

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT NO. 1809

"Community Reentry from Jail"

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' RESPONSE

FINDINGS – California Penal Code Section 933.5(a) requires a response to the designated findings of the Grand Jury.

F1. Currently, the County has no single data system that collects and reports on services and outcomes for both county and community agencies. A data system such as SAFE could support integrated provision of a continuum of service from intake to reentry.

Response: Partially Disagree. It is true that the County does not have a single data system that collects and reports on services and outcomes for individuals from intake to reentry AND is accessible by both County and community agencies. It is difficult for one such system to be successfully deployed to meet the unique needs and missions of public and private agencies charged with varying responsibilities throughout the justice system. For example, the Jail Management System (JMS) used by the Sheriff's Office during the intake process at booking could not be simply replaced by a module of a software system such as SAFE. Similarly, the recently deployed case management systems in the District Attorney's Office and Probation Department could not simply be replaced by a module of a software system such as SAFE. The County is working on ways that each unique data system can share information to assist with the mission of each public and community agency where appropriate.

F2. Resources and Job Fairs are held at WCDF only and not at the other detention facilities, providing an opportunity for more outreach current and former inmates.

<u>Response</u>: **Agree.** It is important to note that the Sheriff's Office plans to hold a Resource Fair at the Marsh Creek Detention Facility in August 2018. The Martinez Detention Facility does not have appropriate programming space to accommodate such resource fairs.

F3. Since the creation of the Reentry Transition Specialist position in 2017, demand has grown from 36 enrollees to over 100. Demand for reentry services exceeds available resources.

<u>Response</u>: **Agree.** It is important to note that the Reentry Transition Specialist is an employee of the Contra Costa County Office of Education and not Contra Costa County. The County has no control over the employment or activities of the Reentry Transition Specialist.

F4. Recent surveys indicate that nearly 60% of inmates upon release are either homeless or at risk of homelessness, leaving them vulnerable to reoffend. The County currently has neither a plan in place nor funds allocated to address the projected 1,000 to 2,000 housing placement needed annually.

<u>Response</u>: **Disagree.** The County provides a significant amount of resources for residents confronted with homelessness regardless of criminal history. For example, in fiscal year 2018/19 the County has budgeted \$73.1 million in the Health Services and Employment & Human Services departments related to homelessness & housing issues, including short and long-term housing access and supportive housing programs.

F5. Clean Slate is also tasked with petitioning the court for relief on the estimated 3,000 marijuana cases eligible for reduction, dismissal, or sealing of prior convictions, under Proposition 64 (the California Marijuana Legislation Initiative) enacted in late 2016. With current County staffing, Clean Slate has been able to submit only 200 petitions to the court to resolve these cases. The demand for services exceeds the currently available staffing.

Response: Agree.

F6. There is one social service worker in the Office of the Public Defender to serve all indigent defense cases. The demand for services exceeds the currently available staffing to address the backlog of Clean Slate reclassification cases.

<u>Response</u>: **Agree.** It is important to note that Social Workers in the Public Defender's Office do not work on Clean Slate reclassification cases. Clean Slate reclassification work is completed by attorney staff within that department. Also, the County Employment and Human Services department is the primary service provider for social services in the County. Indigent clients receiving defense counsel from the Public Defender's Office may also seek social services from the Employment and Human Services department.

RECOMMENDATIONS - California Penal Code Section 933.05(b) requires a response to the designated recommendations of the Grand Jury.

R1. The BOS should consider seeking funds, in time for the FY2019-2020 budget cycle, for adoption of the SAFE database system (or equivalent) countywide, for implementing, tracking, and evaluating reentry services.

<u>Response</u>: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. As stated in our response to Finding No. 1, consolidating several unique information systems across several departments into one system to prioritize tracking of reentry programs in not feasible. The County will continue its efforts ensure that various data systems interface with one-another as needed to allow for necessary tracking and evaluation of reentry services.

R2. The BOS should consider seeking funds, in time for the FY2019-2020 budget cycle, to sponsor annual or semiannual Job and Resource Fairs, modeled after the current WCDF Job and Resources Fairs, to serve those who have been released from incarceration.

<u>Response</u>: This recommendation requires further analysis. The County budget process begins in January and concludes in May of each year. Although the Board is supportive Job and Resource Fairs, like the ones carried out at the WCDF, we must consider funding needs from across the County during the budget process. For this reason, we cannot formally commit to funding expenditure appropriations until a vote is taken on the entire budget each year.

R3. The BOS should consider seeking funds, in time for the FY2019-2020 budget cycle, for additional Reentry Transition Specialists, in support of reentry programs.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. As stated in Finding No. 3, the services provided by the Reentry Transition Specialist are a function of the Contra Costa County Office of Education. Although the Board is supportive the work of Reentry Transition Specialists supporting reentry programs, the County must prioritize the use of available County financial resources to first fund its own mandated functions and activities.

R4. The BOS should consider requesting the Community Corrections Partnership, in consultation with the County's Council on Homelessness, to provide a report to the BOS prior to June 30, 2019, on the housing needs of AB109 offenders and the current availability and utilization rates of AB109-related housing programs, including any relevant recommendations.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. The Community Corrections Partnership produces an Annual Report each year that discusses outcomes, in part, of funding initiatives to assist returning citizens with short and long-term housing. This includes AB109-related housing programs funded by the County through the Community Corrections Partnership budget. In practice, the Grand Jury's request has essentially been implemented for the last several years and is integrated into the Community Corrections Partnership annual budget process.

R5. The BOS should consider requesting the Community Corrections Partnership to develop a five-year plan, in time for the FY2019-2020 budget cycle, to provide funding for transitional housing resources to ensure that inmates released from jail do not become homeless.

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. The County's fiscal year 2018/19 Adopted Budget fully allocates AB109 Community Corrections Partnership revenue remitted to the County by the State and relies on an additional \$1.7 million from one-time resources to balance. It would not be appropriate to fund additional ongoing housing resources with an increased allocation of one-time funding.

R6. The BOS should consider seeking funds, in time for the FY2019-2020 budget cycle, for the Office of the Public Defender to address the backlog of Proposition 64 marijuana cases eligible for reduction, dismissal, or sealing.

<u>Response</u>: This recommendation requires further analysis. The County budget process begins in January and concludes in May of each year. Although the Board is supportive the Public Defender addressing the backlog of Proposition 64 marijuana cases eligible for reduction, dismissal or sealing, we must consider funding needs from across the County during the budget process. For this reason, we cannot formally commit to funding expenditure appropriations until a vote is taken on the entire budget each year.