Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)
Executive Committee Meeting
August 28, 2019
City Hall – Caldwell Park Conference Room
777 Cypress Avenue, Redding CA

MEMBERS	Title of Agency	Present	Absent
Tracie Neal	Chief Probation Officer – Chairman	X	
Roger Moore	City of Redding Chief of Police	X	
Tom Bosenko	Shasta County Sheriff		X
Stephanie Bridgett	Shasta County District Attorney	X	
William Bateman	Shasta County Public Defender	X	
Melissa Fowler-Bradley	Shasta County Superior Court – a presiding judge of the superior court or designee		X
Donnell Ewert	HHSA – the head of the county department of mental health	X	

Attendees:

Chelsey Chappelle, Erin Bertain, Eric Jones, Jeremy Kenyon, Teresa Skinner – Shasta County Probation Department
Joe Chimenti – Shasta County Board of Supervisors
Elaine Grossman, Terri Howat – County Administrative Office
Bill Schueller – City of Redding Police Department
Dave Kent – Shasta County Sheriff's Office
Ben Hanna, Angie Mellis – District Attorney's Office
Shawn Watts – Shasta County Superior Court
Dean True, Melissa Field, Dominic Evanzia – Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency
Brian Muir – Shasta County Auditor Controller's Office
Randy Abney – Department of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO)
Amanda Owens, Danielle Gehrung – GEO Reentry
Jackie Durant, Laura Griffis – HOPE City
Wendy Zanotelli, Chris Ormsby, Christie Braydey – Smart Center
Robert Bowman – Shasta College
Steve Kohn – Member of the Public

Meeting Overview

The meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. A quorum was present. Introductions were made.

Public Comment

Robert Bowman announced that the latest STEP UP newsletter was available with the handouts. He shared that the student featured in the newsletter safely arrived in South Korea for a semester abroad. He said out of the 350 students that applied, she was one of 20 who was chosen to study in South Korea for a semester. He said she is an amazing young lady who termed her probation successfully early, was a 3.8 student with a perfect 4.0 the last two terms. He stated she's doing really well and will be studying

in her mother's hometown. He said they look forward to her return and he will bring her back sometime early next year to talk to the committee about her adventures. He also said that he wanted to thank the Redding Rotary who supplied 125 laptops to STEP UP students free of charge which will be issued next Friday at 2:30 in room 802 if anyone wants to attend. He clarified that these laptops will belong to the students.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roger Moore moved to approve the July 17, 2019 minutes. Stephanie Bridgett seconded the motion. Motion passed: 5 Ayes, 0 Noes, 0 Abstentions

Financial Report

State Allocations to Shasta County

Elaine Grossman distributed a *FY 18/19 Revenue* handout and stated the report has been updated to reflect the July 26th payment from the state for the 18/19 Fiscal Year. She reminded the committee that those payments go through August.

Planning and Implementation Funds

Erin Bertain distributed a packet and stated the first two pages reflect revenues and expenses related to the CCP Planning funds. She reminded the Committee that in November they do a survey for which they receive $100,000. She said the planning funds can be used on whatever this committee deems important or approves. She stated they have been getting planning funds since 2011. She referred to the second page of the report and indicated the balance is just over $400,000 and includes revenues and expenditures to date as well as other expenditures that have been previously approved but not yet realized.

She continued by stating the following pages reflect revenues and expenditures related to AB109 Training and Implementation dollars. She stated those funds were one time, and they received them in 2011. She said they spent them a lot in the very beginning on things like start up expenditures for programs but they haven't spent any of these funds since 2015. She referred to the last page and indicated that there is a balance of just over $28,000.

Donnell Ewert asked if the CIT training that had been approved previously comes out of either of those funds. Erin Bertain answered in the affirmative and referred to the second page of the Planning funds under 18-19 budget obligations. She stated that it was approved for $25,000 but the cost has not hit Probation's General Ledger. She indicated that she expects a journal entry from HHSA to post in the near future. Donnell Ewert clarified that they can use the planning funds for the CIT training, not just the training and implementation. Erin Bertain answered in the affirmative and stated that they just have to be specific about what pot of funds they would like to use.

Tracie Neal stated that it is in the state budget for counties to receive state dollars when they complete the BSCC survey, which will be on the agenda for the committee to review in November. She said every year they wait to see if the Governor will put the planning funds in the budget, and they have confirmed that it is included in the final state budget.

William Bateman asked if the money is targeted and if they could only spend it on certain items. Erin Bertain said the money can be spent on whatever the committee votes for it to be spent on. She stated it is not part of the ongoing CCP allocation and is subject to whether or not the state chooses to include it in the final budget. She clarified that historically they have always used it for one time types of things. She gave examples of previously approved items including a vehicle for Probation's Compliance Officer and the prior CIT trainings which were one time and came out of this money.

Discussion Items

Proposition 47 Grant Proposal

Tracie Neal stated that Probation applied for and was awarded the Proposition 47 grant. She said it's a three-year grant. She stated they have a Prop 47 Advisory Committee that is meeting on a quarterly basis and the next meeting is scheduled at 1pm on November 6th at the District Attorney's Office. She stated that they had about 25 people attend their first committee meeting and she's excited that there are a lot of people interested in being involved with the process. She explained they are currently in implementation and planning phase with a projected go live date of January 1st. She said the program is funded through the end of calendar year 2022 followed by an evaluation period in the first several months of 2023. She clarified that this is the second round of Prop 47 funding issued statewide and 12 of the 23 applicants funded in the first round were also funded in this round. She said there were 43 applicants in round two and 23 were awarded.

She continued by stating that they are in the process of issuing two RFP's, one for a community based organization to provide services and one for program evaluation. She said both of the RFPs will be released today and applications will be evaluated by members of the Prop 47 Advisory Committee. She further reported that the grant includes a new Probation Assistant position which Probation will be taking to the Board of Supervisors for approval in the coming months.

She stated that the program will target the misdemeanant population, specifically those individuals who have substance use and Mental Health disorders. She said the target population will be individuals who are consistently getting arrested by law enforcement, failing to appear in court, and are committing new property and drug related crimes. She stated their goal is to contract with a community based organization (CBO) to provide a team to work with these individuals. She announced that Donnell's agency will provide additional funding to allow for an expanded program. She said the team will provide support, case management, substance abuse treatment, and housing support to these identified individuals. She stated that the Probation Assistant's (PA) will be the liaison with law enforcement, the courts, and the District Attorney's office and assist the CBO in identifying the target population and making those connections. She further clarified that, as an example, the PA would work to connect individuals being processed through the misdemeanor diversion program at the DA's office with the CBO. She said the PA would also work with the jail to identify misdemeanants who have been booked and fall under the criteria. She expressed excitement about being able to provide services to individuals who need them but would not normally receive them because they fall outside Probation's purview.

She said that individuals who are interested in being part of the email list for the Prop 47 Advisory Committee meetings can let Teresa know and she will add them to the list.

