



## PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

November 10, 2014

10:30 A.M.

651 Pine Street, Room 101, Martinez

Supervisor Federal D. Glover, Chair

Supervisor John Gioia, Vice Chair

### Agenda Items:

Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Committee

1. Introductions
2. Public comment on any item under the jurisdiction of the Committee and not on this agenda (speakers may be limited to three minutes).
3. APPROVE Record of Action from the October 27, 2014 meeting. **(Page 4)**
4. CONSIDER accepting a report on the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant and Community Recidivism Reduction Grant programs, AUTHORIZE the County Administrator, or designee to secure a grant writer, if needed, to assist in the development of the final grant proposal and PROVIDE direction to staff as necessary. (Lara DeLaney, Senior Deputy County Administrator) **(Page 9)**
5. CONSIDER recommending a nominees for appointment to the CY2015 Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and CY2015 Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee. (Timothy Ewell, Committee Staff) **(Page 60)**
6. The next meeting is currently scheduled for December 22, 2014 at 1:00 P.M.
7. Adjourn

---

*The Public Protection Committee will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend Public Protection Committee meetings. Contact the staff person listed below at least 72 hours before the meeting.*

---

*Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to a majority of members of the Public Protection Committee less than 96 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at 651 Pine Street, 10th floor, during normal business hours.*

---

*Public comment may be submitted via electronic mail on agenda items at least one full work day*

*prior to the published meeting time.*

---

For Additional Information Contact:

Timothy Ewell, Committee Staff  
Phone (925) 335-1036, Fax (925) 646-1353  
[timothy.ewell@cao.cccounty.us](mailto:timothy.ewell@cao.cccounty.us)

## Acronyms, Abbreviations, and other Terms (in alphabetical order):

Contra Costa County has a policy of making limited use of acronyms, abbreviations, and industry-specific language in its Board of Supervisors meetings and written materials. Following is a list of commonly used language that may appear in oral presentations and written materials associated with Board meetings:

---

<b>AB</b>	Assembly Bill	HCD	(State Dept of) Housing & Community Development
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments	HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
ACA	Assembly Constitutional Amendment	HIPAA	Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990	HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Syndrome
AFSCME	American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees	HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
AICP	American Institute of Certified Planners	HR	Human Resources
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome	HUD	United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission	Inc.	Incorporated
AOD	Alcohol and Other Drugs	IOC	Internal Operations Committee
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	ISO	Industrial Safety Ordinance
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit District	JPA	Joint (exercise of) Powers Authority or Agreement
BCDC	Bay Conservation & Development Commission	Lamorinda	Lafayette-Moraga-Orinda Area
BGO	Better Government Ordinance	LAFCo	Local Agency Formation Commission
BOS	Board of Supervisors	LLC	Limited Liability Company
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation	LLP	Limited Liability Partnership
CalWIN	California Works Information Network	Local 1	Public Employees Union Local 1
CalWORKS	California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids	LVN	Licensed Vocational Nurse
CAER	Community Awareness Emergency Response	MAC	Municipal Advisory Council
CAO	County Administrative Officer or Office	MBE	Minority Business Enterprise
CCHP	Contra Costa Health Plan	M.D.	Medical Doctor
CCTA	Contra Costa Transportation Authority	M.F.T.	Marriage and Family Therapist
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant	MIS	Management Information System
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	MOE	Maintenance of Effort
CIO	Chief Information Officer	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
COLA	Cost of living adjustment	MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
ConFire	Contra Costa Consolidated Fire District	NACo	National Association of Counties
CPA	Certified Public Accountant	OB-GYN	Obstetrics and Gynecology
CPI	Consumer Price Index	O.D.	Doctor of Optometry
CSA	County Service Area	OES-EOC	Office of Emergency Services-Emergency Operations Center
CSAC	California State Association of Counties	OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CTC	California Transportation Commission	Psy.D.	Doctor of Psychology
dba	doing business as	RDA	Redevelopment Agency
EBMUD	East Bay Municipal Utility District	RFI	Request For Information
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	RFP	Request For Proposal
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	RFQ	Request For Qualifications
EMCC	Emergency Medical Care Committee	RN	Registered Nurse
EMS	Emergency Medical Services	SB	Senate Bill
EPSDT	State Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and treatment Program (Mental Health)	SBE	Small Business Enterprise
et al.	et ali (and others)	SWAT	Southwest Area Transportation Committee
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	TRANSPAC	Transportation Partnership & Cooperation (Central)
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	TRANSPLAN	Transportation Planning Committee (East County)
F&HS	Family and Human Services Committee	TRE or TTE	Trustee
First 5	First Five Children and Families Commission (Proposition 10)	TWIC	Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee
FTE	Full Time Equivalent	VA	Department of Veterans Affairs
FY	Fiscal Year	vs.	versus (against)
GHAD	Geologic Hazard Abatement District	WAN	Wide Area Network
GIS	Geographic Information System	WBE	Women Business Enterprise
		WCCTAC	West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee

---



# Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

## Subcommittee Report

### PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

3.

**Meeting Date:** 11/10/2014

**Subject:** RECORD OF ACTION - October 27, 2014

**Submitted For:** PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE,

**Department:** County Administrator

**Referral No.:** N/A

**Referral Name:** RECORD OF ACTION

**Presenter:** Timothy Ewell, Committee Staff **Contact:** Timothy Ewell, (925)335-1036

---

#### **Referral History:**

County Ordinance requires that each County body keep a record of its meetings. Though the record need not be verbatim, it must accurately reflect the agenda and the decisions made in the meeting.

#### **Referral Update:**

Attached for the Committee's consideration is the Record of Action for its October 27, 2014 meeting.

#### **Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):**

APPROVE Record of Action from the October 27, 2014 meeting.

#### **Fiscal Impact (if any):**

No fiscal impact. This item is informational only.

---

#### **Attachments**

October 27, 2014 Record of Action

---



# Agenda

## PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

October 27, 2014

1:00 P.M.

651 Pine Street, Room 101, Martinez

Supervisor Federal D. Glover, Chair

Supervisor John Gioia, Vice Chair

### Agenda Items:

Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Committee

Present: Federal D. Glover, Chair

John Gioia, Vice Chair

Staff Present: Timothy M. Ewell, Senior Deputy County Administrator-Committee Staff

Lara DeLaney, Senior Deputy County Administrator

Mark Peterson, District Attorney-Public Administrator

Robin Lipetzky, Public Defender

Phil Kader, Chief Probation Officer

Michael V. Casten, Undersheriff

Todd Billeci, Chief Deputy Probation Officer

Matthew Schuler, Assistant Sheriff-Custody Services Bureau

Mary Knox, Senior Deputy District Attorney

Thomas Chalk, Captain, WCDF Commander

Dana Filkowski, Deputy District Attorney

Cherie Mathisen, Chief of Administration - District Attorney's Office

Robert T. Calkins, CDBG Program Manager - Conservation and Development  
Department

Donte Blue, County Reentry Coordinator

Terrance Cheung, Chief of Staff - District I

Donna Maxwell, District II Staff

Ed Diokno, District V Staff

### 1. Introductions

***Convene - 1:00 PM***

### 2. Public comment on any item under the jurisdiction of the Committee and not on this agenda (speakers may be limited to three minutes).

***No Public Comment.***

### 3. APPROVE Record of Action from the July 28, 2014 meeting.

*Approved as presented.*

Chair Federal D. Glover, Vice Chair John Gioia

AYE: Chair Federal D. Glover, Vice Chair John Gioia

Passed

4.
  1. ACCEPT staff report on the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant and Community Recidivism Reduction Grant programs; and,
  2. PROVIDE direction to staff as necessary.

*Approved as presented with the following direction to staff:*

*Byrne JAG Grant:*

- 1. Staff needs to prioritize formation of JAG Steering Committee prior to the existing workgroup agreeing on a programmatic approach to the grant.*
- 2. The JAG Steering Committee should be composed of 12-14 members, including "traditional" and "non-traditional" stakeholders as outlined in the State RFP.*
- 3. Committee staff should schedule a special meeting of the Public Protection Committee to receive an update on the JAG Grant proposal development process prior to the November 24, 2014 submission deadline.*

*Community Recidivism Reduction Grant:*

- 1. The \$250,000 grant from the state should be competitively bid in the following increments: Two (2) \$50,000 allocations to Juvenile programming and three (3) \$50,000 allocations to adult programming.*
- 2. For the three (3) \$50,000 allocations to adult programming, the funding should be allocation to West, Central and East county programs equally. The funded programs should build off of existing programming established by the Community Corrections Partnership for the AB 109 population, but it is not a requirement that the Community Recidivism Reduction Grant funding be spent exclusively on the AB 109 population.*

Vice Chair John Gioia, Chair Federal D. Glover

AYE: Chair Federal D. Glover, Vice Chair John Gioia

Passed

5.
  1. ACCEPT report from the County Reentry Coordinator on the status of discussions with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) regarding establishment of programming for certain parolees within Contra Costa County.

*Approved as presented with the following direction to staff:*

*1. The Committee noted that County staff should continue to pursue the opportunity of partnering with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation on programming for parolees in Contra Costa County should the West County Reentry Resource Center Steering Committee vote to disallow participation of parolees in the West County Reentry Resource Center through a contract with the State. The provision of reentry services to parolees is contemplated in current County policy through the County Reentry Strategic Plan.*

6. 1. ACCEPT a report on the review of the Alcoholic Beverage Commercial Sales ordinance (commonly referred to as the "Deemed Approved Ordinance"); and,  
2. PROVIDE direction to staff as necessary.

*Approved as presented with the following direction to staff:*

*1. The Committee directed staff to bring the approved recommendations to the full Board of Supervisors.*

Chair Federal D. Glover, Vice Chair John Gioia

AYE: Chair Federal D. Glover, Vice Chair John Gioia  
Passed

7. 1. ACCEPT a report from the Sheriff's Office regarding the Inmate Telecommunications Request for Proposals process.

*Approved as presented with the following direction to staff:*

*1. The Committee requested a report back in the future once the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) publishes the final ruling on commissions for intra-state inmate phone calls and the resulting impact on the Sheriff's Office Inmate Welfare Fund (IWF).*

Vice Chair John Gioia, Chair Federal D. Glover

AYE: Chair Federal D. Glover, Vice Chair John Gioia  
Passed

8. The next meeting is currently scheduled for November 24, 2014 at 1:00 PM.

*The Committee directed staff to work with each Supervisor's scheduler to schedule a special meeting of the Committee for early to mid November to facilitate additional discussion of the Byrne JAG grant.*

9. Adjourn

*Adjourned - 2:59 PM.*

---

*The Public Protection Committee will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend Public Protection Committee meetings. Contact the staff person listed below at least 72 hours before the meeting.*

---

*Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to a majority of members of the Public Protection Committee less than 96 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at 651 Pine Street, 10th floor, during normal business hours.*

---

*Public comment may be submitted via electronic mail on agenda items at least one full work day prior to the published meeting time.*

---

For Additional Information Contact:

Timothy Ewell, Committee Staff  
Phone (925) 335-1036, Fax (925) 646-1353  
timothy.ewell@cao.cccounty.us



# Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

## Subcommittee Report

### PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

4.

