



AGENDA

**COUNTY OF KERN
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP (CCP)
CCP FULL MEMBERSHIP (Referred to as "CCP")
CCP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Referred to as "Executive Committee")**

5121 Stockdale Highway, Suite #100
Bakersfield, California 93309

Special Meeting
Wednesday, July 11, 2012

8:30 A.M.

All agenda item supporting documentation is available for public review in the office of the Kern County Probation Department, 2005 Ridge Rd, Bakersfield, California 93305 during regular business hours, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, following the posting of the agenda. Any supporting documentation that relates to an agenda item for an open session of any regular meeting that is distributed after the agenda is posted and prior to the meeting will also be available for review at the same location and at www.kernprobation.com.

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT
(Government Code §54953.2)**

Disabled individuals who need special assistance to attend or participate in a meeting of the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) or the CCP Executive Committee may request assistance at the Kern County Probation Department, 2005 Ridge Road, Bakersfield, California, or by calling (661) 868-4100. Every effort will be made to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities by making meeting material available in alternative formats. Requests for assistance should be made five (5) working days in advance of a meeting whenever possible.

CCP TO CONVENE

CCP Members: Chief Kuge, Judge Bush, District Attorney Green, Public Defender Titus, Sheriff Youngblood, Director Dr. Waterman, Chief Williamson, Director Alvarez, Director Cheadle, Executive Director Corson, Supervisor Goh, Director Lewis, Superintendent Lizardi-Frazier, Division Director Merickel

ROLL CALL:

CONSENT AGENDA/OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: ALL ITEMS LISTED WITH A "CA" ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ROUTINE AND NON-CONTROVERSIAL BY STAFF AND WILL BE APPROVED BY ONE MOTION IF NO MEMBER OF THE BOARD OR PUBLIC WISHES TO COMMENT OR ASK QUESTIONS. IF COMMENT OR DISCUSSION IS DESIRED BY ANYONE, THE ITEM WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE LISTED SEQUENCE WITH AN OPPORTUNITY FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD CONCERNING THE ITEM BEFORE ACTION IS TAKEN. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ARE SHOWN IN CAPS AFTER EACH ITEM.

1) Minutes from CCP Meeting of June 27, 2012 – APPROVE

2) Public Presentations

The public is provided the opportunity to comment on agenda items at the time those agenda items are discussed by the CCP. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the CCP on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the CCP. CCP members may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification and, through the CCP, make a referral to staff for factual information or request staff to report back to the CCP at a later meeting. **SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES.**

PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD PRIOR TO MAKING A PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.

- 3) Chairperson's Report (Kuge)
General update and/or information on AB 109 Realignment activities (Fiscal Impact: None) –
MAKE PRESENTATION; NO ACTION REQUIRED
- 4) CCP Committee Member Announcements or Reports
CCP members may make an announcement or a report on their own department's activities.
They may ask a question for clarification, make a referral to staff or take action to have staff place
a matter of business on a future agenda (Gov. Code § 54954.2[a]) –
- 5) Establish Subcommittee to Determine Service Gaps and Recommendation of Evidence-Based
Approaches (Waterman)
Create subcommittee for service gap analysis and recommendation of evidence-based
approaches, subsequently leading to development of an RFP (request for proposal) process for
service providers – DISCUSS; APPOINT MEMBERS; MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR CREATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE AND APPOINTED
MEMBERS
- 6) 2nd Draft – County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13
Review and discuss 2nd draft (as recommended by the full CCP) of County of Kern Public Safety
Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13 and make determination of FY 12/13 AB 109
funding allocations (Fiscal Impact: \$23,451,975) – OPEN DISCUSSION FOR PUBLIC INPUT;
MAKE RECOMMENDATION OF A FINAL PLAN FOR APPROVAL TO EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE
- 7) Carryover of Unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 Funds
Review and discuss worksheet detailing carryover amounts for unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109
funds (Fiscal Impact: \$3,449,838) – MAKE RECOMMENDATION OF CARRYOVER AMOUNTS
AND APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURES TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL
- 8) Staff Request to Postpone Statistics/Data Reports Scheduled for July 25, 2012
Discuss staff request to postpone presentation of statistics/data reports, originally scheduled for
July 25, 2012, due to consideration of time spent on FY 12/13 plan and allocations – MAKE
RECOMMENDATION TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO POSTPONE PRESENTATION OF
STATISTICS/DATA REPORTS TO FUTURE MEETING
- 9) Next CCP Meeting
To be determined – DISCUSS; ANNOUNCE
- 10) ADJOURN AS CCP

CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Executive Committee Members: Chief Kuge, Judge Bush, District Attorney Green, Public Defender Titus,
Sheriff Youngblood, Director Dr. Waterman, Chief Williamson
ROLL CALL:

- 1) Minutes from Executive Committee Meeting of June 27, 2012 – APPROVE

- 2) Public Presentations
The public is provided the opportunity to comment on agenda items at the time those agenda items are discussed by the Executive Committee. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the Executive Committee. Executive Committee members may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification and, through the Executive Committee, make a referral to staff for factual information or request staff to report back to the Executive Committee at a later meeting. **SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD PRIOR TO MAKING A PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.**

- 3) Executive Committee Member Announcements or Reports
Executive Committee members may make an announcement or a report on their own activities. They may ask a question for clarification, make a referral to staff or take action to have staff place a matter of business on a future agenda (Gov. Code Sec. 54954.2[a]) –

- 4) Establish Subcommittee to Determine Service Gaps and Recommendation of Evidence-Based Approaches (Waterman)
Discuss full CCP recommendation of the creation of a subcommittee for service gap analysis and recommendation of evidence-based approaches, subsequently leading to development of an RFP (request for proposal) process for service providers – **APPROVE SUBCOMMITTEE FORMATION AND APPOINTED MEMBERS; PROVIDE DIRECTION TO SUBCOMMITTEE**

- 5) 2nd Draft – County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13
Review and discuss 2nd draft (as recommended by the full CCP) of County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13 and make determination of FY 12/13 AB 109 funding allocations (Fiscal Impact: \$23,451,975) – **APPROVE PLAN; DIRECT CHAIRPERSON TO SUBMIT FINAL PLAN TO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR APPROVAL**

- 6) Carryover of Unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 Funds
Review recommendation of full CCP for determination of carryover amounts for unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 funds (Fiscal Impact: \$3,449,838) – **APPROVE; AUTHORIZE CHAIRPERSON TO SUBMIT TO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR APPROVAL**

- 7) Staff Request to Postpone Statistics/Data Reports for July 25, 2012
Discuss staff request to postpone presentation of statistics/data reports, originally scheduled for July 25, 2012, due to consideration of time spent on FY 12/13 plan and allocations – **APPROVE POSTPONEMENT OF PRESENTATION OF STATISTICS/DATA REPORTS TO FUTURE MEETING**

- 8) Next Executive Committee Meeting
To be determined – **DISCUSS; ANNOUNCE**

- 9) **ADJOURN AS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**



MINUTES

COUNTY OF KERN
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIP (CCP)
CCP FULL MEMBERSHIP (Referred to as "CCP")
CCP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Referred to as "Executive Committee")

5121 Stockdale Highway, Suite #100
Bakersfield, California 93309

Special Meeting
Wednesday, July 11, 2012

CCP Meeting called to order by Chairperson Kuge at 8:37 a.m.