CCP Analyst Dominic Evanzia

Donnell Ewert reminded the committee that they approved funding for an analyst to gather data and evaluate programs that are funded by the CCP and introduced Dominic Evanzia. He stated they refer to him as "new Dominic" because there is another Dominic in the office. He said they can also call him "Dr. Dominic" because he has a PhD in geology. He said that Dominic has been tasked with learning about the CCP funded programs and developing a way to evaluate program outcomes.

Tracie Neal stated that she and Donnell have been introducing Dominic, facilitating individual meetings, talking to him about CCP, and overloading him with information on what he's missed for the last ten years. She stated he has also had the chance to review all of their documents and their annual report.

GEO Shasta County Day Reporting Center Annual Report

Amanda Owens thanked the committee for the opportunity to present and said that Danielle and she are excited to showcase what the Day Reporting Center (DRC) has been up to during the last year. She introduced herself as the Area Manager for Geo Reentry Services in Northern California. She stated that she has the opportunity to oversee DRC's and in-custody programs from Monterey to Shasta. She said the DRC has been open for 6 years beginning April of 2013. She stated they do an annual report that highlights different components of the program including: analysis of outcomes, description of services, a walkthrough of the program model, training, obstacles, and opportunities for the future. She shared that a lot of hard work went into this report by Danielle and the DRC staff. She stated that she also wanted to thank Probation for their support with the development of the document and for holding them accountable to what they are here to do.

She continued by stating that the mission of the DRC and Geo Reentry is not only to reduce recidivism and improve community public safety, but to ultimately change behavior and change lives. She said they are incredibly passionate about what they do and she hopes it's reflected in the report.

She explained that everything they do is based off of evidence and they believe highly in being able to operationalize the principles for effective intervention. She stated that it is both an art and a science with the science being the research of what works to reduce recidivism and the art being putting it into play. She stated this past year they engaged national expert, Dr. Natalie Pearl Ilarraza, who used to work for Geo Reentry as the head of their research department. She said when she retired they kept her on as a consultant and before coming to work with Geo, she worked for San Diego Probation. She stated Dr. Ilarraza is really skilled at being able to analyze programs and ensure that they are operating with fidelity and she really stepped in this last year, analyzed their program, and found ways enhance the model and implement different strategies.

She stated that one of the unfortunate key events from the last year, that they are all familiar with, was the Carr Fire. She said it did impact the program a little bit in terms of services being provided at that time, but they did not shut down at all during the Carr Fire. She stated it was really important to them, and to Probation, to be able to provide their population with support and a safe place to work through that difficult time.

She indicated that she would like to walk them through the participants that were served on page three. She that the reporting period is April 8, 2018 through April 7, 2019, so that they can track year to year

from the day that they opened. She said that since they opened the DRC they have served 975 unique individuals including those served in-custody and 930 excluding those only served in-custody. She reported the average length of programming for the last year was 191 days.

She stated for the 2018-19 year, they served 336 participants at the DRC. She clarified that if you add up all the individuals served from year to year, that number is over the total number served for the six year period and explained that the reason is that one individual can be served in multiple reporting years. She stated there were 112 individuals at the end of the reporting period on April 7th and nine in aftercare. She said the reason that they keep those separate is because they don't bill the county for the aftercare part of the program. She explained that the aftercare part of the program is what they call a value-added service. She said aftercare is six months long, and is something they provide because they want to have that last support for that population in order to ensure they are working on relapse prevention and mentoring and still have that connection.

She stated that there were 36 individuals who completed the program. She said that the male to female ratio for programming in California is, on average, about 80% male, 20% female, and Shasta County is in line with that, and has been for the last six years.

She stated that between 2015 and 2018 they provided services in-custody. She said they stopped in December of 2018 but it is something that they are looking into starting again fairly soon.

She stated that the program is broken down by four different phases: Phase I, Phase II, Phase III, and aftercare. She said the program is pretty intense, it was designed to be that way, in order to impact long term behavior change. Phase I is seven days per week, Phase II is five days per week, Phase III is three days per week, and aftercare is one day per week for six months. She stated the report includes the individuals in each phase at the end of the reporting period. She clarified that it is not an average of the whole year, it is a snapshot of that day, April 7, 2019.

Roger Moore asked why in-custody was not served. Dave Kent stated they did not have the numbers to support the program in the jail several years ago. He said they are revisiting having that program again in the next month and a half, and there shouldn't be any issue with the low numbers and thinks there will be 10 entering the programming. Tracie Neal stated that the contract is for 150 participants, and as people would transition into the community, the numbers would rise in the community and reached the 150 maximum so they couldn't support adding any more offenders. She stated that there is currently 134 in the program so they have some capacity to support providing services in custody. Amanda Owens stated that any time they can program in-custody, it's ideal to be able to take an engaged audience and start to change their thinking before they are released. She said their outcomes are more likely to be positive because there is a seamless transition. She stated that she appreciated the jail taking a look at being able to give them that opportunity again.

She explained that dosage with the offender population is the amount of cognitive behavioral therapy hours an individual receives. She said there is a lot of research on what the ideal amount is of programming that one should receive in order to truly change long term behavior and research shows that it is 300 hours for high-risk offenders. She stated it is similar to a medical model where the doctor would prescribe a specific dose of medicine per day for certain conditions. She stated they have been able to identify a risk and a solution to help one fix that risk. She said the DRC offers a variety of services for offenders to use work towards those 300 hours. She stated that just because the DRC offers a service,

it doesn't mean that the participant partakes in that service and explained that the services they receive are tailored to their individual risk factors; the areas of their lives that are most likely going to cause them to recidivate if not addressed. She said their services can be provided in an individual setting, a group setting, or a lab setting. She clarified that individual services can be assessments, working on behavior change, programming, and individual cognitive behavioral therapy. She stated that the groups include cognitive behavioral groups, anger management, substance abuse, parenting, Moral Reconation Therapy (MRT), Thinking for a Change (T4C), trauma, and aftercare. She said they want to ensure they are addressing all criminogenic needs and dosages are catered to the individual. She indicated they want to make sure they're being responsive to their stage of change and schedule. She stated the DRC is open from 8 am to 8 pm, Monday through Friday, and Saturdays and Sundays from 12pm to 5pm, so that the participants can still take care of life's responsibilities outside of the DRC. She said they are removing any barriers they may have and they want them to work, go to school, and take care of their children.

She introduced the section of the report related to the changes that they have made over the last year. She said they are continuing to find ways to enhance the program model and indicated that some of the changes started prior to the report and some of them started after the report.