**Meeting Date:** 11/10/2014

**Subject:** Bureau of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) - Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)

**Submitted For:** David Twa, County Administrator

**Department:** County Administrator

**Referral No.:**

**Referral Name:** Bureau of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) - Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)

**Presenter:** Lara DeLaney, (925) 335-1097    **Contact:** Lara DeLaney, (925) 335-1097

---

### **Referral History:**

The State Budget Act of 2014 (Chapter 25, Statutes of 2014) includes several new grant programs in the area of public safety for oversight by local government. Contra Costa County has received correspondence from the California Bureau of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) regarding two grant programs for which the County is eligible to participate: the Community Recidivism Reduction Grant and the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program. Each program has required that a Notice of Intent to Apply be filed with the BSCC - Contra Costa County has filed both notices with the BSCC and is eligible to participate. A brief description of each program is outlined below:

**Community Recidivism Reduction Grant:** The Budget Act of 2014 (Chapter 25, Statutes of 2014) allocates \$8 million to the Board of State and Community Corrections for the Community Recidivism Reduction Grant described in Penal Code section 1233.10. Counties are eligible to receive funds if the Board of Supervisors, in collaboration with the county's Community Corrections Partnership, agrees to develop a competitive grant program intended to fund community recidivism and crime reduction services. Each county must notify the BSCC of its interest in participating in this grant program by sending a letter confirming interest by September 30, 2014. On September 16, 2014, the Board of Supervisors approved a letter of interest (Agenda Item No. C.51, attached) agreeing to develop a competitive grant program intended to fund community recidivism and crime reduction services. On October 3, 2014, the Community Corrections Partnership voted unanimously to acknowledge the intent of the County to participate in the grant program in coordination with the Board of Supervisors (Agenda Item No. 6).

**Edward Byrne Memorial JAG Program:** The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program (42 U.S. Code §3751(a)) is the primary provider of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions. The JAG Program provides critical funding necessary to support state and local initiatives, to include: technical assistance, strategic planning, research and evaluation (including forensics), data collection, training, personnel, equipment, forensic

laboratories, supplies, contractual support, and criminal justice information systems.

Currently, the County has budgeted \$341,994 over three departments (District Attorney as lead agency (\$136,630), Probation (\$104,394) and Sheriff's Office (\$100,970) for fiscal year FY 2014/15 for this funding source through the Regional Anti-Drug Program (RADA) grant previously administered by the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA). The State Budget Act of 2014 transferred responsibility and oversight of the Federal JAG Program grant to the BSCC with a new approach. The BSCC has released an RFP (attached) that describes the new requirements for participation in this grant by counties, including the establishment of a local JAG Steering Committee. Contra Costa County is considered a large county and is, therefore, eligible for up to \$1,045,625 per year for three years. This would be a potential increase in funding to the County of close to \$700,000; however, should the new proposal not maintain, at a minimum, current funding levels to individual departments authorized under the former RADA grant program, then that department(s) will have a structural deficit. At a bidder's conference held on Friday, October 17th, the BSCC clarified that funding was available for five large counties (in addition to Los Angeles County).

### **Referral Update:**

At the October 27, 2014 Public Protection Committee, provided the following direction to staff:

1. Staff needs to prioritize formation of JAG Steering Committee prior to the existing workgroup agreeing on a programmatic approach to the grant.
2. The JAG Steering Committee should be composed of 12-14 members, including "traditional" and "non-traditional" stakeholders as outlined in the State RFP.
3. Committee staff should schedule a special meeting of the Public Protection Committee to receive an update on the JAG Grant proposal development process prior to the November 24, 2014 submission deadline.

The special meeting of the PPC was requested to provide the Committee with an opportunity to meet prior to submission of the Byrne JAG Grant proposal to the BSCC. The JAG workgroup is scheduled to meet on Thursday, November 6, 2014, which is the same date that the PPC agenda packet is required to be published pursuant to the Better Government Ordinance. For that reason, staff will provide an update and materials related to the scheduled workgroup meeting at the PPC meeting and request that those materials be accepted into the record.

### **Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):**

1. ACCEPT staff report on the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant and Community Recidivism Reduction Grant programs; and,
2. AUTHORIZE the County Administrator, or designee, to secure a grant writer, if needed, to assist in the development of the final Byrne JAG grant proposal in recognition of the short turnaround time required to submit the grant by November 24, 2014.
2. PROVIDE direction to staff as necessary.

### **Fiscal Impact (if any):**

No immediate fiscal impact. This action is only an informational report to the Committee and request for direction.

BSCC Byrne JAG Grant - RFP

BSCC Byrne JAG Grant - Interest Letter

FY2014 Regional Anti-Drug Abuse (RADA) Program Allocations Board Order

---

# **Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program**

**Fiscal Year 2014  
Project Cycle: 3/1/15-12/31/17**

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**Eligible Applicants: California Counties**

*Released September 15, 2014  
"Notice of Intent to Apply" due October 3, 2014  
**Proposals due November 24, 2014***

*In addition to the grant application, this Request for Proposals (RFP) packet includes important information about funding provisions, grant eligibility, and proposal submission requirements.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CONTACT INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PROPOSAL DUE DATE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>BIDDERS' CONFERENCES.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
▪ <i>Eligibility</i>	
▪ <i>Grant Cycle</i>	
▪ <i>Priority Program Purpose Areas</i>	
▪ <i>Prohibited Uses</i>	
<b>FUNDING.....</b>	<b>7</b>
▪ <i>Fund Source</i>	
▪ <i>Funding in California</i>	
▪ <i>Funding Thresholds</i>	
▪ <i>Matching Funds</i>	
▪ <i>Multi-County Partnerships</i>	
▪ <i>Supplanting</i>	
▪ <i>Leveraging of Funds</i>	
<b>GRANT REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
▪ <i>Stakeholder Collaboration</i>	
▪ <i>Letters of Agreement and Operational Agreements</i>	
▪ <i>Governing Board Resolution</i>	
▪ <i>Audit</i>	
▪ <i>Invoices</i>	
<b>EVIDENCE-BASED, INNOVATIVE AND PROMISING STRATEGIES .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>DATA COLLECTION, REPORTING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>RFP PROCESS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
▪ <i>Proposal Submission</i>	
▪ <i>Technical Compliance Review</i>	
▪ <i>Proposal Evaluation Process</i>	
▪ <i>Key Dates</i>	
<b>GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR ALL GRANT PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>JAG PROPOSAL CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>30</b>
▪ <i>Appendix A – County Population Index</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix B – JAG Three-Year Strategy*</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix C – JAG Steering Committee Member Roster*</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix D – Sample Letter of Agreement*</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix E – Sample Operational Agreement*</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix F – Sample Governing Board Resolution</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix G – List of Other Grant Funding Sources *</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix H – Definition of Terms</i>	
▪ <i>Appendix I – Key Federal Assurances</i>	

*\*Required attachment*

## CONTACT INFORMATION

This Request for Proposals (RFP) provides the information necessary to prepare a proposal to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) for FY 2014 grant funds available through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program.

Be advised that the BSCC staff cannot assist the applicant with the actual preparation of the proposal, but can answer technical questions. Any technical questions concerning the RFP, the proposal process, or programmatic issues must be submitted **in writing** by fax or email to:

Daryle McDaniel, Field Representative  
Corrections Planning and Programs Division  
Phone: (916) 341-7392  
Fax: (916) 327-3317  
Email: [daryle.mcdaniel@bscc.ca.gov](mailto:daryle.mcdaniel@bscc.ca.gov)

or

Colleen Curtin, Field Representative  
Corrections Planning and Programs Division  
Phone: (916) 445-8066  
Fax: (916) 327-3317  
Email: [colleen.curtin@bscc.ca.gov](mailto:colleen.curtin@bscc.ca.gov)

## PROPOSAL DUE DATE

One original and four copies of the proposal must be received (not just postmarked) by the BSCC's Corrections Planning and Programs Division by **5:00 p.m. on Monday, November 24, 2014, at:**

Board of State and Community Corrections  
Corrections Planning and Programs Division  
600 Bercut Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
Attn: Brian Wise, Program Analyst

***Proposals received after 5:00 p.m. on November 24, 2014  
will be deemed ineligible.***

## NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY

Before submitting a proposal, prospective applicants should submit a “Notice of Intent to Apply” by 5:00 p.m. on **October 3, 2014**. This notice must be from a county official and can come in the form of an email or letter submitted to Brian Wise, Program Analyst, at either [brian.wise@bscc.ca.gov](mailto:brian.wise@bscc.ca.gov) or:

Board of State and Community Corrections  
Corrections Planning and Programs Division  
600 Bercut Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
Attn: Brian Wise, Program Analyst

There is no specific template for the Notice of Intent to Apply; the notice should simply include a brief statement indicating the county’s intent to submit a proposal. (If sent by email, please include “Name of County-JAG Notice of Intent” in the subject line.) If more than one county will partner on a joint proposal, please note that within the Notice of Intent to Apply and include the names of all involved counties.

Submission of a Notice of Intent to Apply will assist the BSCC in planning for the length and scope of the proposal rating process. Failure to submit a Notice of Intent to Apply is not grounds for disqualification. Further, prospective applicants that submit a Notice of Intent to Apply and decide later not to apply will not be penalized.

## BIDDERS’ CONFERENCES

BSCC plans to hold three Bidders’ Conferences, tentatively scheduled for the week of October 13-17, 2014; one in southern California, one in central California, and one in Sacramento. Exact dates, locations and times will be posted to the BSCC website ([www.bscc.ca.gov](http://www.bscc.ca.gov)) by September 26, 2014. Please check back to the website for details.

At these conferences, BSCC will provide clarification on the RFP and address any questions that have been submitted in writing. Questions should be submitted by **October 8, 2014** to either of the contacts listed on page 1 of this RFP.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program (42 U.S. Code §3751(a)) is the primary provider of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions. The JAG Program provides critical funding necessary to support state and local initiatives, to include: technical assistance, strategic planning, research and evaluation (including forensics), data collection, training, personnel, equipment, forensic laboratories, supplies, contractual support, and criminal justice information systems.

The JAG Program supports seven Program Purpose Areas designated by federal statute. These include:

- (1) Law enforcement programs.
- (2) Prosecution and court programs, including indigent defense.
- (3) Prevention and education programs.
- (4) Corrections and community corrections programs.
- (5) Drug treatment and enforcement programs.
- (6) Planning, evaluation and technology improvement programs.
- (7) Crime victim and witness programs (other than compensation).

Historically, funding for the JAG Program in California had been allocated directly to counties through a non-competitive process. The majority of funds were passed through to local law enforcement agencies to fund multi-jurisdictional task forces related to narcotics suppression. In fact, in 2012, 98 percent of JAG funds were allocated to Program Purpose Area (1) – Law enforcement programs.

On July 1, 2012, California state law transferred the administration of the Edward Byrne Memorial JAG (JAG) Program from the California Emergency Management Agency (now the California Office of Emergency Services) to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). With this transfer, BSCC became the State Administering Agency (SAA) responsible for oversight of Byrne JAG funding in California.

Around this same time, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), the federal agency that administers the JAG Program, placed a greater emphasis on the role of comprehensive strategic planning by the states. California embraced this change, recognizing that a reassessment of funding priorities was overdue. After assuming responsibility for the JAG Program, BSCC Board members expressed a desire to take a closer look at JAG funding in California, to explore whether the State could or should be investing in any of the other JAG Program Purpose Areas.

To that end, California conducted a comprehensive strategic planning process and gathered input from all criminal justice stakeholders in order to develop a more comprehensive Multi-Year State Strategy for the JAG Program. The BSCC formed an Executive Steering Committee (ESC), comprised of high-level executives from small, medium and large counties, representing the public, private and non-profit sectors. The JAG ESC led the planning process, which included a web-based survey of 890 stakeholders, three public comment sessions throughout the state, discussions with other criminal justice stakeholders, and an examination of other criminal justice financial resources designed to address public safety and victim assistance concerns.

As a result of this planning process, the JAG ESC developed a Multi-Year State Strategy, which subsequently received full Board approval. With this latest round of JAG funding, California will implement this new strategy, representing a major change in the way it administers the JAG Program. While maintaining law enforcement programs as a priority, California's new strategy places an equal emphasis on prevention and education programs, as well as on court, prosecution and defense strategies.

