

# STANISLAUS COUNTY

## COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

### Executive Committee Meeting Minutes Thursday – February 19, 2015 Stanislaus County Probation Department – Conference Room

#### MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT

JILL SILVA, Chief Probation Officer, Probation Department  
BIRGIT FLADAGER, District Attorney  
ADAM CHRISTIANSON, Sheriff  
DEBRA BUCKLES for Madelyn Schlaepfer, Director, Behavioral Health & Recovery Services  
TIMOTHY BAZAR, Public Defender  
STEPHANIE KENNEDY for Rebecca Fleming, Superior Court of California

#### MEMBERS ABSENT

GALEN CARROLL, Chief, Modesto Police Department

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Chief Probation Officer Jill Silva.

#### 2. PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public were present.

#### 3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 17, 2014 MEETING

MOTION: Sheriff Adam Christianson. SECOND: DA Birgit Fladager. The minutes of the June 17, 2014 meeting were approved unanimously.

#### 4. DISCUSS CCP FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Chief Silva noted that the reason for today's CCP Executive Committee meeting is to discuss the direction for Year Five. The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) committee will be meeting tomorrow (February 20, 2015) to begin discussion on developing goals and objectives with the assistance of Christy Almen from the Community Services Agency (CSA). Chief Silva advised that the State is encouraging CCP's to establish goals and objectives and that it is important for the CCP Plan to correlate with the goals and objectives adopted.

Chief Silva distributed a copy of the CCP 2014-15 approved budget and options to consider for Year Five (handouts attached to original copy of minutes). She advised that this budget was sent to the Board of Supervisors with spending in the amount of \$16.2 million. This budget was formulated on estimates and the amount actually received was \$15.7 million, which was approximately \$527,000 less than estimated. With an anticipated reserve/contingency estimated at \$800,000, the projected spending submitted was within the budgeted amount. It is anticipated that all the agencies will not claim their full budgeted allocations; therefore, the reserve may not be needed.

For 2015-2016:

Anticipated allocation	\$14.9 million
Planning Funding	\$150,000
2013-2014 Growth Funding	\$1.3 million

TOTAL AVAILABLE PHASE 5 FUNDING: \$16.4 million

Chief Silva advised she developed options for the Phase Five funding (to serve as a starting point for discussion) which included:

- Option 1:** Status quo budget with no changes/increases.
- Option 2:** Status quo budget with salary cost increases.
- Option 3:** Status quo for County agencies and RFP for CBOs equal amounts (\$145,000).
- Option 4:** Status quo for County agencies and RFP for CBOs with additional funding (\$225,487).

**Other Considerations:**

- Do we want all funding recipients to justify continued funding?
- Do we want all non-core programs to justify continued funding?
- Do we want just CBOs to justify continued funding versus RFP?
- Do we want a 2-year plan or wait until funding is more stable and predictable?
- Do we want to set aside any fund balance as reserve?
- What about set aside for AB900 expansion?
- Need to discuss changes to AB109 population as a result of Prop 47.

Chief Silva noted that the RAC has only developed a temporary formula for growth funding so instead of individual counties getting growth added to their base funding, the State will be taking the entire amount of growth funding available and add this amount to the base allocation that every County will receive. For example, Stanislaus County will receive a base allocation of \$14.9 million with \$1.3 million expected in growth funding. If a permanent formula was in place, these two amounts together will become the new base amount for the following year with growth added. However, since it is temporary, the State will be allocating the \$1.3 million for the entire State and re-allocated using the same formula for the base funding. Growth funding is received in October of the year it is allocated. The total available Phase 5 funding is projected at \$16.4 million.

In developing the Year-Five plan, the committee should consider if a reserve amount is needed, funding for AB900, and AB109 population changes as a result of Prop 47. Sheriff Christianson advised that more than 600 inmates have been released to date because of Prop 47 and the average daily population is just over 1,000. On a short-term basis, it is anticipated that the sentenced inmates will be spending more time in custody and utilizing the in-custody programming. On the long-term basis, it is anticipated that the numbers will trend back upwards. DA Fladager stressed the need to target the population that is the highest priority through assessment and identifying those offenders who are consistently coming through the system. Chief Silva explained a new assessment tool being considered for adult offenders is similar to one being used for juveniles. This tool will identify the offender's risk level and need level along with the services that would be the most effective. When an offender is in custody, an assessment will be completed and the offender will be directly linked into services through the DRC upon their release. The new DRC should be open in July 2015 and assessment DPO's will be seeing offenders while in custody.

The Year Five process options proposed were discussed noting the following:

- Option One: No, because a budget must be presented which accurately expresses expenses.
- A blend of Option 2 and 4 is recommended with any additional funding going to programming.
- Justification is required, including program participants.
- Non-core programs need to justify their existence. An RFP process would be useful with emphasis on the same criteria to provide program details and outcomes.
- Two-year plan would be difficult to devise because of funding questions. A two-year plan does not take into account changes that might occur, such as Prop 47.
- A fund balance is a good idea.
- AB900 set-aside will be likely required by the Board of Supervisors because of the expansion of in-custody programs. The DRC will be critical for the supervision of offenders.
- Option 2, budget with salary cost increases, is needed and reassess next year when impacts of Prop 47 are better known.
- DA Fladager noted that the number of cases has been increasing consistently since 2012.
- The salary cost increase will use any increase in funding; therefore, Option 4 to increase funding to CBOs is not possible.
- BHRS would like to have more flexibility with their budget between their different programs dependent on where their clients' needs are focused. Increases are expected in the number of programs offered and staff needed. MIOCR grant funding will be pursued.
- Discussed CBO funding and RFP process. When \$250,000 or more is available, the RFP process would be preferred.

Chief Silva summarized from the discussion that Option one or two is preferred along with considering the goals and objectives to be developed by the CCP. Therefore, using the status quo, the only reserve will be any carryover from this year that was not used. No funding will be allocated for AB900. The contingency amount is subject to change because agencies have not submitted their final expenses. In addition, Prop 47 effects are still being considered and evaluated. Agencies will be required to report on the number of clients served and program outcomes for the development of the CCP Year Five Plan. Option One might be preferred because salary increases can be re-evaluated at mid-year. Some budgets will have salary savings so increases are not needed at this point.

**MOTION:** Sheriff Adam Christianson. Second: PD Tim Bazar. Utilize Option One, Status Quo Budget with No Changes/Increases, except that BHRS may make adjustments according to the use of their funding, with the opportunity to make salary adjustments at mid-year was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.