Danielle Gehrung stated that, through their collaboration with Dr. Ilarraza, one of the first areas of opportunities they saw to enhance the program was the way they brought participants into the program. She said previously, they were enrolling participants first then conducting a program orientation to tell the participants about the program, the resources, and the tools they were going to provide. She explained that they determined they needed to provide the program orientation prior to enrolling the participant. She said the focus when they bring someone into the program, is to be able to build that rapport, lower resistance, and increase motivation to ultimately obtain that buy-in. She stated that in February 2019 they made the switch and, following referral by probation, participants come to a program orientation where they meet with her, giving her the opportunity to engage, tell them about the program and ask them what their goals are and what they are hoping to accomplish. She said this helps to build that rapport, lower resistance, and increase motivation to buy-in. She stated the opportunity to enroll is the next step, where then they, in a way, choose to come. She explained that part of the goal was to create a little bit more autonomy for them. She said they're seeing a lot more willingness to come back, which is demonstrated in some of their outcomes around their new process. She reported that from February to April they had 26 participants referred and initially 18 of those 26 showed up. She said those that didn't show up initially were re-referred, multiple times if necessary. She stated they wanted to continuously focus on engaging them, not just let them not come back. She reported that, of the 26 referrals, 23 of attended orientation and 22 came back to complete the enrollment process. She stated it has been a fantastic enhancement and one that they are continuing to see, to date, great success with.

Danielle continued by reporting that they have started reporting on the housing stability of the participants. She stated that page five includes a snapshot of the housing situation of the population on the last day of the reporting period. She pointed out a key with definitions of the different housing types. She explained that they see is an increase in housing stability through the phases from Phase I through to aftercare. She said they're reducing the homeless and transient population through helping them obtain that valuable resource. Donnell Ewert asked if they have their own housing resource, or do they use the PATH housing program. Danielle Gehrung said they have a variety of partnerships they have worked to establish, and one of them is the PATH housing program.

Amanda Owens said that the biggest driver of this population to engage in criminal behavior is their anti-social thinking, attitudes, values, and beliefs. She stated if they can address that, then they get the biggest bang for their buck. She reported that within the last year and a half, they have begun using the Criminal Thinking Scale (CTS) through the Texas Christian University. She stated it measures six different elements of criminal thinking and they use it with individuals on day one of the program, as an intermediate assessment, and then an exit assessment to measure the impact these drivers of criminal behavior. She stated that the individuals assessed during the reporting period show risk reductions in all six areas. She said it is really fascinating to be able to see how they progressed and the impact that the program is having. Jeremy Kenyon clarified that they are doing an exit assessment. Amanda Owens answered in the affirmative stated that they do an assessment on day one, one when they phase from II to III, and then one when they go into aftercare.

Amanda stated that there is a lot of research on how to measure if a program is successful. She explained that there are three main categories that experts in the field have identified as ways to measure program success. She said recidivism tends to be the most popular way to measure if a program is successful. She stated that in and of itself, recidivism has some flaws because year to year they are not always comparing apples to apples. She stated that laws change and resources change which impacts recidivism. She said it is still a great mechanism and they want to continue to measure recidivism. She stated the second is intermediate outcomes, such as: reductions in criminal thinking, gains in employment, and gains in prosocial skills. She explained that anything that they can measure that impacts criminogenic needs is considered an intermediate outcome and there are a variety of intermediate outcomes in the report. She stated that third one, and her favorite, is measuring a program's adherence to evidence-based practices because if they know the research on the principles of effective intervention, then they should be measuring if the program is following those principles. She said there are two well-known and respected evaluation tools out there. She stated this committee is familiar with the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC), which Probation was trained on a couple of years ago through the University of Cincinnati. She stated the other is a Correctional Program Assessment Inventory. She said the DRC went through a CPC in 2017 and scored high and in 2018 they did an EBP Technical Audit. She stated that a technical audit is very similar to a CPC, except that it is being done by people that know their program model and have been trained on exactly the way they are supposed to do things which makes it more intense. She said the results of the technical audit were quite impressive. She stated it measures not only the eight principles of effective intervention, but also areas of leadership, rating the team, participant satisfaction, and the program feedback. She said the report includes the program strengths that were identified which included kudos for program fidelity, quality assurance, the quality of services, training, the fact that the program is behavioral based, that they are targeting individual criminogenic needs, the data, and the focus on staff development. She stated the areas of improvement start at the bottom of the page 8 and included a recommendation to pilot an MRT group for those with high anxiety or severe substance abuse issues because the evaluators felt that they weren't being responsive by mixing those populations together. She reported that they took that feedback and were able to implement that group which has shown positive results. She said they were also given feedback regarding the need to document their MRT refresher training to show proof that staff are, in fact, receiving their updates on MRT training each year and that they are receiving coaching sessions from the team as well. She stated that they have already followed through with both of those.

Amanda introduced the outcomes section of the report. She said the discharges are broken down into three categories: completions, neutral, and non-completions. She indicated that sometimes they get a little bit of heat for being so hard on the completions because they are strict in that category and people

say that maybe some of the neutral should be bumped into positive, but completions are only those who at a minimum completed the program as well as those who were able to graduate and complete the aftercare program. She said neutral discharges include those who completed probation and were no longer required to come, were transferred to another county, and were identified as having severe mental health issues and were not appropriate for the program. She stated that non-completions are those who fail to meet the program requirements and includes those who picked up a new charge and went to jail or prison, individuals who failed to continue attending the DRC and "absconded", or individuals who they feel that they had tried absolutely everything they could but the individual is not responding. She reported the discharges as 15% completion, 22% neutral, and 63% non-completion. She said that it is their goal to reduce non-completions and increase the completions.

She said check-in attendance is broken down by phase. She reminded the group that Phase I is seven days a week, Phase II is five days a week, Phase III is three days a week, and aftercare is one day a week. She stated promotion from one phase to the next is based off behavioral change and not just time served, so they should see an increase in the check-in rate from one phase to the next. She clarified that this is the percentage of the times they were scheduled to come into the DRC that they actually did.

She stated that group attendance is also broken down by phase. She reported a healthy jump in Phase II and III. She said Phase I is an area for improvement which requires getting that resistant population to attend services as scheduled.

She stated that an ICBT is an individual cognitive behavioral therapy session and is a service that every individual in the program receives. She explained that it is when they are working with their case manager one-on-one in an intervention that actually targets their risk factors. She said that around 2009, the black box study came out that showed the more time spent focused on case management, the more likely someone is to recidivate and the more time spent on criminogenic needs, the less likely someone is to recidivate. She clarified that case management is defined as "have you done your community service hours" "have you paid your fines" "are you checking in with so-and-so." She explained that it's important to know if someone is in compliance, but it doesn't reduce risk factors or change behavior. She said they are really proud of the structure that they have for ICBT which includes individuals attending weekly or every other week.