CCP Members: Chief David Kuge, Judge Michael Bush, District Attorney Lisa Green, Public Defender Arthur Titus, Sheriff Donny Youngblood, Director Dr. James Waterman, Chief Greg Williamson, Director Lily Alvarez, Director Pat Cheadle, Executive Director Tom Corson, Supervisor Karen Goh, Director Verna Lewis, Superintendent Christine Lizardi-Frazier, Division Director TR Merickel

ROLL CALL: All members present except for the following, Bush (Terry McNally for Bush), Titus (Konrad Moore for Titus), Alvarez (Felicia Skaggs for Alvarez), Cheadle (Pam Holiwell for Cheadle)

NOTE: The vote is displayed in bold below each item. For example, Waterman-Bush denotes CCP Member Waterman made the motion and CCP Member Bush seconded the motion. Discussion or presentations are displayed in italics.

CONSENT AGENDA/OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: ALL ITEMS LISTED WITH A "CA" WERE CONSIDERED TO BE ROUTINE AND APPROVED BY ONE MOTION.

1) Minutes from CCP Meeting of June 27, 2012

Kuge – Stated his staff was unable to complete the Minutes. Requested the CCP approve them at the next meeting. Waterman – Requested that it does not happen again. Stated that it is important because there were a number of things that happened at the last meeting and he wanted to see how they would be reflected in the Minutes. Minutes are needed to move in an orderly fashion; it is a matter of staff time and staff priority. Kuge – Agreed with Dr. Waterman; however, it is a tremendous amount of work for one person to do for the CCP, including working on all requests from the departments regarding data collection, information, putting together the agenda, etc. Ms. Jamison has to do it all. He will assign a full-time clerical to type up the minutes. Two people are needed to handle the workload. He apologized and will try to have all the minutes done before the next meeting. He will dedicate a person to assist Ms. Jamison in preparing the Minutes.

MOTIONED TO TABLE APPROVAL OF JUNE 27, 2012 MINUTES TO NEXT MEETING

Frazier-Corson: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

2) Public Presentations

The public is provided the opportunity to comment on agenda items at the time those agenda items are discussed by the CCP. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the CCP on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the CCP. CCP members may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification and, through the CCP, make a referral to staff for factual information or request staff to report back to the CCP at a later meeting. SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD PRIOR TO MAKING A PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.

Jenifer Pitcher, Kern Citizens for Sustainable Government – Stated they are a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting economic growth and sustainable economic policy. The State has placed a burden on local governments without sufficient funding for AB 109. Requested that the CCP consider all possible alternatives including input from members not on the CCP before departmental allocation requests are approved. She has

attended almost every CCP meeting and is usually the only person that is not directly affected by the legislation. Taxpayers should have a voice in the implementation of AB 109. Requested the CCP look closer at more viable solutions and implement more effective alternatives such as CCF's. Recently, the Governor signed SB 1351 into law; feels this legislation could be very beneficial to the success of prison realignment. She would be happy to submit more options that should be considered. HEARD

Jon Casida, Kern County Hispanic Commission on Alcohol and Drug Use Services – Stated his organization has provided services since 1984. He wants to advocate for more AB 109 dollars for substance abuse treatment. Treatment works for substance abuse problems, mental health problems, and those who have co-occurring issues. Evidence shows treatment saves taxpayer's dollars. Treatment providers are dedicated to improving outcomes. Several providers are taking on projects based on "NIAT," Network for the Improvement of Addiction Treatments. It is evidence-based and the model components are reducing wait time, reducing no-shows, increasing admissions, and increasing continuation for length of stay. Treatment providers are not satisfied with business as usual. For more information on the NIAT program, contact Director Alvarez or contact him at the Kern County Hispanic Commission. HEARD

Louis Medina, Kern County Homeless Collaborative – Provided handouts to describe how many ex-offenders in community end up homeless; would like CCP to consider this when discussing AB 109. They conducted a survey and found in January 2011, 17%, or one out of every six, homeless surveyed, sheltered and unsheltered, were homeless following release from jail or prison. In January 2012, for only the sheltered homeless, 13%, or one out of every eight, said they were homeless following release from jail or prison. In April, they held a one day outreach, one-stop shop resource fair, in and around the Bakersfield Rescue Mission called the "Homeless Connect." Found 15% of the people surveyed, or one out of seven, said they were homeless upon release from jail or prison. At the a three day outreach called "Home First Twelve" they found the most chronically and vulnerable homeless, those living by the riverbed or behind a dumpster, out of 294, 90% said they had spent time in jail, and every other one said they had spent time in prison. Of the 294, 251 had inpatient hospitalizations within the last year and 270 E.R. visits in the last three months. From January to mid-June 2012, they racked up \$426,994 in ambulance transport, costing a lot of money to the community. Their programs are funded by HUD and they view homeless release into a shelter the same as release into to the streets. He invited the CCP to their meetings which take place on the first Monday of every month at United Way. HEARD

Lorraine Castro, Discharge Planning Committee – Stated Turning Point worked primarily with parolees. They have a program for those with co-occurring disorders who are highest to recidivate and the most expensive but they have done amazing things with these individuals. Most do not apply for social security due to lack of sophistication or access to a computer. They have an outpatient drop-in center where they can become stabilized. Twelve, who have co-existing disorders, are attending Bakersfield College. Treatment and discharge planning are a necessary part of the continuum. They are being released to homelessness if there is no discharge planning. HEARD

Nada Yorke – Encouraged CCP to consider the importance of rehabilitation and partnering with community-based organizations to make available alternatives to incarceration. In the early 1990's, she designed a specialized caseload for 135 high-risk drug offenders. After three months, there was a 30% reduction due to residential drug programs and other community-based organizations that provided other needed services. In summer 2011, Kim Albers of Garden Pathways sought private funding for a pilot project to serve 40 men who were perpetrators of domestic violence. To date, over 79 men have come through the program with 11 coming directly from Lerdo on Sheriff's parole status. Two men have returned to custody on domestic violence offenses. Cost of the program equates to \$1,000 per individual for a year versus the cost of incarceration at a rate of \$30,000-\$50,000 per year, a significant cost savings. Requested CCP make more tools available so there are better outcomes and safety for the community. HEARD

3) Chairperson's Report (Kuge)

General update and/or information on AB 109 Realignment activities (Fiscal Impact: None) –

Chairperson Kuge – Announced he will be attending two conferences next week -- one is the research committee for AB 109. The direction of that committee is still to get funding from each county for data collection efforts; however, he has voiced his concern on that matter. Some counties have not started collecting data. Kern is much farther ahead in data collection than other counties in the State. It is still early in the process. He will report back to the CCP. One task of that committee will be to develop collection of information to the State.