The table below lays out California's Multi-Year Strategy for the Byrne JAG Program.

### **Multi-Year Strategy for the Byrne JAG Program**

- (1) Will honor responses from California stakeholders in the 2013 Byrne JAG Stakeholder Survey, with priority given to the survey supported Program Purpose Areas of:
  - a. *Prevention and Education*
  - b. *Law Enforcement*
  - c. *Prosecution, Courts and Defense*
- (2) The needs of small, medium and large counties will be taken into account.
- (3) Funding will be based on local flexibility, on the needs of the juvenile and adult criminal justice communities and on input from a balanced array of stakeholders.
- (4) Applicants must demonstrate a collaborative strategy based on the community engagement model that involves multiple stakeholders in the project or problem addressed.
- (5) Some emphasis will be given to the development of innovative and/or promising strategies to reduce recidivism.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **Eligibility**

Only California's 58 counties are eligible to apply. As a part of the proposal development process, a county must convene a JAG Steering Committee (see "Stakeholder Collaboration," below) to oversee the planning and implementation of JAG-funded projects.

- The county – in collaboration with the JAG Steering Committee – must identify one county department or agency to serve as the applicant agency.
- Two or more counties may partner to submit one joint proposal, following the funding instructions under "Multi-County Partnerships" on page 8.
- Each county may submit only one proposal, whether as part of a multi-county partnership or on its own.

- Though the county is the applicant and administrator of JAG funds (through the applicant agency), the lead agency for the project may be a separate public or private entity.

### **Grant Cycle**

Successful applicants will be funded for a 34-month cycle beginning on March 1, 2015 and ending on December 31, 2017. This application is for first year funds only. Funding for years two and three will not be competitive, though grantees will have to submit an application and show that they have made substantial progress against their JAG strategy. Funding for years two and three will also be dependent on California's JAG allocations for FY 2015 and FY 2016.

### **Priority Program Purpose Areas**

As mentioned in the previous section, the BSCC undertook a comprehensive JAG Stakeholder Survey and planning process in order to determine the focus of the JAG Program in California. The BSCC received 890 survey responses from a broad array of criminal justice stakeholders. Responses to the survey were grouped into seven stakeholder categories: 1) Law Enforcement, 2) Corrections and Community Corrections, 3) Administration and Policy, 4) Courts (including prosecution and defense), 5) Victims, 6) Social Services (including community-based organizations, mental health and public health agencies), and 7) Education and Juvenile Justice.

Based on the results of this survey, California developed a new multi-year strategy for JAG funding. This strategy focuses on the three Program Purpose Areas deemed top priorities by a majority of survey respondents, across all seven stakeholder categories.

**Applicants must develop a proposal that addresses one or more of these three JAG Program Purpose Areas:**

- ❖ ***Prevention and Education Programs***
- ❖ ***Law Enforcement Programs***
- ❖ ***Courts, Prosecution, Defense and Indigent Defense***

Within each of these Program Purpose Areas, respondents to the JAG Stakeholder Survey were also asked to rank in order of importance a list of "areas of need." Responses were again grouped into the seven stakeholder categories. The survey report identified the top three Areas of Need for each of the seven stakeholder categories. These are listed in the table on the following page. (Note that because there were ties within all three of the Program Purpose Areas, there are more than three Areas of Need listed for each.)

Applicants are restricted to the development of proposals that address one or more of the three main Programs Purpose Areas (PPA), and within each PPA selected, one or more of the Areas of Need, as listed in the table on the following page. Within these PPAs and Areas of Need, applicants may implement one or more projects that best fit the needs of the county, as determined by the JAG Steering Committee. Note: For

purposes of scoring, no Program Purpose Area or Area of Need carries more weight than another.

### ***JAG Priority Program Purpose Areas and Priority Areas of Need***

<b>JAG Program Purpose Area:</b>	<b>Prevention and Education Programs</b>
<i>Areas of Need:</i>	• <i>Gang Initiatives</i>
	• <i>Juvenile Delinquency</i>
	• <i>Substance Abuse</i>
	• <i>School Violence</i>
<b>JAG Program Purpose Area:</b>	<b>Law Enforcement Programs</b>
<i>Areas of Need:</i>	• <i>Gang Violence Reduction</i>
	• <i>Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives</i>
	• <i>Drug Enforcement</i>
	• <i>Gun Violence Reduction</i>
<b>JAG Program Purpose Area:</b>	<b>Courts, Prosecution, Defense and Indigent Defense</b>
<i>Areas of Need:</i>	• <i>Problem Solving Courts (e.g., Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)</i>
	• <i>Gun/Gang Prosecution</i>
	• <i>Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense</i>
	• <i>Court-Based Restorative Justice Initiatives</i>
	• <i>Innovations in Indigent Defense</i>

### **Prohibited Uses**

No JAG funds may be expended outside of the three priority JAG PPAs. Even within these PPAs, however, JAG funds cannot be used directly or indirectly for security enhancements or equipment for nongovernmental entities not engaged in criminal justice or public safety. Additionally, JAG funds may not be used directly or indirectly to pay for any of the following items (per federal grant guidelines):

- Indirect costs.
- Vehicles, vessels, or aircraft (with the exception of police cruisers, police boats and police helicopters).
- Unmanned aerial vehicles/unmanned aircraft, aircraft system, or aerial vehicles.
- Luxury items.
- Real estate.
- Construction projects (other than penal or correctional institutions).
- Any similar items.

## FUNDING

### Fund Source

The JAG Program is a federally-funded grant program, with funds allocated by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).

### Funding in California

For Fiscal Year 2014, the portion of California's JAG Allocation available for pass-through is \$17,756,951. A portion of those funds (\$1,087,521) will be allocated directly to the California Department of Justice, as per U.S. Code § 3755 (e)(2), to support local units of government. The remaining **\$16,669,430** will be passed through the BSCC to counties via this competitive process.

The grant period is for March 1, 2015 through December 31, 2017. This application is for first year funds only (March 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015), though applicants must submit a budget for the entire grant period. The second and third year budgets can be estimates, however there should be a plan to spend down all funds requested. There will be a non-competitive application process at the start of the second and third years, and at that time, successful applicants will have the opportunity to make adjustments to their budgets.

Though funding for years two and three will not be competitive, as a part of the application process, grantees must show that they have made substantial progress against their JAG strategy. Funding for years two and three will also be dependent on California's JAG allocations for FY 2015 and FY 2016.

### Funding Thresholds

The JAG Executive Steering Committee has carefully considered its fiduciary responsibilities associated with the federal JAG monies and the needs of small, medium and large jurisdictions. To that end, funding has been distributed between the small, medium and large counties and maximum funding thresholds have been determined according to the total population within each county (see **Appendix A** for county populations). Note: Because the population in Los Angeles County is more than three times that of the next largest county in the state, the Board voted to double its funding threshold, though it will still compete as a large county.

Applicants may apply for any dollar amount up to the funding threshold listed in the table below, according to the category in which that county falls:

	<b><i>Small Counties</i></b>	<b><i>Medium Counties</i></b>	<b><i>Large Counties*</i></b>	<b><i>Los Angeles County</i></b>
<b>Population Threshold</b>	Population <200,000	Population 200,001-700,000	Population 700,001+	N/A
<b>Funding Threshold</b>	<b>up to \$220,000 annually</b>	<b>up to \$715,000 annually</b>	<b>up to \$1,045,625 annually</b>	<b>up to \$2,091,250 annually</b>

*\*excluding Los Angeles County*

Applicants must apply for the same amount of funding for all three years (for example: 1st year: \$200,000, 2nd year: \$200,000 and 3rd year: \$200,000; totaling \$600,000 for a three-year period). Grantees may be able to carry unspent funds into the next calendar year, with BSCC staff approval, but it is extremely important that applicants plan and budget carefully and apply only for the amount of funding they can reasonably spend each year of the three-year grant period.

### **Matching Funds**

The JAG Program has NO match requirement.

### **Multi-County Partnerships**

As mentioned above, two or more counties may partner to submit one joint proposal. One county must serve as lead on the proposal and there must be an applicant agency from that county identified. In the case of a multi-county partnership, the following funding restrictions apply:

- **Counties in the same category:** Multi-county partnerships that consist of counties from within the same category (small, medium or large) may apply for up to the maximum funding threshold in that category, multiplied by the number of counties partnering on the proposal.

For example:

- Four (4) small counties may apply for up to \$880,000 [funding threshold for small counties (\$220,000) x 4 = \$880,000];
  - Three (3) medium counties may apply for up to \$2,145,000 [funding threshold for medium counties (\$715,000) x 3 = \$2,145,000];
  - Two (2) large counties may apply for up to \$2,091,250 [funding threshold for large counties (\$1,045,625) x 2 = \$2,091,250].
- **Counties in different categories:** To preserve the integrity of the funding distribution formula, multi-county partnerships that consist of counties from within different categories (small, medium or large) will default to the maximum funding threshold of the largest category participating in the partnership, multiplied by the number of counties from that category that are partnering on the proposal.

For example:

- One (1) small county partnering with one (1) medium county may apply for up to \$715,000 (default to medium; one medium county; \$715,000 x 1);
  - One (1) small county partnering with two (2) medium counties may apply for \$1,430,000 (default to medium; two medium counties; \$715,000 x 2);
  - One (1) medium county partnering with one (1) large county may apply for up to \$1,045,625 (default to large; one large county; \$1,045,625 x 1).
- **Counties partnering with Los Angeles County:** Multi-county partnerships that include Los Angeles County may only apply for up to the maximum funding threshold in that category, or \$2,091,250.

## **Supplanting**

Supplanting is prohibited under JAG. Applicants cannot replace or supplant non-federal funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose. See the 2014 JAG Frequently Asked Questions on BJA's web site for examples of supplanting (<https://www.bja.gov/Funding/JAGFAQ.pdf>).

## **Leveraging of Grant Funds**

Although supplanting is prohibited, the leveraging of federal funding is encouraged. For example, an applicant may use JAG funds along with other federal funds, to fund different portions of the same project. In instances where leveraging occurs, all federal grant funds must be tracked and reported on separately and may not be used to fund the same line items. Additionally, federal funds cannot be used as match for other federal awards.

# **GRANT REQUIREMENTS**

## **Stakeholder Collaboration**

In order to apply for JAG funding, counties must form a JAG Steering Committee comprised of stakeholders representing diverse disciplines who have experience and expertise in the prospective problem areas to be addressed by the JAG proposal. This will help meet the federal mandate that requires community engagement for the deployment of JAG funds. The steering committee will determine the community needs and develop a three-year JAG strategy in one-year increments, using the identified priorities (see **Appendix B** for Three-Year JAG Strategy Overview).

The JAG Steering Committee will represent a significant cross-section of the juvenile and criminal justice stakeholder communities within the applicant county. The JAG Steering Committee will be diverse in its composition; to include a balanced representation of both traditional and non-traditional stakeholders. Examples of traditional stakeholders could include law enforcement, probation, courts, and other city and county departments. Examples of non-traditional stakeholders could include community-based and faith-based organizations, educators, social service providers, job developers, advocacy groups, or citizens. The county will determine the total number of members to serve on the JAG Steering Committee.

Stakeholders identified for membership on the JAG steering committee shall possess a working knowledge of the problem areas being discussed within the identified JAG priorities. The applicant must describe the process that took place to engage membership for the JAG Steering Committee as well as any working relationships that existed with members prior to the development of the steering committee. The JAG steering committee will work collaboratively to identify the needs of the community as they relate to the JAG priorities and to create and develop a comprehensive project plan with the overall goal of reducing violent crime and recidivism within their county. The applicant must describe how they ensured full and balanced participation and voting

rights for all members of the committee throughout this process. The county may use an existing group, or a subcommittee of an existing group, but must address all the requirements listed in this section. Applicants must attach a member roster containing the names, titles, organizational affiliations, and contact information for each JAG steering committee member (see **Appendix C**).