She stated that sobriety is definitely an issue across the board in Shasta County. She said they break sobriety down into three categories: clean tests - meaning that an individual tested clean for all substances; positive tests - meaning that a substance was detected; and missed test - meaning that an individual was scheduled to test that day and either failed to check in or failed to provide a sample. She explained that their computer database system is random and ensures that everyone is being tested weekly. She further explained that if Bob Smith comes up to test today and doesn't report, it is considered a missed test and in their overall sobriety, they count missed tests as positive. She stated that in Phase 1, 51% of the population is testing positive and indicated that their biggest struggle is sobriety with this population. She pointed out that the data shows individuals gain sobriety as they progress through the phases of the program. She explained that they also require a certain amount of clean time to go from one phase to the next. She stated to go to phase II to III, an individual needs 60 days clean, and to go from III to aftercare, and individual needs 90 days clean.

She stated that despite the opiate epidemic that they have in this country, meth continues to be the drug of choice for this population. She said that opiates increased some from 2016 to 2018-19, but

methamphetamine continues to be what individuals are testing positive for at 49% and marijuana comes in second at 30%.

Roger Moore clarified that 63% of the population have failed the program. Amanda Owens answered in the affirmative. Roger Moore asked how many of them went back to prison. Amanda Owens responded that she does not have access to that information. She stated if Probation or the Courts were able to take a look at that, that would be ideal. Tracie Neal stated they don't have how many went to State Prison, but they have recidivism related to the entire population. She said they run it at the end of each fiscal year, and that last time they ran it was June 30, 2018. She stated that at that time they looked at 803 offenders that had participated, regardless of if they completed the program, and the recidivism was at 37%. She said the data is broken down by the phase the individual was at when they exited the program. She reported that the people that participate in the program but don't get further than Phase I, recidivate at a significantly higher rate than Phase II or Phase III. Amanda Owens said she has some recidivism data from other counties too that she will share in a moment, but Shasta County Probation Department works harder on recidivism data than any county that she has had the chance to work with. She indicated that by breaking recidivism rates down by Phases I, II, III and aftercare, they can see the impact of each phase saying ultimately the longer they are in the program, the better. She stated that although non-completions are at 63%, some of them still have not recidivated since they left the program. Roger Moore asked if they hand them off to Tracie's team when they fail. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative and stated that they take action on their side. She stated that out of the 803 offenders that participated through June 2018, 299 (37%) recidivated. She stated that 254 of those individuals who recidivated left the program in Phase I. She stated that they know that not everybody can get through the program for a variety of reasons, but they know that if they get past Phase I, regardless if they leave the program in Phase II or Phase III, their recidivism drops significantly. She said, out of the 299 who recidivated, 16 people exited in Phase II and five exited in Phase III. Roger Moore clarified that recidivate means to receive a new criminal charge. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative and stated that its those that receive a new conviction. She said the recidivism rate for the131 individuals who completed/graduated is 12%. She stated that it takes a lot of work because they have to look up each individual. Erin Bertain stated that they look up each individual person every year. She clarified that they don't look up those that were recidivators in the prior year because they already count as a "yes". She said they look up each individual person to see if they have a criminal conviction but don't determine if they went to prison as a result of the criminal conviction. Roger Moore indicated that it would be interesting to see what Dominic comes up with as far as the stats because it seems like they are spending a lot of money on something has a 63% failure rate. Tracie Neal said they also look at the cost of the program. She reported that it is costs about $5,000 per offender to go through the program. She stated that the average length of stay is 190 days and, given the amount of services they receive, $5,000 per offender is an affordable cost. She said it equates to about $28 per day for an offender to be in the DRC. Amanda Owens clarified that does not include aftercare. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative. Steve Kohn asked if it accounts for the people that dropped out of the program. Tracie Neal said it accounts for everybody. Steve Kohn asked if, because of these statistics, if it would be possible that there could be a shorter aspect to this, rather than the full completion, that would also be successful. He stated that the effect seems to seriously kick-in in the second phase, and maybe for some, the third phase is more elaborate than needed. He continued by asking, if the highest reason for failure is drug use. Amanda Owens stated that they can talk about the program changes that they have with Phase I. She said sobriety is a huge obstacle for these individuals and the way that their model was set up prior to July 1 would not allow participants to get out of Phase I if they were testing positive.

Amanda said they have to ask how they measure success with this population. She stated that maybe they didn't complete a program that takes, on average, about a year and a half to fully complete, including aftercare, for someone that is motivated. She said an individual who participates but doesn't complete, but doesn't reoffend or have a further impact on the justice system is a success. She said an individual who has never been out of custody more than 30 days in their adult life who participates at the DRC for six months before they return to custody is also a success. In addition to the improvement for the individual, they also save taxpayer dollars in that situation. She stated that the criteria for neutral completion and non-completion is very difficult because they are talking about that long-term behavior change. She stated that they get critiqued all the time that the program is very difficult. Roger Moore asked if they have a limit to how many times they allow a participant to test dirty before they fail out of Phase I. Amanda Owens stated that nothing about the program is black and white because the research wants them to be responsive to the individual and to have some type of contingency management system that responds to every violation. She said it really depends on what Probation has tried with them previously and what their situation is. She stated that they don't necessarily allow people to test positive and every single violation has two responses: 1) some type of sanction to say this behavior is not okay; and 2) some type of intervention to help them correct that behavior. She stated that if someone tests positive for methamphetamine, she can't just sanction them and expect that tomorrow they're going to test clean. She explained that she has to be able to provide a solution that helps them reduce that risk factor that causes them to test positive to begin with and that takes time. Roger Moore stated that he understood but doesn't understand why they don't keep those stats. He stated that maybe that is something that Dominic could work on. Amanda Owens stated that the other option is what consequences they have as a community. She stated that some of this population is really good at doing time. She said some people would rather do time than do this program because it is intense but that is not the solution moving forward for public safety or tax dollars. She stated that it can be frustrating to have someone test positive and stay in the program, there is a point that they do violate and refer the offender back to Probation but it's a balancing act.

Steve Kohn asked if it would be possible, with the failure being substance abuse, to compel them to a drug rehabilitation facility, maybe co-existing with the DRC. Jeremy Kenyon said they do that quite a bit on the Probation side. He stated they are referring to sober living or residential programs before putting them back in the DRC. He said they are constantly working with the DRC in regards to getting people treatment, both inpatient and outpatient. Amanda Owens explained one of the unique things that they have to understand with substance abuse is that, with this population, there are eight criminogenic needs, or key life areas, which are areas of one's life that are causing someone to engage in criminal behavior. She stated that the top four criminogenic needs for the adult population is: 1) antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs - thinking that is faulty that gives someone permission to engage in that behavior; 2) behavior characteristics - things like lack of coping skills, impulsivity, anger management; 3) antisocial associates - who they spend their time with; and 4) Criminal History – which is static and can't be changed but is good to know. She pointed out that the top three most influential things doesn't include substance abuse. She stated that substance abuse is considered a moderate factor. Moderate factors include: substance abuse, education and employment, leisure and recreation, and family. She said substance abuse is a huge dynamic within the population they serve, but there is usually something in the big four that drives substance abuse. She explained that an individual may be using substances because of lack of coping skills, or because of who they are around, or antisocial thinking. She stated that they, as a community, need to address the drivers of that substance abuse. She further explained that they sometimes need to get them clean before they can address those drivers. She said it is an art form because substance abuse programs are incredibly important, but if they don't address the driver and they

just get someone clean, the individual is eventually going to go back to that behavior. Steve Kohn stated that substance abuse treatment should be working with those same issues for the most part in order to address the drug problem. Robert Bowman said one of the challenges is that there are a limited amount of substance abuse beds in the community as a whole. He stated that if they are looking at all of the various programs, both in and out of the justice realm, there is an incredible pull on a very finite amount of beds and a lot of the clients that they share mutually, can't afford a bed in a place like Visions or Empire. He explained that it is also a matter of supply in terms of who gets those beds and how they are triaged in terms of priority: how bad their addiction is, and how far along are they in terms of trying to figure out the what with the where.