PRESENTATION MADE

- 4) CCP Committee Member Announcements or Reports
CCP members may make an announcement or a report on their own department's activities. They may ask a question for clarification, make a referral to staff or take action to have staff place a matter of business on a future agenda (Gov. Code § 54954.2[a]) –
NONE MADE
- 5) Establish Subcommittee to Determine Service Gaps and Recommendation of Evidence-Based Approaches (Waterman)
Create subcommittee for service gap analysis and recommendation of evidence-based approaches, subsequently leading to development of an RFP (request for proposal) process for service providers (Fiscal Impact: None) –

Waterman – Stated one of the confusing things at the last meeting was the desire to fund community-based organizations (CBO's) with focus on rehabilitation and not just incarceration, but they are putting the cart before the horse. For example, in the \$3.3 million that are going to substance abuse and mental health, \$2.5 million is going to contractors, \$150,000 to housing and \$1.5 million to substance abuse providers. Though that will treat 600 instead of the 300 under prior funding, it does not address it entirely. Those are the kinds of the things that need to be brought to the table in a thoughtful way so that they know what they are doing with the money for CBO's. Suggested establishing a small, working committee comprised of members from entities in the community that are not part of the funding mechanism so it is not an attempt for anybody to get more funds for their own department. Suggested Tom Corson, who works in the CBO world to chair the subcommittee and include Department of Human Services and maybe Christine Frazier. Departments like Mental Health, Probation, and Sheriff could give their information to this group so they understand where the funds are going; through their interactions with CBO's they can get an idea of needs, whether it is housing or additional substance abuse treatment.

Kuge – Concurred with Dr. Waterman; they need to identify what the gaps are lacking in the county. Asked Dr. Waterman's thoughts on having CBO's on the subcommittee but not wanting it to be too large. Waterman – Answered that if any CBO does not want any of the money, it would not be a problem. Kuge – Stated, yes, it would be non-profits. Waterman – Stated it is not a good idea to have CBO's on the subcommittee that have an interest in the funds. He would like the three CCP members to bring back a recommendation that do not have an interest in the funds. Corson – Commented that though the process was spelled out in the draft plan, the CCP needs to know where the gaps are. He wants funds to go to the CBO's, but in the past the Kern Network for Children funded child abuse prevention programs and they just said, "Here's the process—fund whatever." It was a shotgun approach and did not get good outcomes. There are gaps and the gaps need to be filled. It would be beneficial to get the information from those that are in the business and objectively come back and say, "These are the identified gaps and programs that are research based and have good outcomes; this is where they would invest the money." Then it would be up to the group to decide. Goh – Supports what Mr. Corson and Dr. Waterman said. The independence of those who will not receive the funding is important, but believes in having representatives from Sheriff and Probation to provide input. They would not necessarily be voting members but indicate who they have worked with in the past, what outcomes have been successful, and invite the public to give their input. Anybody in the public who can potentially get funding is going to be a problem. Kuge – Stated CBO's would bring their information to the subcommittee as to what kind of services they would provide, combined with the services the Sheriff and Probation provides and where gaps lie. Then bring back a recommendation to the CCP as to what programs can fill these gaps. Waterman – Commented that this is not circumventing the RFP (request for proposal) process; An RFP would still be required. Corson – Stated they need to ask what the various departments, Sheriff, Probation, Public Defender, District Attorney, Mental Health see are needs and gaps. Once they have that information, the subcommittee can then determine the gaps. This allows the RFP process to be competitive for CBO's. It would not be good for CBO's to go to the subcommittee with information and then they are the ones that get funded. He does not want CBO's to have an advantage just because they were part of the process.

Moore – Expressed appreciation and admiration for CBO's that do tremendous work. At the last meeting, the CCP initially began with a CBO proposed allocation over \$1 million. It was Dr. Waterman who proposed stripping \$500,000 from CBO's. Questioned why now they seek to strip \$500,000, then go and study it, versus studying it before making a decision to deprive such substantial funding from CBO's. Dr. Waterman also proposed to strip the money from the Public Defender's office (P.D.). It was only through the Sheriff that the P.D. can continue to provide defensive representation efforts against the tremendous tenacity, professionalism, and aggressiveness of the District Attorney (D.A.). It is hollow to have a recommendation to study the gaps in the aftermath and proposed by the individual who proposed to cut it by half a million dollars. Waterman – Stated Mr. Moore's point is well-taken and has thought about that since the last meeting and has some seller's remorse. They did not obtain public input before the vote. It is not a done deal yet. There is now around \$400,000 designated funds raising the amount to

between \$700,000 and \$800,000 for CBO's. Probation went into the process trying to create mutual sacrifice and ended up being the only ones that took a hit. In retrospect, he wished he had suggested they study before they made that decision last week, so that is why it is on the agenda. It is not the right thing to do to make these funding decisions before they really know what they are doing. Kuge – Stated he had thought about it also. Agreed that they have to know what gaps are lacking in the community before they start throwing money out. Probation has \$312,000 carryover to give for CBO's and the Sheriff is giving \$184, which raises the amount closer to the \$1 million original proposed allocation.

Green – Volunteered to be a member of the subcommittee. She would like to learn, is a quick learner and would welcome the opportunity to be a part of the subcommittee. Waterman – Stated he does not see a problem; however, asked if it would be perceived as another fairness issue between the D.A. and P.D. Does the P.D. have to be on the subcommittee too? Kuge – Commented it has nothing to do with funding for either department; Ms. Green wants to learn about CBO's. Corson – Stated he wants what is best for the community, so anyone can be a part of the subcommittee. Kuge – Stated that it is not that they are asking for money, they are looking at determining the gaps. Corson – Stated that anyone can provide information on the gaps and evidence-based programs. They would just be providing information to make a decision. Green – Stated she attended the collaborative meeting in April that Mr. Medina mentioned in his presentation and so did Supervisor Goh. She wanted to and did learn more on the topic, so she is genuinely interested and not just because of the current discussion. Kuge – Stated he does not see a problem with D.A. Green serving on the subcommittee because she has an interest in learning what the community has to offer. Moore – The P.D. is certainly agreeable to volunteering as it relates to Ms. Green's comment. However, the social service agencies would be best because they are familiar with the needs of the clientele, whether homeless, whether substance abusers, or whether domestic abuse.

