

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In response to the PPC directive to expand services funded by AB 109 revenue to the County's non-AB 109 population, a collaborative workgroup was convened by the Quality Assurance Committee of the Community Corrections Partnership. The workgroup set out to develop recommendations for how this expansion could be implemented in the contracts administered by the CAO in a way that would maintain prioritization of the AB 109 population and ensure distinctive data was collected from all clients served. To accomplish these goals, the workgroup met a total of six times throughout the March 2015 and now presents this set of recommendations to the PPC.

1. Adopt the workgroup's framework to provide service providers the option to use their "available capacity" to provides services to the non-AB 109 population

An organization will have available capacity when it enrolls less than the contracted maximum ceiling of AB 109 clients during an established period of time. This available capacity may then be used to serve non-AB 109 clients in the following period. For example, if a provider is contracted to provide services to a maximum of 120 clients for the current year, this could be interpreted as a maximum ceiling of 10 clients for any one month period. If only eight clients were enrolled for services this month, the provider would then be able to enroll two non-AB 109 clients in services next month. To protect service providers from becoming overburdened by referrals in any one period, service providers should be given the option to stop providing services to the non-AB 109 population at any time.

2. Give the CAO discretion to determine the appropriate period to determine available capacity for the service providers

While shorter periods may allow service providers to react more quickly to changes in demands for their services, longer periods are more likely to reduce the strain on limited administrative resources. Having flexibility to negotiate the proper period will also allow for the use of technology to possibly assist in the service expansion process, or to pursue different implementation approaches that match the varied capacities and services of the providers.

3. Adopt the workgroup's list of priority status groups

The workgroup used the following priority status groups to guide the development of these recommendations. Furthermore, the workgroup agreed that the qualifying incident for each priority status group should be related to a felony offense, and that priority status group 8 should not be eligible for services through AB 109 revenue, but inclusion of this group on this list could prove useful should the list be adopted for other purposes in the future.

Priority Status Groups

1. AB 109 Sentence
2. Formal Felony Probation
3. Released from a Correctional Facility in the Past Three Years
4. Pretrial
5. Informal Felony Probation
6. Specialty Courts
7. Parole
8. None of the Above, and Beyond Three Years Since Incarceration Release

4. Give direction to the CAO on how service expansion should be implemented using the priority status groups

Some members of the workgroup believed that each organization should be able to use its available capacity to provide services to everyone who belonged to priority status groups 2-7. Other members of the workgroup, however, expressed concern with using local revenue to fund services for individuals on state supervised parole. These members also felt that service expansion should either be limited to the highest level priority status groups, or phased into these higher groups first and only expanded to further groups if service providers were still reporting available capacity.

5. Require all contracted service providers to use ServicePoint to track client enrolment/exit data, and other information that will be required to be reported

Most service providers are already using ServicePoint to track data that is reported for the AB 109 population. ServicePoint should be used by all contracted service providers to track information for every client enrolled in services supported by AB 109 revenue. This data system should also be set up to indicate if each non-AB 109 client's identity, residency, and priority status have been verified, and track the referral of non-AB 109 clients between service providers on the system.

6. Require an eligibility process that includes minimum standards for the verification of each client's identity, residency, and priority status group

Because the non-AB 109 population is unlikely to have the single referral source of Probation, service providers should be required to perform due diligence in their attempts to verify each enrolled client's identity and eligibility for services. To be eligible for services, each client should be a resident of Contra Costa County, and belong to a specified priority status group. Verification of a client's identity should require one government issued photo ID which may also verify the residency status if it includes a local address. In the alternate, any other government issued document and second document with the person's name will verify their identity, and residency will be verified if either of these includes a local address. For those that are homeless or staying with others, a letter from the housing provider or an affirmed statement of residency may be used to verify residency. Priority status should be verified by presentation of any government issued document.