### **Letters of Agreement and Operational Agreements**

As part of the necessary collaboration that must occur for the JAG Program to be successful, applicants must engage a wide range of stakeholders. There may be two levels of participation within a JAG Program. The level of participation will determine what type of documentation must be included with the proposal:

(1) Letter of Agreement (less formal)

For each partner agency that participates as a part of the JAG Steering Committee, and/or partners that provide in-kind services, the applicant must include a **signed** Letter of Agreement. This shall serve as an acknowledgement of the partnership that will exist, wherein no funds will be exchanged. A sample Letter of Agreement can be found in **Appendix D**.

(2) Operational Agreement (more formal)

For each subcontractor, consultant or service provider that will be paid for services under the grant agreement – including community- or faith-based organizations – the applicant must include a draft Operational Agreement. This shall serve as a formal agreement between the two parties indicating that there will be some type of contract or interagency agreement for services and acknowledging the exchange of funds.

An Operational Agreement should include: (a) a description of the agencies commitment to demonstrate a formal system of networking and coordination with other agencies and the applicant; (b) the names of anticipated project staff; (c) original signatures, titles, and the agency name for both parties; (d) effective performance period dates; and (e) the amount of JAG funds designated to the agencies. Signatures may be obtained after the proposal due date. A sample Operational Agreement can be found in **Appendix E**.

### **Governing Board Resolution**

Successful applicants are required to submit a Board of Supervisors' Resolution (see **Appendix F**, Sample Board of Supervisors' Resolution), before the grant award can be finalized and funds awarded. A signed resolution is not required at the time of proposal submission, but applicants are advised that *no invoices will be processed for reimbursement until your agency's Board Resolution has been received by the BSCC*.

### **Audit**

Grantees must submit an audit of expenditures (either grant-specific or as part of a City/County single audit) within 120 days of the end of each 12-month grant period. Reasonable and necessary extensions to the timeframe may be granted if requested.

### **Invoices**

Disbursement of grant funds occurs on a reimbursement basis for costs incurred during a reporting period. Grantees must submit invoices to the BSCC on a quarterly basis, within 45 days following the end of the reporting period via the on-line process. Grantees must maintain adequate supporting documentation for all costs claimed on invoices for reimbursement.

For additional information, refer to the BSCC's Grant Administration and Audit Guide, July 2012 at: [http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Grant\\_Administration\\_Guide\\_July\\_2012.pdf](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Grant_Administration_Guide_July_2012.pdf)

### **Outside Grant Funds**

Applicants must complete the "List of Other Grant Funding Sources" form (see **Appendix G**) and submit it with the proposal packet.

## **EVIDENCE-BASED, INNOVATIVE AND PROMISING STRATEGIES**

### **Evidence-Based Practice (EBP)**

The concept of evidence-based practice was developed outside of criminal justice and is commonly used in other applied fields such as medicine, nursing, and social work. Because there are numerous definitions of evidence-based practice, for the purpose of this RFP, evidence-based practice consists of three basic principles:

1. Evidence that the intervention is likely to work, i.e., produce a desired benefit;
2. Evidence that the intervention is being carried out as intended; and
3. Evidence that allows an evaluation of whether the intervention worked.

In discussions of evidence-based practice in criminal justice, it is common to distinguish between *programs* and *strategies*.

*Programs* are designed to change the behavior of individuals in the criminal justice system and are measured by individual level outcomes. Programs aiming to reduce substance use and antisocial behavior, for example, include Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Behavioral Programs; Social Skills Training; and Family Crisis Counseling.

Although *strategies* may include programs to change individual behavior, this term is generally used for interventions to promote community level policy objectives. Such strategies may be evaluated for effects on overall service delivery or use of jail beds rather than in terms of recidivism alone.

- Some interventions are "brand-name programs," which have already been tested and found effective in a variety of settings: for example, Nurse Family Partnership, Functional Family Therapy, and Life Skills Training.
- Brand name programs offer the advantages of detailed training and implementation protocols available from the developer.

- Whether a brand name program is suited to the particular circumstances of an agency or setting should be determined in advance, because effectiveness can be compromised when brand name programs are altered.<sup>1</sup>

For these reasons, one cannot rely simply on the brand, but must apply the principles of evidence-based practice to an agency's particular circumstances. Depending on that review, applicants may wish to adopt a brand-name program, adapt non-branded interventions developed elsewhere, or develop a new program or strategy (see "Innovative and/or Promising Strategies," below).

Showing that a program or strategy is likely to work in a local setting requires not only evidence of effectiveness but evidence of relevance.<sup>2</sup> Applicants should determine what kind of evidence is available and the reasoning that indicates the proposed practice is likely to succeed and will be effective in the local community and with the population being served. In addition, applicants should identify any lessons learned that have been applied in planning for the intervention in the local setting.

### **Innovative and/or Promising Strategies**

The State Strategy for the JAG Program adopted by the BSCC states that "some emphasis shall be given to innovative and/or promising strategies to reduce crime and recidivism." Based on this, applicants are encouraged to identify innovative or promising strategies in their proposals for JAG funds.

"Innovative," for purposes of this RFP, shall be broadly construed to include programs or strategies that are "new" in the county or area where applied or represent expanded or reconfigured programs targeting additional populations or needs in the applicant county. Innovative programs or strategies described in the proposal must be linked to one or more components of an evidence-based practice.

"Promising," for purposes of this RFP, shall be broadly construed to include crime-reduction and recidivism-reduction programs or strategies that have been implemented elsewhere with evidence of success, but with evidence that is not yet strong enough to conclude that the success was due to the program, or that it is highly likely to work if carried out in the applicant's circumstances. The difference between evidence-based and promising approaches is a difference in degree that depends on the number of situations in which a program or strategy has been tested and the rigor of the evaluation methods that were used. Applicants seeking to implement "promising" programs or strategies should be able to describe the documentation, data and evidence available to support the approach and why it is best suited to the needs and objectives described in the proposal.

Evidence, which may vary in terms of its novelty or its strength, is relevant to the assessment of a program's potential benefits, whether described as innovative, promising, or evidence-based.

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter Greenwood, Ph.D. "Preventing and Reducing Youth Crime and Violence: Using Evidence-Based Practices," January 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Nancy Cartwright and Jeremy Hardie, "Evidence-Based Policy A Practical Guide to Doing it Better," Oxford University Press, 2012.

## Requirements for All JAG Proposals

1. The applicant must show, in the grant proposal, that the proposed intervention(s)<sup>3</sup> (whether evidence-based, innovative or promising) are likely to achieve benefits desired in the local setting. To do this, the applicant must:
  - Describe the intervention(s) being proposed for implementation;
  - Discuss any evidence (research, outcome evaluations, etc.) that indicates the intervention or its components have been effective elsewhere;
  - Describe the population(s) for which each intervention has been shown to be or is likely to be effective; and show that it is appropriate for the proposed target population; and
  - Discuss what has been done to ensure that the support factors (e.g., inter-agency partnerships, certified trainers, auxiliary services, suitable criteria for participation, program materials, etc.) required or necessary for the intervention can be mobilized in the local setting.

Documentation of effectiveness can take the form of research or literature review, or reference to reviews of program effectiveness conducted by policy shops, some of which are listed in the section below titled, “EBP Informational Resources.” Descriptions of local needs and agency capacities, in light of the factors that supported an intervention elsewhere, can be applied to an assessment of relevance.

2. Applicants must also describe how they will track operations to assess whether an intervention is being carried out as intended. This task is often referred to as a *process* evaluation; *formative* evaluation is a related term also found in the literature. (See “Local Evaluation Plan” within the Data Collection, Reporting and Evaluation Requirements section, page 15.)
3. Finally, applicants must address their plans for outcome evaluation, i.e., how they will assess what happened as a result of the intervention and whether it produced its intended benefits. (See “Final Local Evaluation” within the Data Collection, Reporting and Evaluation Requirements section, page 16.)

### EBP Informational Resources

The list of websites provided below may be useful to applicants in the proposal development process. This is not an exhaustive list; it is offered as an informational resource only.

- Board of State and Community Corrections  
[http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s\\_evidence-basedpractices\(ebp\).php](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_evidence-basedpractices(ebp).php)

---

<sup>3</sup> For purposes of this section, the term “intervention” includes both programs and/or strategies.

- Office of Justice Programs  
<http://www.CrimeSolutions.gov>
- Blueprints for Violence Prevention  
<http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/index.html>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)  
National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices  
<http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov>
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy  
<http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/>
- John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
Center for Crime Prevention and Control  
<http://johnjayresearch.org/ccpc/>
- National Network for Safe Communities  
<http://www.nnscommunities.org>
- Promising Practices Network  
<http://www.promisingpractices.net/>
- National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
“Preventing and Reducing Youth Crime and Violence: Using Evidence-Based Practice.” A report prepared by Peter Greenwood, Ph.D., for the California Governor’s Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy, 2010.  
<https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=255934>
- Find Youth Information  
<http://www.FindYouthInfo.gov/>
- National Reentry Resource Center  
<http://nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/>
- National Institute of Corrections  
<http://nicic.gov/Library/>
- California Institute for Behavioral Health Solutions  
<http://www.cimh.org/evidence-based-practices-0>
- Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy (“Top Tier”)  
<http://coalition4evidence.org/>
- National Criminal Justice Association  
<http://www.ncja.org/>

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Model Program Guide  
<http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/>
- Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University, Director Mark Lipsey  
<http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/research/pri/publications.php>
- Association for the Advancement of Evidence-Based Practice  
“Implementing Proven Programs for Juvenile Offenders: Assessing States’ Progress.” A report prepared by Peter Greenwood, Ph.D., 2011.  
<http://www.advancingebp.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/AEBP-assessment.pdf>

## DATA COLLECTION, REPORTING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

All grantees are required to submit a (1) **Local Evaluation Plan** to the BSCC by June 30, 2015, (2) **Quarterly Progress Reports**, and (3) a **Final Local Evaluation** by March 31, 2018.

Applicants are required to set aside a minimum of 5 to 10 percent of the grant funds for the development of the Local Evaluation Plan, data collection efforts, and submission of the Final Local Evaluation. Depending on the complexity and size of a proposed project(s), some applicants may benefit from using a local college, university or consultant to help develop and execute the Final Local Evaluation.

### (1) Local Evaluation Plan

The purpose of the Local Evaluation Plan is to ensure that programs funded by the BSCC can be evaluated. Applicants will be expected to submit a detailed description of how the applicant will assess the effectiveness of the proposed program, including all individual project components. The Local Evaluation Plan can be submitted in either a narrative or bulleted format. The Plan should describe the research design that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project component(s), with the project goals (i.e. the expected benefits to participants or the community) and the project objectives (i.e. specific measurable accomplishments intended to advance project goals) clearly stated.

In addition, applicants should address two components: the process evaluation and the outcome evaluation, outlined in more detail below:

- a) **Process Evaluation:** The purpose of the process evaluation is to identify how the program activities will be carried out. A process evaluation should describe the types of data that will be collected and typically includes, but is not limited to, such measures as:
  - Estimated number of participants in each component of the planned program.
  - A plan for tracking participants’ progress in the program(s); e.g. start dates, attendance logs, dropouts, successful completions, etc.

- A plan to document the services provided to each participant.
- A plan to document the activities performed by staff who conducted the program.

Since each JAG project is unique in its approach and the intended results may vary, not all measures in the process evaluation, as stated above, may apply. For example, if an applicant plans to use a portion of the JAG funds towards Information System upgrades, a different set of measures may be used to explain how the program activities will be carried out.