Williamson – Commented that since the proposed subcommittee would be open to the public, any of them could go to the meeting. County Counsel would give the final say. Devin Brown, County Counsel – Stated not all subcommittees of the CCP are subject to the open meeting requirements of the Brown Act. The subcommittee Dr. Waterman is proposing is more of an advisory ad-hoc committee and those committees are not subject to the open meeting requirements of the Brown Act, but it does not mean that they cannot make them open public meetings. Williamson – Stated that the subcommittee would be taking input from CBO's and different people to determine the gaps, how to fill those gaps, utilize the money appropriately, and come back with a decision from the subcommittee stating what those gaps are. Then the CCP would decide how much money to set aside and put out for RFP.

Frazier – Stated she would accept the responsibility of serving on the subcommittee, but only on the condition that the data and information is clean and unbiased. The subcommittee needs to be small and comprised of non-funded agencies. The Sheriff, D.A. and P.D. can still attend, listen and ask questions. The subcommittee should be the one that determines what information comes back to the CCP, so they are not in a situation where they are arguing about the data. They need to look at existing gaps, bring the information to the CCP, and decide how to fill those gaps and determine through the RFP what attributes are needed in the entity that provides that service. Beyond that, County Counsel may say they are crossing the line between what they should be doing as a subcommittee.

Kuge – Stated there needs to be flexibility as to which gaps to fill first. They will not be able to address all needs at the same time. There is a lot of work with RFPs and the process is lengthy and complex. There needs to be some latitude for Dr. Waterman to determine which gaps to fill first and which are the most important. The recommendations will go to him. Frazier – Stated it is not our recommendations, it is to show what the picture looks like in terms of gaps. If it is recommendations, they are going down the wrong road. Kuge – Stated it is basically making a recommendation to the CCP saying these are our gaps and this is what they think should be filled. Frazier – Asked that it is not for a specific provider. Kuge – Answered, she is correct, just determining the gap in services, not a specific group. "Recommendation" may be the wrong word. Corson – Commented that the data and analysis comes from the experts. The subcommittee would look at the data and determine where the gaps are, avoid duplication of services but still bolster services. They will come back with the analysis and the CCP decides what the RFP is going to look like. Kuge – Stated that "needs analysis" may be a better word for this purpose.

Waterman – Stated his concern that it was implied he has a decision-making role in the process, which he does not. He wanted to make it clear that it is the CCP that does. There are other departments that do RFP's and can help, especially if three or four different RFP's are needed to meet different needs. He does not want it to be perceived that it is his decision.

Public Comment:

Kim Albers, Garden Pathways – Sergeant Gonzalez and T.R. Merickel have spent an inordinate amount of time over the last year identifying the gaps and attending meetings. They attend more meetings than she does which is saying something. Asked if the CCP is starting from scratch because she wants to make sure the Sheriff and Probation have input. Stated her appreciation for the change in tone from the previous meeting and support for CBO's.

Waterman – Clarified that the RFP needs to be done by a county entity, so he would not expect the subcommittee to stray into the RFP issue, just say, "This is a really big need" and then proceed to the RFP process. Corson – Stated that once the subcommittee has the information, they would digest it and come back to the CCP with the analysis. It may end up being what has already been said by the CBO's. He does not have a problem with the RFP process and wished it was \$10 million. His fear is an RFP would go out; they receive 100 different applications for 100 different things; then it becomes \$10,000 here, \$20,000 here and it does not do any good.

Rick Ross, Turning Point of Central California – Requested clarification by asking if they meant that CBO's should not give any input to the subcommittee because they may be a potential bidder. Corson – Answered that if it is data or outcome or statistics, that kind of information is needed. Ross – Asked about things that are being done in other counties that are being tested? Frazier – Stated they do not want CBO's to advocate for a specific provider. Ross – Recommended the subcommittee talk to Probation Officers because they have contact with them every day saying, "I need this service, can you do it?" Those officers in the field know where the gaps are.

MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SUBCOMMITTEE AND APPOINT DR. CHRISTINE LIZARDI-FRAZIER, MR. TOM CORSON AND MS. PAT CHEADLE

Green-Goh: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

Williamson – Asked if the subcommittee will be required to follow the Brown Act. Kuge – Answered the subcommittee will not be obligated to post notice of meetings, but will most likely do so and Probation can post them on their website.

Corson – Asked how they can get the experts; he does not want to do anything they should not be doing. He wants to let the CCP know when the subcommittee is meeting. Kuge – Stated Mr. Corson can send Probation the information. Kuge – Asked to give Probation a draft of how they want it to read and it will go on their website.

Frazier – Stated that the subcommittee will meet first to determine a planning process, then let everyone know when they can attend. They will determine what data sets they are going to look at, then make sure it is published so interested parties can provide input at that meeting.

- 6) 2nd Draft – County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13
Review and discuss 2nd draft (as recommended by the full CCP) of County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13 and make determination of FY 12/13 AB 109 funding allocations (Fiscal Impact: \$23,451,975) –

Kuge – Asked that the public not comment during CCP discussion and apologized for not allowing public comment at the last meeting, but will make sure public will be provided comment after CCP discussion.

Waterman – Asked if the CCP was voting again. Kuge – Answered yes, according to County Counsel the CCP needs a second vote, essentially voting on a recommendation to the Executive Committee. Youngblood – Asked why the CCP is voting again. Devin Brown – Answered when a vote is not opened up for public comment, it could invalidate the vote. Kuge – Stated he did not do that at the last meeting; he needs to open up for public comment this time. Goh – Asked if the meeting could be directed to public comment at that time. Kuge – Stated he did not have any objection, and opened the meeting to public comment.

Public Comment:

Kim Albers, Garden Pathways – Stated that she researched ten broad-based re-entry services programs throughout the nation that successfully reduced recidivism rates. The cost per person annually was between \$1,300 and \$1,700 not including residential programs, most likely out-patient programming. The national average was \$3,265 per person, per year. With the \$438,000 Dr. Waterman recommended minus an employee costing \$100,000 leaving about \$350,000, less than 100 folks would be served. Both the Sheriff's virtual Jail and Probation rely on CBO's for services. She wanted to make sure the CCP was aware that those are non-substance abuse,

non-mental health, that those are funded in a separate way. The average national cost per person for organizations providing re-entry services that are doing good job is about \$3,000.00 per person. Kuge – Stated that the amount for CBO's was more than \$438,000.00. Albers – Stated that she is grateful to see the carryover if it is adopted.

Kuge – Stated that for the next fiscal year, the amount will not be known until determined by the CCP which could be different from Probation's proposal amount. He was hoping to start at \$1 million but it may be close to approximately \$700,000-\$800,000 for this year.

Albers – Stated she really appreciates the difficult task before the CCP and realizes it is a tough with the increasing crime rates.