Donnell Ewert asked about alcohol testing and how they deal with that. Amanda Owens stated that every time an individual reports to the DRC, they are breathalyzed. She said that even if the step out to get something from their car that they forgot, they're breathalyzed on their way back in. She explained the reason for that is: 1) they want to test them; and 2) they want to ensure that people are not under the influence of alcohol when they are in the center. She said the positive tests are less than 2%. She said they do also send in once in a while for ethyl glucuronide (ETG) for the individuals that struggle with alcohol, which tests for alcohol use within the prior 72 hours.

Roger Moore stated that he did like how they try to get down to the root of the problem and it is important because everybody is unique and different. He said it would be nice to see that data: how many times does it take to find that root, or do they. Amanda Owens stated it is frustrating for them to say there were this amount of people who "fail", because it's difficult to measure the impact of the part of the program they did complete.

She reported the education and employment rate is broken down on page 13 by phases. She said in order to get to aftercare they need to be employed or enrolled in school full time, so that number has always been 100%. She clarified that SSI does not count and if any individual is on SSI, they remove them from the percentage overall so they can see the phase breakdown for employment. William Bateman asked if there was a reason why they were doing percentages rather than the actual number of people. She said they do have the actual number in order to get the percentages and could always report out on that but, in the past, the committee was interested in the percentages. She indicated that they are now also measuring the change they are making to education and employment. She said in the next year they will be tracking how many people entered the program unemployed, employed, or in school, and then how many people gained education and employment while in the program. William Bateman asked about the target percentages. Amanda Owens stated that the targets referred to the percentage of people that are in that phase. Donnell Ewert stated that percentage is a rate per 100 and that it controls for the fact that they are going to have different numbers in different phases, so the denominator is going to be different. He stated that if they report numbers they would need the percentage as well. William Bateman stated that he was looking at the beginning program count for June 30, 2014: 49, and asked if that would be the base number that they are basing the percentages on. Amanda Owens stated that it is how many people were in. She stated let's say there were 10 people in Phase I, 49% would mean basically that 5 are employed, so that is how they get the percentages. William Bateman stated that he understands how percentages are calculated, but they have to keep flipping back and forth to find what the exact number of people is. Amanda Owens clarified that he would like to see, on each sheet, just a reminder of how many people are in each phase. William Bateman stated that he was just wondering if that would make assessing this information simpler.

Amanda Owens asked if the group was interested in comparing recidivism, employment, or sobriety to other counties in California. Donnell Ewert stated that he didn't think so and what is really important to them is how associated employment is with not reoffending, how important is sobriety in not reoffending, in our own County. He stated that comparison she is talking about just tells them how their program works in other places, and maybe periodically that would be interesting, but the main thing that they want to know is how the various interventions prevent recidivism. Amanda Owens clarified that it had been asked for in the past and they try to respond to all of the requests. She stated that for those of them that are interested, they can always ask her and she would be happy to share the data with them.

She reported that they really have a learning culture at the DRC with staff. She said they are asking staff to do a difficult job: change adult criminal thinking. She said it is not enough to just understand EBP or be able to articulate it, they have to put it into practice each day or operationalize it. She stated that in addition to all of the training that staff are required to do for their specific job duties and their yearly refreshers, each staff member receives over 100 hours of EBP training per year. She further clarified by saying that is just what is documented and doesn't account for the spontaneous coaching, feedback, and fidelity assessments that each individual receives. She said they believe, and research shows, that those that have the strongest outcomes, are those that have a coaching environment and it is really important that they're hiring supervisors who are basically EBP coaches and are auditing all services they provide and giving feedback and practicing with staff.

Danielle Gehrung said that, as a leader, one of her favorite things is coaching staff and helping them develop into effective changes agents. She said one of the ways they do that is just being intentional about, every month, every day, operationalizing EBP and growing in their skills and knowledge. She stated that each month they do an EBP recognition where she gets to recognize a staff member for their commitment to operationalizing EBP and share those details of a moment where they could hear change talk happen or a participant move through the stages of change. She said each facility in the region submits an EBP recognition for each month. She stated that in addition to that, and having a fundamental practice of continuously investing in their growth, they do a briefcase session every month. She explained that The Briefcase is an EBP series in which they get to go through a bunch of different sessions based on the principles and practices of EBP and they get to talk about the skills, the tools, and grow in their knowledge and abilities to again reduce the risk of each criminogenic need that Amanda shared earlier. She stated this is not just an opportunity for her to coach, staff get to lead a briefcase session throughout the months and to develop as a leader. She said they all have professional development plans, where they set their own goals and objectives.

She said that every week she has a KPI one-on-one with each staff member. She explained that a KPI is a key performance indicator, and each staff tracks and reports their own outcomes on their groups, one-on-one sessions, how many rewards and sanctions they deliver, and absconds and what they are doing to address them. She stated that she meets with each staff one-on-one to dig into their own data and talk about areas of strength and areas of growth in which they can create action items and she can support them to improve outcomes the next week. She stated they are very focused on data, daily and weekly, in order to be a data driven organization.

She stated that every Wednesday she has the opportunity to join a manager's call, led by Amanda, where they get more professional development. She stated they have an evidence based research article or book, and spend 20 minutes digging into investing in their own knowledge and abilities and sharing that

knowledge with their peers. She said the rest of the hour is spent digging into the outcomes, figuring out what works and what doesn't, and identifying any action items for growth.

She explained that Motivational Interviewing (MI) is a communication tool that they utilize to work alongside the participants. She said it is a way to elicit intrinsic motivation that results in long-term prosocial behavior change. She stated every staff member will go through MI training and then, as a follow-up and a way to continuously grow in that skill, each staff has an MI coach, in addition to herself, to which they will submit tapes. She stated they will record their one-on-one sessions, submit the tape to their coach, and be able to get feedback on how they are doing: what they are doing well and where they can improve.