- b) Outcome Evaluation: The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to identify how the applicant will determine if the program “worked” in terms of achieving the goals set for the program. The outcome evaluation should list the outcome measures that will be tracked and describe the method by which the impact of the program on the outcome measures will be determined.

## (2) Quarterly Progress Reports

The purpose of a Quarterly Progress Report is to provide BSCC with an update on the process evaluation, as stated in the (1) Local Evaluation Plan. Grantees must have the ability to collect the specified program activity data (e.g. number of participants, events, etc.) and report it to the BSCC on quarterly progress reports during the term of the grant performance period. The report form and instructions will be available to grantees on the BSCC’s website. Progress Reports will be due no later than 15 days following the end of each quarter.

## (3) Final Local Evaluation

The purpose of the Final Local Evaluation is to determine whether or not the overall program (including each project component) was effective in meeting the goals laid out in the (1) Local Evaluation Plan. To do this, the grantee must assess and document the effectiveness of the activities that were implemented within each individual project component. These activities should have been documented in the previously submitted (1) Local Evaluation Plan.

The Final Local Evaluation must also describe the research design, as laid out in the (1) Local Evaluation Plan. Most importantly, the Final Local Evaluation will describe the final outcomes of the program (for each individual project component), including a determination of the degree of effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness. For example, if the goal of a program was to reduce gang-related crime in a specific area, an applicant should specify the following:

- a) A strategy for determining whether or not incidents of gang-related crime were fewer at the end of the program as compared to before it began.
- b) A rationale for inferring that the reduction in gang-related crime was directly related to the program and not to other factors unrelated to the program.

## RFP PROCESS

### Proposal Submission

As stated above, proposals must be **received** (not just postmarked) at the BSCC office in Sacramento no later than 5:00 PM on November 24, 2014. Applicants must submit one original and four copies of the proposal (i.e., Applicant Information Form, Proposal Narrative, Proposal Budget and all other required attachments). Proposals may be mailed or hand delivered to the attention of Brian Wise, Program Analyst at:

Board of State and Community Corrections  
Corrections Planning and Programs Division  
600 Bercut Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
Attn: Brian Wise, Program Analyst

***Proposals received after 5:00 p.m. on November 24, 2014  
will be deemed ineligible.***

### Technical Compliance Review

BSCC staff will review each proposal to determine if it meets the RFP requirements. In order to avoid having otherwise worthy proposals eliminated from consideration due to relatively minor and easily corrected errors/omissions, applicants will have an opportunity to respond to deficiencies identified during this review process, which will take place **November 25, 2014 through December 12, 2014**, and to make **non-substantive** changes that bring the proposal into technical compliance.

### Proposal Evaluation Process

Members of the JAG Executive Steering Committee (a diverse group of local criminal justice stakeholders, from both the public and private sectors) will evaluate the merits of each proposal in accordance with the prescribed rating criteria (as listed below). It should be noted that small counties will compete against other small counties, medium against medium, and large against large. To preserve the integrity of the funding distribution formula, multi-county partnerships that consist of counties from within different categories (small, medium or large) for rating purposes will default to the largest category participating in the partnership. Los Angeles County will compete in the "Large County" category.

Following the rating process, the Executive Steering Committee will convene for a Final Rater Review where they will develop funding recommendations for consideration by the BSCC Board.

Applicants will be notified in writing of the committee's funding recommendations. It is currently anticipated that the BSCC Board will act on the recommendations at their meeting in February 2015. Applicants are not to contact members of the Executive Steering Committee or the BSCC Board about their proposal.

The rating factors that will be used and the maximum points allocated to each factor are shown in the table below. Omission or lack of clarity for any section is likely to result in a reduction of allowable points.

**Important note:** Proposals must receive a minimum of 250 points (i.e., 50 percent of the 500 total possible points) in the combined raters' averaged scores to be considered for funding.

<b>PROPOSAL EVALUATION RATING FACTORS</b>	
<b>Rating Factor</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>
Project Need	50
Project Description, Goals and Objectives	125
Collaboration	100
Evidence-Based, Innovative and/or Promising Strategies	75
Data Collection and Evaluation	50
Capability and Qualifications to Provide Services	75
Proposal Budget: Cost Effectiveness and Budget Review	25
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>500</b>

### Key Dates

Key dates in the RFP and grant implementation process are shown in the table below:

<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>TIMELINE</b>
Release Request for Proposals (RFP)	September 15, 2014
Bidders' Conferences	<i>Tentatively</i> October 13-17, 2014
Notice of Intent to Apply Due to BSCC	October 3, 2014
Grant Proposal Due to BSCC ( <u>received</u> by 5:00 p.m.)	November 24, 2014
BSCC Technical Review	November 25, 2014– December 19, 2014
Rating Process & Development of Funding Recommendations	January 5-30, 2015
BSCC Board Considers Funding Recommendations	February 2015
New Grants Begin	March 1, 2015
New Grantee Orientation (Mandatory)	TBD (March 2015)
Local Evaluation Plan Due to BSCC	June 30, 2015
Reapplication Process for Year Two	TBD (December 2015)
Reapplication Process for Year Three	TBD (December 2016)

ACTIVITY	TIMELINE
Grant End Date	December 31, 2017
Final Local Evaluation Due to BSCC	March 31, 2018

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR ALL GRANT PROGRAMS

*The following information is provided to all prospective BSCC grantees. The applicant is not required to address this section within its JAG proposal, but should spend time in consideration of how this information may impact grant activities.*

### **Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity**

Research shows that youth of color are significantly overrepresented in the juvenile justice system in California. In 2011, Black youth were four times as likely to be arrested as White youth, nearly seven times more likely to be securely detained, and six times as likely to be committed to a correctional facility. Latino youth are nearly twice as likely to be arrested and securely detained and almost three times as likely to be committed to a correctional facility. These disparities are the result of numerous interrelated factors; some of which exist within the structures of the current juvenile justice system, and some of which are influenced by unconscious biases. Whatever the cause, BSCC believes that the overrepresentation of people of color in the criminal justice system can be addressed through meaningful dialogue, increased awareness, evaluation feedback and policy reforms intended to reduce structural inequality.

To that end, California is committed as a state to examining service delivery within the criminal justice system for perceived inequities and actual disparities that might exist at the state and local level. In fact, California is required to demonstrate a good faith effort to address the federal initiative known as *Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity* (formerly Disproportionate Minority Contact, or DMC), which refers to the disproportionate rate at which youth of color come into contact with the juvenile justice system (at all points, from arrest through confinement), relative to their numbers in the general population. In an effort to comply with this requirement, the BSCC has undertaken a number of activities to ensure that California addresses this concern, to include trainings, access to and support of structured decision-making tools, and funding opportunities.

JAG recipients will be invited to attend a one day Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity (R.E.D.) training for project directors and other interested staff which will be provided during the grant term. The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity states, “equity is important because it shapes legitimacy within the community.” In preparation for this training, we have included questions below that you may want to consider in relation to equity within your proposed program. These questions focus on the primary domain of Community, in which equity issues can be most significantly impacted and responded to, and which will be the focus of the training offered by the BSCC, in support of grantee success.

- *How are you measuring your effectiveness with underserved communities?*
- *How does your organization deal with issues of linguistic diversity?*
- *What is the nature of your organization's relationship to the community relative to the proposed program?*
- *Does the proposed program reflect the specific needs of the diverse communities served?*

JAG funding may be used to reimburse agencies for travel related expenditures such as mileage, meals, lodging if required, and other per diem costs. Applicants should include these costs in the budget section of their proposal. Registration information regarding the date, time and location of the regional trainings will be sent to all project directors.

Additional information about R.E.D. can be found on the BSCC's website at [www.bscc.ca.gov](http://www.bscc.ca.gov) or applicants may contact California's R.E.D. Coordinator, Shalinee Hunter, at (916)322-8081 or [shalinee.hunter@bscc.ca.gov](mailto:shalinee.hunter@bscc.ca.gov).

## JAG PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

A complete JAG Proposal must contain the following (to be submitted in the order listed):

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS	✓
Applicant Information Form (Section I)	
Proposal Narrative (Sections II–VIII)	
Proposal Budget (Section IX) A. Budget Line-Items (one for each of the three years) B. Budget Line Item Detail (i.e. Budget Narrative)	
JAG Three-Year Strategy (Appendix B)	
JAG Steering Committee Member Roster (Appendix C)	
Letters of Agreement for JAG Steering Committee Members and Other Partners Listed on the Grant (Appendix D)	
Draft Operational Agreements (Appendix E) for Partners Receiving Grant Funds	
List of Other Grant Funding Sources (Appendix G)	

*Notes:*

- The Governing Board Resolution is due prior to Grant Award Agreement, not at time of proposal submission (Appendix F).
- No other attachments will be considered for rating purposes.

## PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

### **SECTION I: How to complete the Applicant Information Form (on next page)**

- 1.1. Unit of Local Government:** Complete the required information (including federal identification number) for the county agency submitting the proposal.
- 1.2. JAG Program Title:** List the title of the overall program.
- 1.3. JAG Program Purpose Areas:** Of the three eligible Program Purpose Areas, list which one(s) were selected.
- 1.4. Amount of Funds Requested:** List only the amount of grant funds requested for the first 10 months of the grant period only (March 1, 2015-Dec. 31, 2015). Unless applying as part of a multi-county partnership, the amount may not exceed \$220,000 for counties designated as “small,” \$715,000 for “medium,” \$1,045,625 for “large,” or \$2,091,250 for Los Angeles. (Funding parameters for multi-county partnerships are outlined on p. 8).
- 1.5. Summary of Proposal:** Provide a brief description (3-5 sentences) of the overall JAG program, to be supported by the grant funds requested. Note: This information may be posted to the BSCC’s website for informational purposes.
- 1.6. Applicant Agency:** Complete the required sections for the county agency/department, including the name of the Project Director.
- 1.7. Day-to-Day Contact Person:** Provide the required information for the individual with whom BSCC staff will work on a daily basis during the grant period.
- 1.8. Designated Financial Officer:** Provide the required information for the individual who will approve invoices before the county submits them to the BSCC and be responsible for the overall fiscal management of the grant. Reimbursement checks are mailed to the Designated Financial Officer. Please be sure to include the payment mailing address.
- 1.9. Applicant Agreement:** The person signing here must be authorized by the County Board of Supervisors to enter into grant award agreement on behalf of the county.

### **SECTIONS II – VII: Proposal Narrative**

Sections II through VII make up the Proposal Narrative. The Proposal Narrative must be submitted in Arial 12 point font, with one-inch margins on all four sides. The narrative may be single or double spaced, but cannot exceed **20 pages** in length.

Note: These 20 pages do not include the “Applicant Information Form” (Section I), the “Proposal Budget” (Section IX), or other required attachments (see Appendices).

### **SECTION VIII: Proposal Budget**

Section VIII, Parts A and B, make up the Proposal Budget. Please see instructions beginning on page 27.