Jenifer Pitcher, Kern Citizens for Sustainable Government – Agreed with Ms. Albers, it is important to invest a significant amount of money in CBO's because they are able to get the job done efficiently and with less cost as most public entities. Limited funds into the contingency fund are not the best option because there is no guarantee of future funding. The constitutional amendment to guarantee funding is contingent upon tax increases, which most polls show will not pass. It is important to have a savings account for the employees that were hired costing the county several hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. There will be no future salary savings. Also, if in the future, legislation requires matching funds from the County that are specific to AB 109 and Realignment, perhaps the contingency fund could be used for that as opposed to coming out of the County's general fund. Kuge – Stated that he agreed with Ms. Pitcher and Probation had proposed allocating \$1 million in contingencies, which is now approximately \$30,000. Also, the county was slated to receive \$10.8 million; however, the State is paying short of the proposed amount. Because of that, he has believes even the \$23 million for this year will probably be short. Without the contingency fund, it will have to come out of each department's budget, which Probation's proposal was trying to avoid.

Moore – Stated he appreciated Ms. Pitcher's comment as it relates to the contingency fund recognizing that the carry-forward amounts by the Sheriff and Probation greatly exceed the original allocation that was set out in the contingency fund. He asked Ms. Pitcher if that would represent more than an adequate substitute for the initial \$1 million that was contemplated. Asked how much should be set aside and if the carry-forward amounts if they exceed by a factor of three or four, what would be the purpose of that and would it be adequate in protecting the carry-forward surpluses.

Pitcher – Stated that \$33,000 in the contingency fund would not be sufficient. It would only pay for a probation officer or a sheriff's officer for about three months. In the long run, \$33,000 would not go far.

Kuge – Directed to Mr. Moore that there was a start-up period and then there was a period where staff could not be hired. Now, the staff is being hired and there will not be much carry-forward next year like this past year.

Moore – Asked if it is appropriate to build in a contingency reserve for next year's budget since the CCP is budgeting on a year-by-year basis because of the start-up there are substantial surpluses. If the CCP wants to set up a savings account, it is included for this year. In future years if a contingency is needed because surpluses may not be available, it makes good sense to budget it then. Asked if a tremendous surplus and a contingency are needed? It is "over" insurance given the dramatic needs, and the CCP needs to honor that philosophical theory and for this year, they are in good shape in replacing those carry-forwards.

Waterman – Stated that even if one or two million dollars is placed in a reserve fund, it would only all programs to run for an extra two weeks, four weeks, or six weeks. If it crashes and burns, there is not going to be any savior. The CCP ought to spend the money they have now, with a small amount in contingency. The CCP cannot save enough to really affect any soft landing if it is not funded.

Youngblood – Stated they all understand that if the constitutional amendment does not pass and the Governor does not fund Realignment, none of this is going to matter. They will crash and burn and the people that were hired will probably be laid off. We are all kind of accepting that.

Pitcher – Stated that when planning for future funding, money is usually put into a savings account. Youngblood – Responded that the only way that would work is if half the funds were designated for this year and half in a contingency for next year in case it was not funded by the State and the CCP is probably not willing to do that.

Merickel – Stated that having a contingency fund allows for future fixed assets. Probation and Sheriff are definitely going to have fixed assets that will need to be replaced four or five years down the road. If there are large amounts

of fixed assets, and no contingency set aside, money will have to come out of the general fund to buy those assets, or it will have to be taken out of the individual departments by laying off employees. These are things the CCP needs to think about – there will be future fixed assets directly related to 109.

McNally – Stated that his department is as a state funded agency that had a significant contingency bank account that was swept this year. The CCP cannot account for what the State will do if they are faced with significant budget cuts. If there is a large amount of contingency, it is at risk because it could be swept by the State for balancing other issues. The State looks at it as a "use it or lose it" concept. The State is going to look at a pot of money as "found" money. Kuge – Stated that he understands the State can do what they want, but in statute they cannot sweep the funds. However, the State could always change their mind.

Goh – Concurred with Mr. McNally and Dr. Waterman. Requested clarification regarding contingency reserves due to salary savings last year. Asked if the same will happen for the current year? Sandra Quigley, County Administrative Office (CAO) – Explained that last year, the CAO asked public safety departments to delay hiring until negotiations were settled with employee unions; thus, the reason for the very large carry-forward amounts attributed to salary savings. Since negotiations have been resolved, there should be no delays in hiring other than the normal process such as background tests. There should not be a large carry-forward next year like this past year. There was the one time savings this year, but believes it will be the CCP's intention to re-budget that in the next agenda item. Goh – Stated she understands. Just wanted clarification that the cost savings will be one-time salary savings.

Sandra Quigley – Stated Mr. Nilon (CAO) requested the CCP members to be concise in their statements and make their points, since the last meeting there was not a productive conversation. Kuge – Stated that he will not let it get out of hand like the last meeting and he will end discussion if it does, but Ms. Green should have the opportunity to express her views.

Green – Stated that she will vote against the current version of the plan because of the \$232,000 allocation to the P.D. This time last year, she was concerned that Realignment would be a disaster for public safety; she still has grave concerns given the increase in crime that is reflected by the departments. She realizes that Realignment, at least for now, is here to stay and Kern County is receiving less money this year than other counties because they are perceived as not having the programs and not giving the proper attention to substance abuse treatment programs. The other reason she is voting against the current version of the plan is the \$438,000 is not enough money for CBO's. She proposed to take the \$438,000, plus the carryover of \$312,000 and give that to CBO's. Then take the \$232,000 that the Sheriff was willing to give up to the P.D. and give that to CBO's, then the million dollars is reached to make a real effort to get some of these programs in place, though some already are. It is gratifying to hear the success of domestic violence programs, but in her administration, she has seen double the number of deputies to attorneys prosecuting domestic violence cases, 80 is just the tip of the iceberg. She is asking for \$232,000 for a deputy attorney to review cases submitted by law enforcement agencies. The P.D. has no corresponding role. The D.A. has other programs which the P.D. has no corresponding programs such as truancy deputies and a white collar unit. That is why the P.D. is a smaller agency than the D.A. Her office handles every criminal case and a few civil for the entire County of Kern. The P.D. does not. There is the Indigent Defense Program, private defense attorneys, and some defendants go pro per. The P.D. does not handle all criminal defendants. Why would they ever think that her department should get \$232,000 and the P.D. should get the same amount? They do not do the same jobs on the same scale. She did not ask for any money last year because she could not statistically support the need for that money. She is not into empire building but her goal and focus is on public safety. After six months, she has statistics from June; they received 27% more felony complaint requests for this six-month time frame in 2012 than they did in the six-month time frame in 2011, equating to 7,806 requests for felonies in 2011 in the six month period and in the six month period in 2012, there were 9,925. That statistic justifies the funding for another complaint deputy. The P.D. submitted (on page 29) in their justification that the county's strategic plan in 2008 states that increasing resources in one area of public safety affects other areas. If that were true for AB 109, then the D.A. should get a lot more money since Probation and Sheriff get a lot more money. But they are not seeing an increase in filings yet. That is not to say at this time next year they will not be filing 20% more cases, whereby she would need two deputy D.A.'s. If she needs two deputy D.A.'s to go in the Court room and prosecute, then maybe the P.D. does too, but not this year, not now. The only statistic that the P.D. put in support of their proposal was there was a 16% felony caseload increase since 2009 and 2010. Those are irrelevant figures for the purpose of Realignment because it went into effect October 1, 2011. The P.D. can go to the Board of Supervisors and ask for positions if that is their situation which they did earlier this year and were funded for two Deputy P.D.'s. For the P.D. to suggest there is going to be an increase in cases filed is illusory right now. It may happen next year but hope it does not. Proposed or amended that the P.D.'s \$232,000 request be given to CBO's. P.D. clients are the ones who benefit from CBO's, not the victims of the crime and not her office.

