney's Office**  
Donnell Ewert, Director of Regional Services - Shasta County **Health & Human Services Agency**  
Mark Montgomery, Director - Shasta County **Mental Health/Adult Services**  
David Reiten, Deputy Director /ADP Administrator - Shasta County **Mental Health/Alcohol & Drug**  
Denny Mills, Executive Director - Shasta County **Office of Education**  
Wesley Forman, Chief Probation Officer - Shasta County **Probation**  
Jeffrey Gorder, Public Defender - Shasta County **Public Defender**  
Sheila Ashmun, Undersheriff & Dan Van Buskirk, Captain/Custody - Shasta County **Sheriff's Office**  
Melissa Fowler-Bradley, Court Executive Officer - Shasta County **Superior Court** Administration  
Roger Moore- Redding **Police Department**

**Handouts:**

Penal Code 1230 (Proposed Amendment)  
CSAC Funding Assumption Proposal

**Meeting Overview:**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 2 p.m. Introductions were made.

An overview of **SB 678** was offered for new attendees by Wes Forman. Everyone indicated they were up to date.

An update of recent state budget actions was discussed. Highlighted actions included a 6/15/11 budget submittal which was immediately vetoed by the Governor, the State Controller's decision that it was not a balanced budget, and that AB 109 funding was not included, but a potential trailer bill with \$300M (potentially to replace part of \$500M VLF loss) was passed and being sent to the Governor.

Wes Forman explained the two handouts included in the packet. One was the proposed amendment to Penal Code 1230, providing a new version of the Executive Committee members. The other handout was the CSAC AB 109 Funding Proposal identifying approximately \$3.8M for Shasta County. There was some question about whether the \$3.8M included funds for court personnel to handle "parole violations" as outlined in AB 109.

The AB 109 implementation date has been pushed back to 10/1/11, at the earliest, and only if funding is allocated. This gives the CCP/Executive Committee a few more months to develop a plan, a much appreciated relief.

Also discussed was the delayed implementation of pre release parole board violations until 7/1/13 to gives the Courts additional time to develop a plan with the state. Post Release parole board violations will continue to be implemented with the rest of AB 109 on 10/1/11.

The rest of the meeting was spent discussing impacts of AB 109 to individual agencies. A summary is provided.

Impacts were organized into three categories: Non/Non/Non's, Post Release and Parole Violators.

**Non/Non/Non-** There is no impact to any agency until an offender meets the criteria of a NNN and prison would have been the sentence.

Sheriff

Local custody

Probation- No impact unless part of a post release disposition.

Supervision

Programming and treatment\*

Parole violation hearings

Court Personnel

Parole violation hearings- Impact unknown pending details of hearings.

\*Treatment Agencies (Social Services, Public Health, Mental Health, A&D Services, Community Organizations)- No impact unless part of a post release disposition.

Public assistance

Prenatal treatment

Mental health

Substance abuse treatment

Housing

Employment

**Post Release-** Impact is immediate but prospective unless otherwise indicated.

Sheriff

Local custody- No impact unless parole violated.

Probation

Supervision

Programming and treatment\*

Parole violation hearings

Court Personnel

Parole violation hearings- Impact unknown pending details of hearings.

\*Treatment Agencies (Social Services, Public Health, Mental Health, A&D Services, Community Organizations)

Public assistance

Prenatal treatment

Mental health

Substance abuse treatment

Housing

Employment

## **Pre Release (Parole Violators)**

### Sheriff

Local custody- No impact unless parole violated.

### Probation

Supervision- No direct impact unless sanctions include a mixture of local custody followed by community supervision.

Programming and treatment- No direct impact unless sanctions include a mixture of local custody followed by community supervision.

### Court Personnel

Parole violation hearings- Impact unknown pending details of hearings (beginning 7/1/13).

### Special Notes:

- The impact of parole violations is unknown pending details.
- Will there be any service transfer from parole to county? If no, creating new services will have a huge impact?
- Current programming and treatment is inadequate, partly due to state reduction in funding.
- There is a potential release of medical needy prisoners in the AB 109 population.
- AB 109 Plans will be different from county to county.
- Shasta County has limited jail space.

### Needs:

### Potential Solutions:

- Need a county resolution mandating participation in alternative graduated sanctions.
- Work Release Program
- Sheriff Parole
- HEC
- DRC

The next meeting is scheduled for 2:00 p.m., July 13, 2011, in Room 209 at National University.

### Suggested agenda items:

- Invite Dave Nichols from Parole to discuss the AB 109 population.
- Make a list of needs.
- Discuss solutions.