# Board of State and Community Corrections

## EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT (JAG) PROGRAM

### CFDA #16.738

#### SECTION I: APPLICANT INFORMATION FORM

<b>1.1. UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR GRANT</b>				
COUNTY	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER	FEDERAL EMPLOYER ID NUMBER)		
MAILING ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	
<b>1.2. PROJECT TITLE</b>	<b>1.3. JAG PROGRAM PURPOSE AREA(S)</b>	<b>1.4. AMOUNT OF FUNDS REQUESTED</b>		
		\$ (first year only)		
<b>1.5.. SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL</b>				
<b>1.6. APPLICANT AGENCY (MUST BE A COUNTY DEPARTMENT/AGENCY)</b>				
NAME OF DEPARTMENT/AGENCY		NAME AND TITLE OF DEPARTMENT/AGENCY HEAD		
NAME AND TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR		TELEPHONE NUMBER		
STREET ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	FAX NUMBER
MAILING ADDRESS (if different)	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
<b>1.7. DAY-TO-DAY CONTACT PERSON</b>				
NAME AND TITLE		TELEPHONE NUMBER		
STREET ADDRESS		FAX NUMBER		
CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	E-MAIL ADDRESS	
<b>1.8. DESIGNATED FINANCIAL OFFICER</b>				
NAME AND TITLE		TELEPHONE NUMBER		
STREET ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	FAX NUMBER
PAYMENT MAILING ADDRESS (if different)	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
<b>1.9. APPLICANT AGREEMENT</b>				
By signing this application, I certify that I am vested by the Applicant's governing board with the authority to enter into contract with the BSCC. I certify that all funds received pursuant to this Grant Agreement will be spent exclusively on the purposes specified in this Application and Proposal. I further assure that the Applicant will administer the grant program in accordance with the Grant Agreement as well as any and all applicable state and federal laws, audit requirements, and state and/or federal program guidelines.				
NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICER (PERSON WITH LEGAL AUTHORITY TO SIGN)				
APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE (blue ink only)				DATE

## SECTION II: PROJECT NEED (50 Points)

**Address the following in narrative form:**

- 2.1. Demonstrate a clear and convincing project need.
- 2.2. Demonstrate the need(s) is related to any or all of the three priority Program Purpose Areas and corresponding Areas of Need.
- 2.3. Demonstrate a compelling justification for the grant funds.
- 2.4. Demonstrate the relationship between need(s) and grant goals with supporting local data.
- 2.5. Demonstrate why current need is not met with existing resources.

## SECTION III: PROJECT DESCRIPTION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (125 Points)

**Address the following in narrative form:**

- 3.1. Describe the 3-year project strategy in narrative form. In addition, complete “Three-Year JAG Strategy” (see Appendix B).
- 3.2. Describe how the proposed project will address the needs described in the Project Need Section.
- 3.3. Describe how the proposed project links to one or more of the three priority JAG Program Purpose Areas and corresponding Areas of Need.
- 3.4. List project partners that will provide services (agencies, contractors, stakeholders, private and/or public), include a description of the services to be provided; the partners' credentials; involved personnel; justification for choice; and the value the partners add to the proposed project.
- 3.5. List the project goals and measurable objectives that will be implemented to achieve goals (include baseline data to help determine goals and objectives).
- 3.6. Describe staff allocations and assignments for the separate project components.
- 3.7. Define the target population (e.g., gender, age, offense history, criminogenic factors) including why and how it was selected.
- 3.8. Describe the process for determining which services a participant will receive (if applicable).
- 3.9. Provide a timeline of major project activities for the entire project period that is reasonable given the nature and scope of the project.
- 3.10. Describe management structure and decision-making process for the project.
- 3.11. Describe management's approach to ensuring program components are being monitored, assessed and adjusted as necessary.
- 3.12. Provide documentation of the organization's readiness to start project(s) beginning March 1, 2015.

## SECTION IV: COLLABORATION (100 Points)

**Address the following in narrative form (see RFP, page 9, *Stakeholder Collaboration*):**

- 4.1. Provide a roster for the JAG Steering Committee, to include names, titles and organizational affiliations. Include a Letter of Agreement for each member.
- 4.2. Describe the process used to identify, recruit and engage steering committee members.
- 4.3. Describe each member selected for the JAG Steering Committee, including their experience and expertise as related to the Project Need.
- 4.4. Demonstrate that there is full and balanced representation from both traditional and non-traditional stakeholder groups as related to the Project Need.
- 4.5. Describe prior working relationships with members, if any.
- 4.6. Describe process used to identify the problem area(s) and develop the strategy.
- 4.7. Describe how full participation and voting rights were ensured for all members throughout the process.
- 4.8. Describe the applicant's history of collaboration, if any.
- 4.9. Steps to establish and maintain collaboration as it relates to supporting this proposed project.
- 4.10. Describe the steering committee's ongoing role throughout the project.

## SECTION V: EVIDENCE-BASED, PROMISING AND INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES (75 Points)

**Address the following in narrative form (see RFP, *Evidence-Based, Promising and Innovative Strategies*, page 11-14):**

- 5.1. Describe the intervention(s) being proposed for implementation, including whether the intervention is evidence-based, innovative or promising (according to the definitions provided on pages 11-12).
- 5.2. Discuss any evidence (e.g., research, outcome evaluations, etc.) or support (for “promising” or “innovative”) that indicates the proposed intervention or one or more of its components have been effective elsewhere.
- 5.3. Discuss how the outcomes achieved elsewhere support using the proposed practice(s) in the applicant's jurisdiction to achieve the goals and objectives described in the proposal.
- 5.4. Describe the population(s) for which each intervention has been shown to be effective; show that the intervention is appropriate for the proposed target population.
- 5.5. Describe what has been done to ensure that the support factors required or necessary for the intervention can be mobilized in the local setting.

## **SECTION VI: DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION (50 Points)**

**Address the following in narrative form (see RFP, page 15, *Data Collection, Reporting and Evaluation Requirements*):**

### **Local Evaluation Plan**

- 6.1. Clearly state the program goals (i.e. the expected benefits to the participants and or the community).
- 6.2. Clearly state the program objectives (i.e. specific measurable accomplishments intended to advance program goals).
- 6.3. Provide a detailed plan for assessing the effectiveness of the overall JAG Strategy, including all individual program components.
- 6.4. Describe the research design that will be used to complete the evaluation.

### **Process Evaluation**

- 6.5. Provide the estimated number of participants in each individual program component.
- 6.6. Describe the plan for tracking participants in terms of progress in the program, for example start dates, attendance logs, dropouts, successful completions, etc.
- 6.7. Describe the plan to document the services provided to each participant.
- 6.8. Describe the plan to document the activities performed by staff who conducted the program.

### **Outcome Evaluation**

- 6.9. Identify method of determining if the program "worked" in terms of achieving the program set goals.
- 6.10. List outcome variables that will be tracked.
- 6.11. List the outcomes that will be tracked.
- 6.12. List criteria for determining participant success/failure in the project.

## **SECTION VII: CAPABILITY AND QUALIFICATIONS TO PROVIDE SERVICES (75 Points)**

**Address the following in narrative form:**

- 7.1. Describe applicant's ability to conduct the proposed project(s).
- 7.2. Describe applicant's/partners' experience and capability to conduct the project(s).
- 7.3. Describe the experience and qualifications of key project staff to provide and manage services.

## SECTION VIII: PROPOSAL BUDGET (COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET REVIEW) (25 Points)

Project costs must be directly related to the objectives and activities of the project. The budget section must cover the entire three-year grant period (recognizing that the budgets for years two and three will be estimates, subject to change based on unforeseen developments and available federal grant funds).

**The following items will be rated as a part of this section (addressed by the Applicant in Parts A and B below):**

- 8.1. Provide a description of the factors considered and the reasons behind the budget allocations and the extent to which this budget will allow the applicant to achieve its stated goals.
- 8.2. List the cost per each project component(s).
- 8.3. List each staff person assigned to the program, including title, responsibilities and percentage of time allocated to program.
- 8.4. Provide the number of individuals that will receive services, if applicable.
- 8.5. List the cost per participant in the project(s) (per capita), if applicable.
- 8.6. Provide the direct and indirect costs.
- 8.7. Describe the project's cost effectiveness.
- 8.8. Provide complete and detailed budget information in each section.
- 8.9. Letters of Agreement are included for partners providing in-kind services; draft Operational Agreements are included for all contracted (paid) service providers.

### **A. Budget Line Item Totals**

Complete the following table for the grant funds being requested. **Complete one table for each of the three years.** Report amounts in whole dollars. While recognizing that counties may use different line items in the budget process, these are the categories used by the BSCC on its invoices. Please check your calculations as figures in the table to not auto-calculate.

All funds shall be used consistent with the requirements of the BSCC's Grant Administration and Audit Guide, July 2012:

[http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Grant\\_Administration\\_Guide\\_July\\_2012.pdf](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/downloads/Grant_Administration_Guide_July_2012.pdf)

LINE ITEM	GRANT FUNDS
1. Salaries and Benefits	\$
2. Services and Supplies	\$
3. Professional Services (Sub-Contractors/Consultants)	\$
4. Community-Based Organization (CBO) Contracts	\$
5. Data Collection, Reporting and Evaluation Efforts (minimum 5-10% of grant funds)	\$
6. Fixed Assets/Equipment	\$
7. Other (Including Training, Travel, etc.)	\$
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>

## B. Budget Line Item Detail (i.e. Budget Narrative)

Provide a narrative detail in each category below to sufficiently explain how the requested grant funds and local match will be used (based on the budget tables submitted). Match funds may be expended in any line item and must be identified in their respective cash or in-kind dollar amounts.

The 'other' category funds should be budgeted for travel purposes for one mandatory grantee briefing meeting (*to be held in Sacramento, date TBA*) as well as any other travel. Please note that out-of-state travel must be approved by BSCC.

The Budget Narrative must be submitted in Arial 12 point font, with one-inch margins on all four sides. The narrative may be single or double spaced, but cannot exceed **five (5) pages** in length.

- 1. SALARIES AND BENEFITS:** Provide the number of staff and percentage of time, classification/title, hourly rates of all project staff and benefits.
- 2. SERVICES AND SUPPLIES:** (e.g., office supplies, training costs; itemize the services/supplies).

3. **PROFESSIONAL SERVICES:** (e.g., contracts with expert consultants or other governmental entities).
4. **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION (CBO) CONTRACTS:** Provide name of CBO(s), itemize nature of services that will be received and show funds allocated. Show hours and billing rates of all CBO staff.
5. **DATA COLLECTION, REPORTING AND EVALUATION EFFORTS:** Applicant must dedicate a minimum of 5-10 percent of the total grant funds requested (for all three years) toward Data Collection and Evaluation efforts (e.g. costs associated with collection of required data and evaluation plan). This cost can be spread across the three years of the project in a way that makes sense to the applicant (i.e., does not have to be 10/10/10.)
6. **FIXED ASSETS/EQUIPMENT:** (e.g., computers, and other office equipment necessary to perform project activities)
7. **OTHER:** (e.g., travel and training expenses)

## APPENDIX A

### County Population Index

Source: CA Department of Finance, Population Estimates, January 2014

#### Large Counties (700,001+)

Alameda	1,573,254
Contra Costa	1,087,008
Fresno	964,040
Kern	873,092
Los Angeles County	10,041,797
Orange	3,113,991
Riverside	2,279,967
Sacramento	1,454,406
San Bernardino	2,085,669
San Diego	3,194,362
San Francisco	836,620
San Joaquin	710,731
San Mateo	745,193
Santa Clara	1,868,558
Ventura	842,967

#### Medium Counties (200,001-700,000)

Butte	222,316
Marin	255,846
Merced	264,922
Monterey	425,756
Placer	366,115
San Luis Obispo	272,357
Santa Barbara	433,398
Santa Cruz	271,595
Solano	424,233
Sonoma	490,486
Stanislaus	526,042
Tulare	459,446
Yolo	206,381

#### Small Counties (<200,000)

Alpine	1,079
Amador	36,151
Calaveras	44,650
Colusa	21,660
Del Norte	28,131
El Dorado	181,058
Glenn	28,353
Humboldt	134,648
Imperial	180,672
Inyo	18,590
Kings	150,181
Lake	64,699
Lassen	32,581
Madera	153,897
Mariposa	18,467
Mendocino	89,029
Modoc	9,197
Mono	14,143
Napa	139,255
Nevada	97,225
Plumas	19,140
San Benito	57,517

Shasta	179,412
Sierra	3,089
Siskiyou	45,231
Sutter	95,733
Tehama	63,717
Trinity	13,389
Tuolumne	53,604
Yuba	73,682

## APPENDIX B

### Three-Year JAG Strategy

**Instructions:** This form is a required attachment to the JAG Proposal. It is intended to serve as a supplement to the Proposal Narrative, providing an at-a-glance summary of the overall program strategy. BSCC staff will use this form when conducting site visits and in compiling information for reports. The grantee may be asked to use it as a part of the quarterly progress report. To complete the form: Fill in the name of the applicant county (or counties). Select a JAG Program Purpose Area (PPA) **from the drop-down box**. For each PPA selected, select a corresponding Area of Need **from the drop-down box**. (Program Purpose Areas and Areas of Need can be found on page 6 of the RFP.) In the table, list each unique project component or activity planned to address that Area of Need. Also list the agency responsible for implementation, the expected outcome(s), how progress will be tracked (i.e. methodology for data collection), and timeline information (e.g., expected date of implementation, benchmarks for data collection, etc.).