The P.D. should take the \$232,000 which they cannot demonstrate in increased case load yet, and give that to their clients so they have a fighting chance in these programs to be implemented.

Kuge – Asked Mr. Brown how would Ms. Green's recommendation be handled, an amendment or a new vote? Devin Brown – Answered that a new vote is required with a new motion and a new second. The motion and second can be on a new recommendation.

Moore – Stated he reaffirmed that they support the D.A.'s request for funds. He disputes that Realignment funds were not intended to be equally apportioned between the D.A. and P.D. and referred to Government Code Section 3035, subdivision F, paragraph five, which specifies an identical and equal allocation as it relates to funding revocation proceedings. The notion that the money should go to the CBO's instead of the P.D. to give clients a fighting chance overlooks the fact that if the D.A. convicts the clients and sends them to prison, they are not going to even have a fighting chance. Money has been said to be the mother's milk of politics. Funding is the oxygen for the work that the P.D. does and Ms. Green is attempting to step on the oxygen flow to the P.D. It is unfortunate for one department to seek to interfere with another department's funding. It is one thing to be fierce advocates in court, it is another to argue as administrators. He remains deeply grateful for the Sheriff for his wisdom, insights, and recognition of the P.D.'s needs. Ms. Green said the P.D. has no numbers; he would offer Ms. Green's statistic that there is a 27% increase in criminal complaint referrals and Chief Williamson's report of a 40% increase in crime. The P.D. is a reactive department. They receive clients as a result of the actions of other departments. If the D.A. gets 27% more filings, the P.D. is going to see an increase. The only other alternative is that each and every one of those additional filings is rejected, but that is wholly inconsistent with what we know about the aggressiveness, professionalism, and tenacity of the D.A.'s office. Ms. Green is correct when she said the P.D. does not represent every single client; however, that overlooks the P.D. does not have the grant funding for many of the types of crimes that the D.A. receives special funding for. The P.D. relies, without regard to Realignment, exclusively upon the largess of the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Green omitted that the P.D. was obliged to tell the Board of Supervisors that the cost of the two new deputy P.D.'s would not increase the cost of the P.D.'s office, but would result from the departure and ability from Prop. 172 funds and replacing more expensive retiring lawyers with cheaper, less experienced ones. \$232,000 is not enough to match and do what the Public Defender by constitution is charged with doing, but recognizes there are political limitations and that would be a very hard sell to come in and ask for more than Ms. Green does. That is why the P.D. is asking for this amount, which is less than one percent of the total funds. Why is there such fierce opposition by Ms. Green who wants to step on less than 1% that the P.D. is seeking? The only department who would bare the cost to this is the Sheriff; if he is okay with it, why shouldn't everyone else be okay with it? It is with regret that Ms. Green feels the need to oppose it and he urged everyone else to support it. Requested that if the vote is to strip the money from the P.D., then return it to the Sheriff because the Sheriff has tremendous needs and they are tremendously impacted. Williamson – Clarified that 16% is the increase in crime, not 40%. GTA's were just over 40%.

Waterman – Asked Kuge for his vision and rationale for use of the extra \$800,000 since it is proposed for probation officers and not rehabilitation. At prior meetings, Kuge articulated how inexpensive it would be to double the size, for example, of Probation's day reporting unit and the desire to use the S.T.R.O.N.G. to craft individual plans. None of that has really happened so far in the Plan that Probation articulated going forward. Kuge – Answered that he will let Mr. Merickel answer, but stated that Probation was unable to hire personnel to make those assessments because with high officer caseloads, Probation was not able to follow through. Waterman – Asked that if the CCP funds additional money to Probation and they start identifying individuals who need services such as substance abuse treatment and housing, what good will that do if the resources are not there? Part of the problem for them and the community is that the parole department put their parolees in substandard housing, but at least they did put money into that. And what is actually happening is they have cut the parole outpatient clinic dramatically and they are shortening by half or more time people are spending on parole. They are just discharging people off of parole right and left into homelessness. If Probation receives all this extra money and identifies these needs, is that really going to do anything? Probation has not increased resources. Kuge – Answered that Probation has increased resources by utilizing CBO's. Once they identify the needs, Probation knows which programs to send them to. CBO's are out there whether the CCP funds them or not. Probation refers offenders to those programs because they cannot arrest everybody and throw them in jail due to limited capacity. Probation is looking at intermediate sanctions like these programs before they use the jail sentence.

Merickel – Stated that the Day Reporting Center has doubled. As of today, there are 100 people in the Day Reporting Center, so it is fully implemented. With the additional officers, Probation will be able to reduce caseloads to fully implement the O.N.G. Research shows that having an individualized case plan with a probation officer using M.I. (motivational interviewing) techniques working with the individual offender, does reduce recidivism. The probation officer is an agent of change if caseloads are down to a low enough level. Probation will also be able to do additional things such as going after AWOL offenders, which, while they are AWOL, are obviously not getting

any treatment and are not being supervised. In his opinion, it is a misnomer to say there is a million dollars for CBO's and now Probation is taking that away. It was Probation's proposal for that in the first place; so, Probation is not opposed to it, the way it is constructed needs to be the appropriate way. Kuge – Indicated that Probation presented a plan that they thought was fair for every department, but not every department agreed to it. That is why the meeting was held to have their plans explained. Probation can justify the need for more, and do more to identify those needs and send them to the appropriate programs in the community. Probation currently does not have that capacity with the limited number of staff and high caseloads.

McNally – Asked County Counsel for follow-up by Mr. Morgan to advise whether the allocation for either the Public Defender or the District Attorney fell within the scope of PC 1203. Devin Brown – Answered that the analysis had not been completed. Mr. Morgan is still working on formulating that. Kuge – Stated that Mr. Morgan notified him that he would not have the answer at the meeting.