Amanda Owens stated she also wanted to talk about the program changes, especially with Phase I. She stated that starting on page 19, they've included changes and enhancements they made to the program model. She stated that Shasta County has made a countywide initiative to address ACES and the DRC joined that initiative and started doing the ACEs assessment with the individuals that came into the program starting in January 2019. She stated that they do it in Phase I, once they feel that the participant is comfortable and is going to be honest on the assessment. She stated the results are broken down by the DRC, the Shasta County data from 2012, which surveyed 271 households, and California overall. She said the results demonstrate the DRC population has a much higher ACE score than the overall scores for California, but lower than the 2012 report from the 271 households within Shasta County. She said they will continue to track the results of this assessment. She indicated they've responded to the ACE scores of their population by implementing a trauma curriculum for both females and males in the DRC.

She stated that page 23 discusses some of the consistent obstacles they face, substance abuse and high rate of absconds. She said they utilized Dr. Ilarraza to figure out what they could do to enhance the DRC. She said that in addition to the program orientation change they discussed earlier, they also implemented an engagement specialist as a new role for staff. She explained that each staff has an assigned time where they work at the front desk to engage with the individuals who are coming into the program. She said if someone hasn't reported in the last few days and they were planning on just checking in but leaving prior to receiving services, the engagement specialist is going to engage with them right then and there and try to provide some type of intervention so they can walk out the door having received some type of service they wouldn't have otherwise received. She reported they also increased the quality assurance fidelity coaching and changed the starting point packet.

She stated that Phase I, prior to July 1, was not only an assessment phase, it also included treatment. She said they found that they were taking a very resistant population that wasn't ready to change and they weren't being responsive to their motivation to change. She stated that this population has a lot of stability factors that need to be addressed, so they pushed some of the treatment to Phase II. Phase I is now more about getting that buy-in, building rapport, getting stabilization factors addressed, and getting them to Phase II. She stated that the goal is that the momentum of going from Phase I to Phase II will be carried on by the reward of going from 7 days a week to 5 days a week. She stated they implemented that July 1st, so they don't have any results on that yet, but the goal would be that would get more people to Phase II, and ultimately through the entire program. She stated that it doesn't change the treatment that they are receiving in the program, it just bumps the majority of it to Phase II leaving Phase I to be more about assessment, stabilization, and orientation. Roger Moore stated that their stats are going to go through the roof as far as completion of Phase I. Amanda Owens answered in the affirmative and stated

that looking at the last month and a half, today they have 33 people in Phase II, whereas at the time of this reporting they had 20. She stated that in the last six weeks that number has increased and hopefully they can carry the momentum and go into Phase III.

She stated they also used to have to do MRT step 3 in order to get to Phase II, and they had to be clean and sober to pass MRT step three. She stated that now they only have to pass step 2 to get to Phase II. She stated that they also used to be required to have 90% attendance in order to get from Phase I to Phase II. She stated that trying to get 90% attendance for individuals who are incredibly resistant, who don't think they have a problem, and are still using, was setting them up for failure, so they dropped that requirement. Roger Moore stated that they made it quite a bit easier to pass. Amanda Owens stated to Phase II. She stated that they still have attendance criteria for progressing from Phase II to III and Phase III to aftercare. She stated that it is now 80% to go from II to III, 90% to go from III to aftercare. Donnell Ewert stated that he understands that the label matters, it gives people a sense of accomplishment and encouragement, but they talk a lot about dose and dose equals time, to some extent. He stated that the activities matter, a lot, but time is important. He stated that if they shorten Phase I, the failure rate in Phase II is going to go up. He asked if they are playing games with it to make Phase I more successful, or do they really think that this graduation from Phase I to Phase II is significant enough that it can make a difference. He said that they are just changing where the line is, and there is nothing magical about where the line is. Amanda Owens said they talked about that and discussed it with Dr. Ilarraza. She stated that it is now about "what is the treatment" in Phase I. She stated that they used to do a Behavior Change Plan within 14 days of an individual starting the program which was often too early because the individual didn't yet want to reduce those criminogenic risk factors. She stated that now the behavior change plan starts in Phase II, and in Phase I they have a starting point behavioral change plan where all the action items are catered to get them out of pre-contemplation. She said everything they are going to do with meeting during Phase I is to just try and get him to dip his toe in, "okay maybe I can change" and "what might that look like". Donnell Ewert stated that it would give them a better sense of success in Phase I. Amanda Owens answered in the affirmative and said they are being more intentional about the stage of change, because they were putting people right into treatment on day one who were in pre-contemplation. She said it worked for some people, but they can be more responsive to those in pre-contemplation and it's more about catering to that stage. She stated that Dr. Ilarraza has also been working with Orange County, and they started this method before the Shasta DRC did, and they have been seeing some good success. She said the dosage is still there, but it is about being responsive to what makes sense in Phase I, and it's getting them out of pre-contemplation. Donnell Ewert stated that the time in Phase I is going to be less and when they get into Phase II they will have had less dose of intervention. He said they are going to see the failure rate go up in Phase II, which is okay as long as the overall failure rate goes down.

Amanda said they also created the Essentials Starting Point, where in the first couple of weeks of the program, they develop goals and action items around those stability factors: housing, transportation, employment, and basic needs identification. She clarified they are still working on those, but in a more structured way.

She reported that they have revised the programs rewards and sanctions system, added trauma curriculum, added additional staff, changed their computer program to be more updated, and added SmartLINK. She explained that SmartLINK is an app and is something that a lot of Criminal Justice professionals are moving towards. She stated that it was developed as a way to have some type of accountability with the offender population for them to be able to check-in using facial recognition and

also be able to track their whereabouts and send messages. She said they are not going to use it to have facial recognition but more as a way to communicate. She stated that they are now in a day and age where technology is used to communicate with everyone, so they are going to be implementing SmartLINK (their second round of training is this Friday) as a way to communicate with participants and also as a privilege to try and increase the attendance at the DRC. Roger Moore asked if the facial recognition was cost prohibitive. Amanda Owens stated that it is all out of their own pocket and they would be happy to do that if Probation wants them to. She said they are trying to use it more as an incentive rather than a sanction, the incentive being that they get to communicate with the DRC and they can get reminders. She stated that if they need to use it as a sanction, they ultimately can. She indicated a belief that probation will be using this app in the future as an accountability tool. Tracie Neal stated that they use it on a couple of caseloads. Eric Jones confirmed they have the facial recognition component. Tracie Neal explained that when there is the facial recognition, it does a GPS point, so they know where they're at. She said it's a way to monitor whereabouts as well without having have a GPS monitor on the offender. She stated that it is really a pretty good app and the offender can submit a paystub, prescriptions, or other required documentation as well. Roger Moore stated that it's good to know that they're talking to the right person. Jeremy Kenyon said they can set the check-ins for five minutes before treatment is supposed to start so if they don't show up to treatment, they know exactly where they were instead. Tracie Neal asked how many caseloads they were using it on. Eric Jones stated that everybody now has the opportunity but the Addicted Offender Program was the one they first rolled it out on. He said that it worked really well, so they opened it up to others. He stated that some officers are using it with just a few people, and that not everybody has a phone. Amanda Owens clarified that they will use the facial recognition, but not as a sanction, as a reward, meaning that instead of coming in they will be allowed to check-in through the app.