### Three-Year JAG Strategy for County of

**Year One: March 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015**

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

**Area of Need:** Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

**Area of Need:** Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

**Area of Need:** Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

## Three-Year JAG Strategy for County of

**Year Two: January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016**

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

Area of Need: Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

Area of Need: Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

Area of Need: Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

# Three-Year JAG Strategy for County of

## Year Three: January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

Area of Need: Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

Area of Need: Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**JAG Program Purpose Area:** Choose an item.

Area of Need: Choose an item.

Project Component / Activity	Agency / Organization Responsible	Expected Outcome (Measurable)	How Progress will be Tracked (i.e. data collection)	Timeline / Benchmarks

**APPENDIX C**  
**JAG Steering Committee Member Roster**

**JAG Steering Committee – County of**

Name	Title	Agency/Organization	Phone Number	Email Address

## APPENDIX D

### Sample Letter of Agreement

*\*Sample only\**

*To be used for agencies/organizations listed as members of the JAG Steering Committee  
and/or that will provide in-kind services via partnership  
(no funds exchanged)*

Date

[Partners Name]  
[Partners Address]

[Recipients Name]  
[City of]  
[Address]

Dear [City Official]

This letter is letter of agreement between [Partners Name] and [County of] that explains the support and services provided for the proposed JAG project, including (membership on the JAG Steering Committee, a partnership to include..., etc.).

[Explain JAG Steering Committee membership, services or support, dates, timelines, etc.],

Regards,

Signature

## APPENDIX E

### Sample Operational Agreement

*\*Sample only\**

*To be used for subcontractors, consultants and/or community-based organizations  
identified in the budget pages  
(funds exchanged)*

*Draft only – signatures not required at time of proposal submission*

This Operational Agreement stands as evidence that the **(Applicant Agency)** and the **(Partner Agency)** intend to work together toward the goals outlined in the JAG Three-Year Strategy. Both agencies believe that implementation of the **(Name of JAG Program)**, as described within this proposal, will further these goals. Each agency agrees to participate in the JAG Program, if selected for funding, as outlined herein.

The **(Applicant Agency)** project will closely coordinate JAG services and activities with the **(Partner Agency)** through:

- Project staff being readily available to (Partner Agency) for service provision through describe arrangements with the Agency.
- Regularly scheduled meetings (how often) between (persons/positions) to discuss strategies, timetables and implementation of mandated services. Specifically:
  - (List specific activities that will be undertaken between the two agencies or other specifics of the agreement.)
  - xxx
  - xxx
- Effective grant performance period dates.
- Amount of JAG state funds designated to the Partner Agency.

We the undersigned, as authorized representatives of **(Applicant Agency)** and **(Partner Agency)** do hereby approve this document.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name and Title  
Agency Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name and Title  
Agency Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## APPENDIX F Sample Board Resolution

**Before grant funds can be awarded, counties must submit a resolution from the Board of Supervisors that includes, at a minimum, the assurances outlined in the following sample.**

WHEREAS the (*insert name of applicant county*) desires to participate in the Enhanced R.E.D. Grant Project supported by federal Formula Grant funds and administered by the Board of State and Community Corrections (hereafter referred to as BSCC).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the (*insert title of designated official*) is authorized on behalf of the Board of Supervisors to submit the grant proposal for this funding and sign the Grant Agreement with the BSCC, including any amendments thereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that federal grant funds received hereunder shall not be used to supplant expenditures controlled by this body.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the county agrees to abide by the statutes and regulations governing the federal Formula Grants Program as well as the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement as set forth by the BSCC.

Passed, approved, and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of (*insert name of county*) in a meeting thereof held on (*insert date*) by the following:

Ayes:

Notes:

Absent:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Typed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST: Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Typed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX G**  
**List of Other Grant Funding Sources**

Please complete this form, listing all other criminal justice grant funds (state and/or federal) that the applicant agency will receive during the 2015 calendar year.

State or Federal Administering Agency	Name of Grant Program	Funding Amount	Brief Project Description

## APPENDIX H

### Definition of Terms

#### **Collaboration**

The basic manner in which different and potentially competing agencies will work together to complete the grant proposal process. Counties must rely on the collaborative process – in the form of the JAG Steering Committee – to determine the distribution of how funding will be allocated between programs and strategy that serve one or more of the JAG priorities.

#### **Steering Committee**

A working group of professional individuals from diverse disciplines who use critical thinking skills and compromise to work toward common goals.

#### **Goal versus Objective**

Goals and objectives are terms in common use, sometimes used interchangeably because both refer to the intended results of program activities. Goals are longer-term than objectives, more broadly stated, and govern the specific objectives to which program activities are directed.

In proposals, goals are defined by broad statements of what the program intends to accomplish, representing long-term intended outcome of the program<sup>4</sup>.

Examples of goal statements<sup>4</sup>:

- To reduce the number of serious and chronic juvenile offenders.
- To divert nonviolent juvenile offenders from state juvenile correctional institutions.

Objectives are defined by statements of specific, measurable aims of program activities<sup>5</sup>. Objectives detail the tasks that must be completed to achieve goals<sup>6</sup>. Descriptions of objectives in the proposals should include three elements<sup>4</sup>:

- 1) Direction – the expected change or accomplishment (e.g., improve, maintain);
- 2) Timeframe – when the objective will be achieved; and
- 3) Target population – who is affected by the objective.

<sup>4</sup> Justice Research and Statistics Association, Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center. (2003, June). *Juvenile justice program evaluation: An overview* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.jrsa.org/nijec/publications/program-evaluation.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. *A guide to Developing Goals and Objectives for Your Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/ofpa/goalwrite.htm>.

<sup>6</sup> National Center for Justice Planning. Overview of Strategic Planning. *Where do we want to be? Goals and Objectives*. Retrieved from <http://ncjp.org/strategic-planning/overview/where-do-we-want-be/goals-objectives>.

Examples of program objectives<sup>4</sup>:

- By the end of the program, young, drug-addicted juveniles will recognize the long-term consequences of drug use.
- By program completion, juvenile offenders will have carried out all of the terms of mediation agreements with their victims

## Process Evaluation versus Outcome Evaluation

### Process Evaluation<sup>4</sup>

The purpose of the process evaluation is to assess how program activities are being carried out in accordance with goals and objectives. Process measures are designed to answer the question: “What is the program actually doing and is this what we planned it to do?”

Examples of process measures include:

- the number of juveniles who received counseling services, which may be compared to the number expected to receive services;
- the average caseload per probation officer, which may be compared to the average caseload expected;
- the number of interagency agreements entered into by the program, which may be compared to the number planned.

### Outcome Evaluation<sup>4</sup>

The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to whether the program “worked” in terms of achieving its goals and objectives. Outcome measures are designed to answer the question: “What results did the program produce?” Examples of outcome measures include:

- changes in the reading and math scores of juveniles who completed the program;
- changes in self-reported drug and alcohol use;
- the number of juveniles who have subsequent contacts with police after leaving the program.

In an evidence-based practice approach, outcome evaluations must include not only the measures but analysis of the extent to which the measured results can be attributed to the program rather than to coincidence or alternative explanations.

<sup>4</sup> Justice Research and Statistics Association, Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center. (2003, June). *Juvenile justice program evaluation: An overview* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.jrsa.org/nijec/publications/program-evaluation.pdf>.

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Key Federal Assurances**

Applicable state and federal laws and guidelines will be covered in greater detail in subsequent contract language. For purposes of this Request for Proposals, the Applicant will agree to abide by the following federal laws and guidelines.

#### **Overview of Civil Rights Obligations**

The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant is a federal grant program, administered by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). As such, it falls under the jurisdiction of the U.S. DOJ's Office of Civil Rights. The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is the State Administering Agency for JAG funding in the State of California. BSCC has the following civil rights obligations:

- BSCC must ensure compliance with applicable civil rights laws within the agency.
- BSCC must ensure compliance with applicable civil rights laws by all grantees ("sub-recipients"), vendors, and contractors.

#### Federally-protected classes include:

- Race
- Color
- National Origin
- Sex
- Religion
- Disability
- Age
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Identity

#### Cross-cutting Federal civil rights laws:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- Title II of the American With Disabilities Act of 1990
- The Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972

#### **Additional JAG Sub-Recipient Certifications**

- Formulation of an Equal Employment Opportunity Program (EEOP)
- Establishment of a Civil Rights Coordinator
- Development and Implementation of Formal Grievance Procedures
- Compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
- Compliance with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

- Compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments
- Compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act

*Sub-recipients with 50 or more employees that receive \$25,000 or more in DOJ funding are required to:*

- Designate a Disability Coordinator
- Adopt Disability Grievance Procedures
- Provide Notice of Non-Discrimination Based on Disability

*Title II of the ADA requires that public entities with 50 or more employees that receive federal funding (regardless of the amount):*

- Designate a Disability Coordinator
- Adopt Disability Grievance Procedures

## The Board of Supervisors

County Administration Building  
651 Pine Street, Room 106  
Martinez, California 94553

John Gioia, 1<sup>st</sup> District  
Candace Andersen, 2<sup>nd</sup> District  
Mary N. Piepho, 3<sup>rd</sup> District  
Karen Mitchoff, 4<sup>th</sup> District  
Federal D. Glover, 5<sup>th</sup> District

## Contra Costa County



David Twa  
Clerk of the Board  
and  
County Administrator  
(925) 335-1900

September 30, 2014

Brian Wise  
Board of State and Community Corrections  
600 Bercut Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95811

**RE: Justice Assistance Grant Program—CONTRA COSTA COUNTY Notice of Intent**

Dear Mr. Wise:

As the Contra Costa County Administrator, I would like to express our interest in participating in the FY 2014 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program to address one or more of the three JAG Program Purpose Areas: Law Enforcement Programs; Prevention and Education Programs; Courts, Prosecution, Defense and Indigent Defense or the overall goal of reducing violent crime and recidivism within the County.

We understand that as a part of the proposal development process, the County must form a JAG Steering Committee to identify a department as the applicant agency, to develop a three-year JAG strategy, and to oversee the planning and implementation of JAG-funded projects.

We also understand that we will be required to set aside a minimum of five percent of the grant funds for the development of the Local Evaluation Plan, data collection efforts, and submission of the Final Local Evaluation.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this grant program. We look forward to successful outcomes in terms of recidivism reduction and safer communities.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David J. Twa".