McNally – Asked Ms. Quigley if the CCP has to vote for the entire budget package as drafted today? Or can they parse out items that are still under discussion and table the rest for a later discussion? Sandra Quigley – Answered that she did not think there is any reason why they could not adopt a portion of it now if they wanted to allow the departments to get started with their expenditures and adding positions in the budget. The other items would need to be placed in contingency. McNally – Suggested moving forward on some of the critical issues like the Sheriff's and Probation's efforts. Suggested the motion should be to approve the plan and table the allocations for the D.A. and P.D. until Mr. Morgan provides his analysis as to whether those are appropriate expenditures under PC 1203. Move ahead with the Plan and have further discussions on whether it is even reasonable to allocate monies to those agencies because they do not fall under the definition he read, which is for Probation to utilize the resources for supervision and rehabilitative services, which maybe a bit of a stretch of the imagination. Suggested that instead of having another long discussion, move forward on what they can and table the other items until they get some direction from County Counsel.

Green – Mentioned that many counties and many D.A. offices received funds other than their revocation allotment in their AB 109 plans. She knows that another D.A. office has asked for a criminalist because they have their own lab from their Realignment money. It is very clear that this is an appropriate expenditure and they do not need to wait for County Counsel, especially since County Counsel is busy. Since they have to present the Plan in its final state to the Board of Supervisors, she thinks it would be better to implement it all at once.

Kuge – Asked Ms. Quigley when does the CCP need to have the Plan presented to the Board of Supervisors? At budget hearings? Sandra Quigley – The CCP does not have to have the Plan ready for budget hearings; however, it is preferable because it is much easier to get it in the initial budget. Departments will not have access to the money and cannot add the positions until it goes to the Board, but if it went in September or October like it did last year, it would just be the same process.

Goh – Stated that \$23 million dollars is a huge amount of money to distribute and she wondered whether they have given enough thought to the alternative sanctions. She questions whether they have done a good enough job in highlighting the alternative sanctions and she knows that departments have incorporated some alternative sanctions within their plans, but does not see them highlighted well in the narrative. Also, she does not see the results. It has been eight months and there is a statement made on page 8 that says the initial data reports show they have been successful. But within the report and in discussions, that really has not come forward. The County has a far greater number of people in our community than we had projected and they certainly understand the implications. However, it would be important as to really understand what the alternative strategies are. It is not clear in some cases whether strategies have been implemented or whether these are things that are being considered for the future. With this size of investment, they owe it to themselves and to the public to do a better job in highlighting that. She appreciated Ms. Green's comments and her open-mindedness regarding the roles of CBO's. CBO's are cost effective. It is important to consider each one, to look at historical performance, and not lump everyone together. She asked the CCP to consider funding CBO's by carefully examining the role that CBO's can play in fulfilling the charge to produce alternative sanctions through evidence-based practices. "Evidence-based," the label takes money to prove. Not everything has to be proven through a study. Some non-profits just do not have money to prove it, but they may be implementing the practices and showing measurable outcomes. Asked CCP to take another look at how alternative sanctions are implemented, how they are highlighted even in the narrative, and how they are communicating that to the public. The public has an impression that it is the same-old, same-old and she believes that there is a place for incarceration. Within the report there is really, very little in terms of outcomes. For example, within the report, page 16, it shows 55% of jail population and 86% of the inmate population, but there is no context with the prior. Having some context within this would be helpful for the other Supervisors to see. Mental Health did a good job of doing that within their section of the

narrative and being able to contrast it with where they were before and where they are today. Some of the other departments need to provide more of that information.

Kuge – Stated that Probation has not been able to do as much as they would like to do because of the hiring freeze of safety officers. Probation presented preliminary numbers and recidivism rates that Ms. Jamison produced and will continue to do that. However, they do not know if they will receive the funding. There are so many different ideas out there as to where the money should go. Under Ms. Green's idea that the money from the P.D. goes to CBO's would get them close to the million dollar mark again and still give Probation the opportunity to expand. Once they know what the number is, then they would be able to really detail out what they can and cannot do. But, if that \$600,000 is taken, then Probation will have to look at what they can do with the smaller amount. The narrative is somewhat generic because until the plan is done, they will not know exactly what they can and cannot do.

Merickel – Stated that the Sheriff did a really good job of showing how they are not doing business as usual such as how they are working with CBO's and Mental Health. Maybe Probation did not do as good of a job as they would have liked, but stressed that Probation has the Day Reporting Center and doubled the capacity. Probation detailed the assessment tool, which is something the departments never used before on the adult population. Maybe it is written from an insider point of view, so someone from the public might say that is not impressive, but for an insider who knows the S.T.R.O.N.G. assessment; this is really on the cutting edge of what Probation is doing. Appreciated Ms. Goh's input but both the Sheriff and Probation are doing things differently and if that is not expressed well in the Plan, that is unfortunate because he believes the community is trying to do things differently.

Goh – Thanked Mr. Merickel. Stated he is right that, from an insider's point of view, she understands what Probation has done. Since the public, who is not involved in the day-to-day discussions and the other Supervisors, it would help to better highlight what the alternative strategies are. The things she has heard from the public and read in the media questions whether they have done a good job in alternative strategies, which says to her the information is not getting out there. It is not clear to the public. On page 3 of the Plan, the law states that county should focus on using alternative sanctions and evidence-based practices in order to more effectively reduce recidivism. Ms. Green made the comment about some funding not being at a certain level because they may not be as effective in the alternative strategies. The Fresno Bee made such a statement that their community did not get that type of funding for that reason. They need to determine what can be done to better demonstrate that alternative strategies are in place and the effectiveness of what has been implemented to date.

Kuge – Agreed and he has read articles in the paper, but unfortunately, those articles are written by people who do not attend the meetings and do not listen to the discussions; it is very unfair. When the CCP has discussion at the meetings, they talk about the alternatives and the proposed strategies. Those people need to be at the meetings to listen; if somebody writes an article and does not attend the meetings, they do not really hear the crux of what is being discussed.

COMMITTEE BREAK AT 10:20 A.M.; RECONVENED TO CCP AT 10:30 A.M.

Waterman – Stated that at the prior meeting there was a problem with discussion about the carryover funds after the vote on the budget. They need to talk about the carryover funds now so they understand how much is really there. Kuge – Asked Dr. Waterman if he would like to hold Item 6 until they are finished with the carryover discussion. Waterman – Answered that it has a relevance to the vote on the budget.

Moore – Added that with the exception of the public comment, the proposed budget in the second draft reflects the collective consensus of the CCP. He asked whether or not the Chairperson could consider inviting public comment if they choose to do a large carryover and then have the discussion focus on whether public comment has influenced prior consideration to override the previous vote as reflected in the second draft.

Kuge – Stated a new motion and a new vote are needed. He will ask for public comment, but will table Item 6 and discuss the carryover, then go back to Item 6. Asked County Counsel if he has that discretion to do that or is a motion and a vote needed. Devin Brown, County Counsel – The Chairperson has that discretion. Kuge – Stated that since the carryover funding has much to do with the final allocations, they will table Item 6. The public will have an opportunity to make comment on Item 6.