She stated overall, they have had a busy and productive year and appreciate all of the support and collaboration. She stated that they understand the resources that go into the DRC and realize it is a privilege to be part of the solution here in Shasta County. Donnell Ewert stated that they very much appreciate that they are a learning organization, are not content to keep doing what they've been doing, they value EBP, and are constantly trying to make it better and more successful. Amanda Owens thanked Donnell and said they have put a lot of resources into evaluating everything they do and there's always going to be something better, so they need to adapt with the times, and let the data tell a story as well.

Amanda shared that Geo Reentry has created Geo Reentry CONNECT which is a public version of a database the DRC offered to their population where they could click on a city and see all the different resources in that city. She stated that now, any person across the entire country can go on their website, pick a city, and see all of the resources there. She stated that it also walks users through employment tools, resume building samples, and who is hiring in that community. She said if they are an agency that wants to have their program listed on this site, there is a button they can click, provide their information, and then they will upload their services.

<u>Action Items</u>

Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Training

Dean True stated that they completed the second training for local law enforcement including the Sheriff, RPD, APD, and Probation. He stated that it was a three-day training, which was well received, and they had close to 20 people who attended. He reported that the second training was improved over the first,

as the location was much more comfortable for the participants. He reminded the committee that the training is put on by a retired law enforcement officer from Sacramento who has a great team of a half dozen people who provide different modules and speak to people at a real level about what is going on. He reported each training costs somewhere between $12,000 and $14,000 and is provided for us locally, which isn't a bad deal. He stated they are willing to widen the target audience for no additional cost. He said they have previously kept the training exclusive to law enforcement operating in Shasta County but they could expand that. He said the leader of the group suggested that it might be good to have some Mental Health professionals included. He stated the training won't necessarily provide them with a lot of information they do not already have, but it would foster communication between the law enforcement group and the mobile crisis team people in the community. He clarified that it is just something to consider and there wouldn't be any extra cost. He suggested that they could open it up to law enforcement agencies in other counties and charge fees to reduce Shasta County's cost. He reported that the trainer is comfortable with groups of 30, 40, or 50 people. He reminded the committee that they had 25 at the first training and 20 at the second. Roger Moore indicated that it was well received by their officers and it was a very valuable training. Dean True stated that he has a great group of people, they are very real, many of them are retired officers or within the law enforcement field, and they speak right to the guys about "this is what happens to me." He stated that they have great stories about what went wrong and what went right.

William Bateman asked if that was something that could be expanded to include people in the Public Defender's office. Dean True responded that it is up to the committee. He said they have even done a training for Mayers Memorial Hospital for the hospital staff. He clarified that it was a one day training, and it was provided by some, but not all, of the team that provides the three-day training. He said the training is designed to teach what to do with people who are in crisis right now, how to make it better, what makes it worse, and how to avoid the horrible situations they see in the news sometimes with somebody who has significant mental illness and gets into situations with law enforcement. He stated the idea is to resolve those things peacefully and get the person to treatment.

Roger Moore made a motion to continue the training stating that it is very valuable. Stephanie Bridgett seconded the motion. Tracie Neal clarified that the motion is to allocate funds, not to exceed $30,000, for two CIT trainings for calendar year 2020. Roger Moore answered in the affirmative.

Donnell Ewert wanted to clarify the time period and asked if it was for 2020, not 19-20. Dean True said it is up to them and the county usually does contracts by Fiscal Year. Donnell Ewert asked when they are planning to do them. Dean True stated that he didn't have any plans at this point and that he needed the go ahead first. He said they usually need about a three to five-month notice because they have to get a whole team together to come up there.. Donnell Ewert confirmed that they were approving spending through December 31, 2020.

Donnell Ewert asked if this was going to come out of the Planning dollars. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative. Donnell Ewert clarified that it would not be coming out of the general fund of the CCP, for lack of a better term. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative.

Stephanie Bridgett asked if they were going to be making a decision on who it is going to be open to, because traditionally it has just been sworn officers, but it sounded like there was a question about non-sworn. Roger Moore stated that he would keep it to sworn. Stephanie Bridgett stated that is kind of what she thinks it is focused on, but since it was raised they should make a decision on that. Tracie Neal asked

if William Bateman was thinking of the training for his social workers. William Bateman stated it would be for the social workers and the support staff. He said they frequently have people who are currently in psychosis coming into their office who are their clients. He explained that they have to deal with them and he thought it might be helpful, since it is crisis training, to have their folks trained as well. Dean True stated that he was the one who said they should make it all law enforcement because they had provided CIT in the past but there were very few members of law enforcement. He said there was a couple of reasons for that but his hunch, and he had heard anecdotally from the committee, is that it might be good to have just LE in the room because they all work in the same field so they could get real with each other. Tracie Neal asked Eric Jones, because he had attended the training, what he thought when he hears Bill talking about the population. Eric Jones said he knows the social workers have been doing some transportation and indicated that he didn't know about the whole office component. He stated he didn't think that all the attorneys needed to go, but he would support the social workers who work more closely with those people and reiterated that it is a really good training. William Bateman asked if they thought that it would inhibit the training if people other than law enforcement were there. Eric Jones said that he didn't think it would necessarily inhibit the trainer because he believes the trainer is going to be who he is so it wouldn't inhibit his delivery. Stephanie Bridgett asked if it would inhibit the participants. Eric Jones stated that the Probation Department lives in both worlds and that it is probably easier for them. Roger Moore said that it is hard for law enforcement to open up at any meetings if there are civilians there or people who represent the defense in court. He said they are just going to be sitting with their arms crossed. Dean True stated that even when there is all law enforcement, there is a fair amount of that too. Roger Moore answered in the affirmative, and stated that is what they are trying to get rid of, and thinks it would inhibit the engagement on their end. He said if they don't have complete trust, they won't say anything in class. Dean True stated that the instructor prefers much more interaction, and sometimes it is a little bit like pulling teeth. Eric Jones said that the class they had was pretty interactive. Chelsey Chappelle asked if it would help to have a conversation about what he provided to Mayers look at bringing the one-day for the non-sworn staff. She stated that would be a cost the group would have to consider, but that might be an option. Dean True stated his one-day cost between $3,500 and $5,000. Chelsey Chappelle said that they may be able to send some of their non-sworn staff to that as well, and the one-day option could be beneficial.