DAVID J. TWA  
County Administrator

cc: Members, Board of Supervisors  
Contra Costa County Legislative Delegation



Contra  
Costa  
County

To: Board of Supervisors  
From: Mark Peterson, District Attorney  
Date: December 3, 2013

Subject: Approval to Submit Application and Execute Grant Award Agreement for Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Program Grant

**RECOMMENDATION(S):**

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the District Attorney, or designee, to submit an application and execute a grant award agreement and any extensions or amendments thereof, pursuant to State guidelines, with the Board of State and Community Corrections in the amount of \$341,994 for funding of the Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Program for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Revenue of \$341,994 Countywide; \$136,630 to the District Attorney for prosecution services, \$100,970 to the Office of the Sheriff for forensic services, and \$104,394 to the Probation Department for supervision services. 100% State; Budgeted. Pursuant to State guidelines, the Program is governed by a Steering Committee composed of the District Attorney, Sheriff-Coroner, County Probation Officer, and the County Alcohol and Other Drugs Administrator, which allocates funding among participating departments.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Program has been in effect since fiscal year 1995/96 and funds three components including the District Attorney, Sheriff-Coroner and Probation

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD  
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **12/03/2013** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

**VOTE OF SUPERVISORS**

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor  
Candace Andersen, District II Supervisor  
Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor  
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor  
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: December 3, 2013

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: Chris Heck, Deputy

Contact: Cherie 957-2234

**BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)**

Department. As in prior funding cycles, the State requires that a single application be submitted for each County; therefore, the District Attorney is submitting an application on behalf of Contra Costa County. The program will continue to concentrate on a prioritized and integrated drug enforcement effort coordinated through State-led Narcotics Enforcement Teams operating in the County. Grant activities focus on mid and high-level narcotics dealers and manufacturers, violent and repeat offenders, and drug trafficking gangs and organizations, to interdict the importation, manufacture and distribution systems which have, in recent years, become more sophisticated in their methods of operations. Grant conditions require that the County accept responsibility for any liability arising out of the performance of the grant award, including civil actions for damages, and supplantation is prohibited.

**CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:**

No impact.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Resolution No. 2013/438



# Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors

## Subcommittee Report

### PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

5.

**Meeting Date:** 11/10/2014

**Subject:** APPOINTMENTS TO THE CY2015 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
PARTNERSHIP & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Submitted For:** PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE,

**Department:** County Administrator

**Referral No.:** N/A

**Referral Name:** APPOINTMENTS TO THE CY2015 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
PARTNERSHIP & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Presenter:** **Contact:** Timothy Ewell, (925)335-1036

---

### **Referral History:**

The California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 109 (Chapter 15, Statutes of 2011), which transferred responsibility for supervising certain lower-level inmates and parolees from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to counties. Assembly Bill 109 (AB109) took effect on October 1, 2011 and realigned three major areas of the criminal justice system. On a prospective basis, the legislation:

- Transferred the location of incarceration for lower-level offenders (specified nonviolent, non-serious, non-sex offenders) from state prison to local county jail and provides for an expanded role for post-release supervision for these offenders;
- Transferred responsibility for post-release supervision of lower-level offenders (those released from prison after having served a sentence for a non-violent, non-serious, and non-sex offense) from the state to the county level by creating a new category of supervision called Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS);
- Transferred the custody responsibility for parole and PRCS revocations to local jail, administered by county sheriffs

AB109 also created an Executive Committee of the local Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and tasked it with recommending a Realignment Plan (Plan) to the county Board of Supervisors for implementation of the criminal justice realignment. The Community Corrections Partnership is identified in statute as the following:

### ***Community Corrections Partnership***

1. Chief Probation Officer (Chair)
2. Presiding Judge (or designee)
3. County supervisor, CAO, or a designee of the BOS

4. District Attorney
5. Public Defender
6. Sheriff
7. Chief of Police
8. Head of the County department of social services
9. Head of the County department of mental health
10. Head of the County department of employment
11. Head of the County alcohol and substance abuse programs
12. Head of the County Office of Education
13. CBO representative with experience in rehabilitative services for criminal offenders
14. Victims' representative

Later in 2011, the Governor signed Assembly Bill 117 (Chapter 39, Statutes of 2011), which served as “clean up” legislation to AB109. Assembly Bill 117 (AB117) changed, among other things, the composition of the local CCP-Executive Committee. The CCP-Executive Committee is currently identified in statute as the following:

***Community Corrections Partnership-Executive Committee***

1. Chief Probation Officer (Chair)
2. Presiding Judge (or designee)
3. District Attorney
4. Public Defender
5. Sheriff
6. A Chief of Police
7. The head of either the County department of social services, mental health, or alcohol and drug services (as designated by the board of supervisors)

Although AB109 and AB117 collectively place the majority of initial planning activities for Realignment on the local CCP, it is important to note that neither piece of legislation cedes powers vested in a county Board of Supervisors' oversight of and purview over how AB109 funding is spent. Once the Plan is adopted, the Board of Supervisors may choose to implement that Plan in any manner it may wish.

**Referral Update:**

Each year, the PPC reviews the membership of the Community Corrections Partnership and makes recommendations for appointment to non *ex-officio* seats to the Board of Supervisors. The Board has made these appointments on a calendar year basis. Today's action is necessary to bring recommendations to the Board in December, which will take effect on January 1, 2015.

**Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):**

RECOMMEND nominees for appointment to seats on the CY2015 Community Corrections Partnership & Executive Committee (see attachments).

**Fiscal Impact (if any):**

No fiscal impact.

---

---

**Attachments**

2014 CCP Membership

2014 CCP Executive Committee Membership

CSAC Informational Letter

---

---

## EXHIBIT A - 2014 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP

<u>Seat</u>	<u>Appointee</u>	<u>Term Expiration</u>
Chief Probation Officer (Chair)	Philip F. Kader	<i>ex-officio</i>
Presiding Judge (or designee)	Mimi Lyster-Zemmelman	<i>ex-officio</i>
County supervisor, CAO, or a designee of the BOS	David J. Twa, County Administrator	December 31, 2014
District Attorney	Mark A. Peterson	<i>ex-officio</i>
Public Defender	Robin Lipetzky	<i>ex-officio</i>
Sheriff	David O. Livingston	<i>ex-officio</i>
Chief of Police	Guy Swanger, Concord Police Chief	December 31, 2014
Head of the County department of social services	Kathy Gallagher, EHS Director	<i>ex-officio</i>
Head of the County department of mental health	Vacant	<i>ex-officio</i>
Head of the County department of employment	Stephen Baiter, Executive Director-Workforce Development Board	<i>ex-officio</i>
Head of the County alcohol and substance abuse programs	Cynthia Belon, Director of Behavioral Health Services	<i>ex-officio</i>
Head of the County Office of Education	Joseph A Ovick, Ed.D.	<i>ex-officio</i>
CBO representative with experience in rehabilitative services for criminal offenders	Vacant	December 31, 2014
Victim's Representative	Devorah Levine, Zero Tolerance Program Manager	December 31, 2014

## EXHIBIT B - 2014 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<b><u>Seat</u></b>	<b><u>Appointee</u></b>	<b><u>Term Expiration</u></b>
Chief Probation Officer (Chair)	Philip F. Kader	<i>ex-officio</i>
Presiding Judge (or designee)	Mimi Lyster-Zemmelman	<i>ex-officio</i>
District Attorney	Mark A. Peterson	<i>ex-officio</i>
Public Defender	Robin Lipetzky	<i>ex-officio</i>
Sheriff	David O. Livingston	<i>ex-officio</i>
Chief of Police	Guy Swanger, Concord Police Chief	December 31, 2014
Representative approved by BOS from the following CCP members:	Cynthia Belon, Director of Behavioral Health Services	December 31, 2014
*Head of County department of Social Services		
*Head of County department of mental health		
*Head of County department of alcohol and substance abuse programs		



## MEMORANDUM

July 12, 2011

1100 K Street  
Suite 101  
Sacramento  
California  
95814

Telephone  
916.327-7500

Facsimile  
916.441.5507

To: Members, Board of Supervisors  
County Administrative Officers

From: Paul McIntosh  
Executive Director

Re: AB 117 and the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)

---

There continues to be a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding regarding the changes in the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) encompassed in Assembly Bill 117 (Chapter 39, Statutes of 2011), passed as part of the 2011-12 budget. AB 117 did not change the make-up of the CCP, first formed in SB 678 in 2009, but does provide for revisions to the makeup of the CCP's Executive Committee, which originally was established in AB 109 (Chapter 15, Statutes of 2011).

The fourteen-member CCP in each county remains essentially unchanged and is comprised of the following (Penal Code Section 1230.1):

- Chief Probation Officer (Chair)
- Presiding Judge (or designee)
- County supervisor, CAO, or a designee of the BOS
- District Attorney
- Public Defender
- Sheriff
- Chief of Police
- Head of the County department of social services
- Head of the County department of mental health
- Head of the County department of employment
- Head of the County alcohol and substance abuse programs
- Head of the County Office of Education
- CBO representative with experience in rehabilitative services for criminal offenders
- Victims' representative

AB 117 requires the CCP to prepare an implementation plan that will enable the county to meet the goals of the public safety realignment. AB 117 is silent as to what those goals may be and provides counties with flexibility in how to address realignment. AB 117 does not abdicate the board of supervisor's authority over appropriations and does not enable the CCP to direct how realignment funds will be spent.

The seven-member CCP Executive Committee, as provided in AB 117, is comprised of the following:

Chief Probation Officer (Chair)

Presiding Judge (or designee)

District Attorney

Public Defender

Sheriff

A Chief of Police

The head of either the County department of social services, mental health, or alcohol and drug services (as designated by the board of supervisors)

Under AB 117, the CCP would develop an implementation plan and the Executive Committee would vote to approve the plan and submit it to the board of supervisors. The plan would be deemed accepted unless the board of supervisors voted via a 4/5 vote to reject the plan and send it back to the CCP. Concerns have been raised regarding why the CAO or board member is not part of the Executive Committee and why a 4/5 vote is required to reject the plan.

CSAC's role in the drafting of this component of AB 117 was as one of several stakeholders involved in the public safety realignment. While most of the county stakeholders maintained general agreement on realignment issues during each phase of negotiations in general, there were disparate opinions in how the planning process should unfold. CSAC felt strongly that the only way realignment will be successful is if the planning effort results in a significant shift away from a predominantly incarceration model and movement to alternatives to incarceration. Therefore, it was critical that the planning process be structured to encourage compromise in the CCP to reach the goals of the community in a manner acceptable to the board of supervisors.

The CAO, as you know, must be in a position to remain objective and provide the board of supervisors with unvarnished recommendations on matters that come before them. Having the CAO or a board member as part of the Executive Committee, and therefore casting a vote on the plan to be presented to the board of supervisors, would represent a conflict of interest to the CAO or board member and place them in a position that could compromise their independence. Rather, this approach seemed to capture the best of both worlds – the CAO is part of the planning process and can bring that global vision to that process but is also free to make contrary recommendations to the board of supervisors should they disagree with the ultimate plan adopted. Likewise with a member of the board of supervisors being part of the executive committee.

Some have commented that the 4/5 vote requirement to reject the plan submitted by the CCP limits local flexibility and discretion of the board of supervisors. While the dynamics of the planning process will differ from county to county, the goal was to force consensus within the CCP and the planning process and not

provide an avenue for a participant to try to push their opinion outside of the CCP with the board of supervisors. A super majority makes an “end run” difficult, but still enables the board to reject the plan if the board disagrees with it. A 4/5 vote requirement is not unusual, but does place a higher level of focus on the planning process. It should be noted, as well, that counsel has opined that meetings of the CCP and the Executive Committee will be subject to the Brown Act and all discussions will be required to be conducted in a public meeting.

AB 117 is not a perfect solution but it represents a negotiated agreement that will enable California’s counties to move forward with the dramatic changes necessary to make realignment successful. Clearly the successful implementation of realignment will require a significant paradigm shift in our public safety communities. The successful model will not be an incarceration model, but one that seeks to divert and rehabilitate citizens, returning them to be productive members of our community. Hopefully, the construct of the CCP – that is intended to drive the local public safety community to a consensus about a “different way of doing business” - will ultimately lead to that approach.