Tracie Neal asked if they would like to go forward with this training with law enforcement specific with the idea that they would research additional options for other staff. Roger Moore and Stephanie Bridgett answered in the affirmative. William Bateman stated that he definitely thinks that it is important that law enforcement gets it. He said he didn't want to have other people there if they didn't feel like it would be a conducive environment for training and learning. He stated they could do a law enforcement version and then consider a non-law enforcement version. Donnell Ewert stated that the motion has enough money for two three-day trainings. He asked if they could change it to $35,000 which would enable them to do a one-day in addition for the other types of people. Tracie Neal asked if they could do that even though they have it listed on the agenda. Erin Bertain stated that they can make all kinds of motions for it, so she doesn't see why not.

Roger Moore stated that he would make that motion as amended. Stephanie Bridget clarified that it was for up to $35,000 to include one day for the non-sworn. Roger Moore answered in the affirmative. Stephanie Bridgett stated that she would continue to second.
Motion Passed: 5 Ayes, 0 Noes, 0 Abstentions

Stephanie Bridgett asked to bring item 5.C up to be discussed before item 5.B. The committee agreed.

CCP Plan

Tracie Neal stated that they have been trying to work on updating the CCP plan and it has been a little bit of a struggle. She said there is a desire to get it updated sooner rather than later, and she wanted to suggest that she and Stephanie meet together offline to do some updates to the plan, keeping it redlined and bring it to the October 16th meeting where they would discuss the changes and use that meeting to exclusively work on finalizing the plan. She clarified that they don't need a motion, they just need a consensus that the group would allow Stephanie to work together on the updates. The committee agreed.

HOPE City HUB Year End Report and Local Innovation Subaccount

Tracie Neal stated in 2016/17, the local innovation subaccount was created from 10% of annual allocations from growth accounts for four different growth accounts. Erin Bertain clarified that for Shasta County it comes from three areas: CCP Growth, the CCP Growth the PD/DA are directly allocated, and the Juvenile Justice Growth Special Account, which is JJCPA funds that Probation receives for juvenile programs. She stated that 10% of whatever the growth, which varies wide and far from one year to the next, is set aside and requires that Board of Supervisors (BOS) make a decision about what happens to these funds. She said the Board can direct the money to any area that is covered by one or more of the original four areas. She reminded the group that the CCPEC made a recommendation to the BOS. Tracie Neal clarified that they had conversations with the Community Correction Partnership (CCP) and the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council to brainstorm ideas for what these dollars should be used for. She stated the CCPEC on March 15, 2017 voted to make a recommendation to the BOS that the dollars be used for one EBP or best practice crime prevention project for individuals under 18 years old, which the BOS subsequently approved. She said Probation issued an RFP and Elaine Grossman, Jeff Gorder, and Dianna Wagner evaluated the proposals. She stated the RFP was awarded to HOPE City, and within the packet there is a HOPE City year-end report and, in September, HOPE City will do a full presentation on their project.

She reported that over the last couple of years, additional funds have accumulated. She stated at the time when they made the recommendation to the BOS, they specified one project. She said they have been looking at those dollars and would like to ask the committee to recommend to the BOS an expansion from one project to two with a fiscal cap for the next two years.

Erin Bertain said it would be good to talk a little bit about the money they have built up. She stated in 16/17 they received just over $39,000 and the following year they received about $35,000. She said last fiscal year they saw the large one-time growth payment for CCP of $112,000. She stated that right now, including the budget obligations for 2019/20, they will have about $112,000. She clarified that includes the cost for HOPE City in 2019/20, whose contract this year is $50,000, but does not include whatever growth they will receive in the current year. She said she wouldn't anticipate receiving an amount similar to 2018/2019 but $30,000 or more should come in this year as well. Tracie Neal reiterated that the pot is growing which made them think funding a second program might be a good option. She said Erin and she evaluated the numbers and felt comfortable with a recommendation for an RFP that would fund a program for 2 years, maximizing over those two years for about $50,000. Donnell Ewert asked if it would be $50,000 total. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative. Donnell Ewert asked why they would not do $50,000 per year for two years, they have $112k and they're going to get more. Erin Bertain said they don't really know what they are going to get in this fiscal year. She explained that HOPE City will

build their program to $50,000 this year, and if they get less and they have committed $100,000, it would reduce the HOPE City program. She said a balance helps even out the funds over time.

Stephanie Bridgett asked if it would be for a new entirely different type of program. Tracie Neal answered in the affirmative and specified that, if the committee agreed, Probation would go back to the board and request permission to do an RFP to add a second crime prevention program for those individuals 18 and under. If the Board approves, Probation would issue an RFP similar to the one that they issued the first time which would allow additional applicants or other people to apply. She said they would do a similar process where they would ask people on the advisory committee to sit on the RFP process to evaluate and then identify the program in the community.

William Bateman asked that if the funds they get are limited, aren't there going to be recurring costs throughout the year. He asked how they would stay funded. Tracie Neal stated that right now they have a three-year contract with HOPE City, so at the end of that contract they would come back to the committee and potentially make a recommendation back to the BOS.

Stephanie Bridgett asked if this is what that $112,000 is earmarked for, or can it be used for other projects. Tracie Neal replied that at the time they did the outreach to different committees, each of the committees talked about the importance of crime prevention with that youthful population. She said that determined their target population at that time. She said they could table the matter and could do more outreach. She reminded them they had previously selected groups that receive part of the growth funding that the innovation dollars are drawn from. She said the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council is responsible for oversight of the juvenile dollars included in the pot.

Elaine Grossman asked if the CBO that has the project one agreement would be allowed to apply to the second RFP and expand the existing program. She said it might be beyond the scope of the agenda language right now, but it may be something that has to be addressed. Tracie Neal agreed that it will need to be addressed in the future.

William Bateman suggested they think about it. Tracie Neal agreed that they can think about it and agendize it for another meeting to talk through it. She said they can provide a handout so that at a quick glance, everybody understands why they have this innovative subaccount, and then the process that they went through to allocate those dollars. The committee agreed.

Jackie Durant, introduced herself as the director of HOPE City, and thanked the CCP for submitting that RFP a couple of years ago. She stated that it has been a wonderful journey this last year, in the first year of the three-year contract. She reported that they have served double the number of youth requested of them and already this year they have served 50 youth. She reported they have added an additional evidence based program, ACEs Overcomers, which is a peer reviewed EBP for addressing ACES, and all of their kids they are working with have high ACE scores. She stated she wanted to suggest the possibility of increasing their budget to expand their program. Tracie Neal stated they will have a full presentation from HOPE City about the HUB program at their September meeting.

<u>Operational Updates</u>

None.

Future Agenda Items

Tracie Neal announced she would earmark those items discussed at previous meetings for future agenda items.

Next Meeting

Tracie stated that at the advisory on September 18, they are going to be looking forward to the HUB report and Wendy, the new director of the SMART Center, doing a presentation. She said on October 16th they move forward with their CCP plan.

Adjourn

Roger Moore motioned to adjourn. Donnell Ewert seconded the motion.
Motion passed: 5 Ayes, 0 Noes.

Meeting adjourned at 4:39 p.m.