Item 6 tabled at 10:42 a.m.; discussion returned from Item 7 at 11:01 a.m.

Public Comment:

Kim Albers, Garden Pathways – Requested a restatement of the motion.

Moore – Requested that they renew the motion and implement and adopt the proposed allocations as reflected and made by Probation in the second draft. Kuge – Asked to clarify that the motion is approve the allocation in the second draft. Moore – Stated that the only difference between this meeting and last meeting is some change in attendance and the absence of public comment which is going to follow. He requested they readopt the same motion.

Green – Stated she thought that Dr. Waterman's comments regarding the Minutes was apropos and she is not sure how the public can comment when they do not have minutes from the last meeting. They do have access to the Plan, but the public is at an unfair advantage because they would not have access to the discussion. Kuge – Commented that in this instance, most everybody there was at the last meeting. He thought this is the same plan that Dr. Waterman made the same motion now that Mr. Moore has motioned again.

Waterman – Stated these are significant items that have been discussed since the last meeting. One is that the rollover funds took a significant hit. The second was there was no public input and have not established a process for examining what CBO's should do. That should be considered given the discussion that has occurred since the last meeting and not say it was passed before, so pass it again. Kuge – Stated that is true, but Mr. Moore made a motion to keep the same plan. Anybody can make a motion to amend that motion. Devin Brown – Stated that if someone asked to amend Mr. Moore's motion and Sheriff Youngblood's second, they have to get agreement with those two.

Moore – Stated he would invite any amendment. Green – Stated she would amend Mr. Moore's motion that the \$232,000 allotted under the current proposal be removed from the P.D. and given to CBO's. Kuge – Asked if Mr. Moore has to agree to that? Devin Brown – Affirmed yes. Green – Added the contingency Chief Williamson mentioned should be included as well. Kuge – Stated that was already voted on. If Mr. Moore does not agree, then they have to vote on his motion. Asked if it does not pass then a new motion is required? Devin Brown – Affirmed the vote will be on whatever Mr. Moore and Sheriff Youngblood agree to. If there is no agreement, then the vote will be on their motion. Moore – Stated that he would accept Ms. Green's amendment with the associated clause that the \$232,000 the D.A. has requested likewise go to CBO's, consistent with the spirit of the government code which calls for an equal allocation. If the D.A. is willing to modify their amendment so money from both departments goes back to CBO's, then certainly he would encourage that amendment. Kuge – Asked Ms. Green if she agrees. Green – Answered she does not agree, for the reason she stated earlier.

Goh – Stated she will not be able to support the original motion for the same reasons she spoke about previously. The P.D.'s request for funding is not based on the right premise. Judge Bush said the same thing at the last meeting. The P.D. has a very important role, but it is not apples to apples. They need a greater allocation for CBO's; therefore she will not support the motion as stated.

Waterman – Stated he would like to see more money in the CBO contingency fund. That will allow them to make a decision at that point in terms of what the priorities are. The CCP is making decisions about priorities before they have the full information. If at that time the CCP can decide to reallocate those funds wherever they felt the priority was. If the P.D. is drowning at that point then they can do that. Moore – Stated his department is. Goh – Stated she does not see the need to rush into it if more research and information is needed to make a decision. It does not impact the budget process as stated by the CAO's office. If more time is needed, the CCP can ask for more time and consider the research that is going to be done by the subcommittee.

Youngblood – Indicated that the inmates and the jails are not waiting for the CCP to study this. Every time approval of the Plan is passed on to another date, it is killing them. It will wind up costing more money. They can beat this horse but there is not enough money to go around; there is no getting around it. The Sheriff and Probation gets it. He strongly recommended that they come to a conclusion today. Kuge – Agreed with Sheriff Youngblood. The probationers are not waiting. They are coming into the communities.

Waterman – Stated he thinks they can come to an agreement today but they can put \$232,000 in contingency while they hammer out the \$232,000, the \$312,000 rollover, and the \$439,000 already there up to \$983,000 that would be earmarked for CBO's or if they felt that other priorities were there. Youngblood – Stated that cannot be done until they have the vote. Waterman – Stated he is going to vote against it, because he will make another motion after that to move on it today. By voting against it, he is not suggesting they put it off, but instead take the \$232,000 and put it in contingency. Kuge – Stated they need to move on the motion but will open it up for public comment on the current motion.

Public Comment:

Kim Albers, Garden Pathways – Urged the CCP again that CBO's need a higher priority in the budget.

Jenifer Pitcher, Kern Citizens for Sustainable Government – Agreed with Dr. Waterman's suggestion that the \$232,000 from the Sheriff's budget to the Public Defender's budget go into contingency or CBO's. The District Attorney gave a percentage as to their increase, Chief Williamson gave a percentage as to their increase, but she did not hear any percentage of increase in cases by the Public Defender. Agreed with D.A. Green that unless there is evidence that certain cases are increasing, some department budgets can wait until their numbers are more exact. And until that time, put the money into contingencies or CBO's.

MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SECOND DRAFT PLAN AND ALLOCATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH \$9,934,431 TO SHERIFF, \$8,832,000 TO PROBATION, \$3,332,526 TO MENTAL HEALTH/SUBSTANCE ABUSE, \$250,000 TO ETR, \$232,000 TO DISTRICT ATTORNEY, \$232,000 TO PUBLIC DEFENDER, \$166,509 TO STREET INTERDICTION TEAM, \$438,940 TO CBO's, AND \$33,569 TO CONTINGENCY

ROLL CALL VOTE: Kuge-No; McNally (for Bush)-No; Green-No; Moore (for Titus)-Yes; Youngblood-Yes; Waterman-No; Williamson-No; Skaggs (for Alvarez)-No; Holiwell (for Cheadle)-No; Corson-No; Goh-No; Lewis-No; Frazier-Yes; Merickel-No

Moore-Youngblood: Ayes – 3; Noes – 11

MOTION DID NOT PASS

Waterman – Stated that brings the amount earmarked for CBO's to \$232,000, plus \$312,000 carryover, plus the \$438,940 for CBO programs for a total of \$983,000. Kuge – Asked if he wants to put it in CBO'S or as a new line item? Waterman – Answered that since the money is not carryover funding, he would move that money and put it in CBO programs specifically. The \$312,000 would be left in contingency allowing more flexibility and it is a one-time allocation.

Kuge – Stated that the new motion proposes to keep all the numbers the same except that the Public Defender's \$232,000 be moved to CBO's which would raise it to \$670,940.

Moore – Conceded that he has lost and accepts it; however, he wanted to state that there is inconsistency in the logic of Dr. Waterman's approach. At the last meeting Dr. Waterman recommended the CBO amount be sliced by \$500,000. Now he was saying to bump it up \$232,000. That was accompanied by the recommendation that they study it. It seems illogical to arbitrarily strip and then bolster before the study is done. Since the CCP has made a decision that they are going to study the gaps, he does not know how Dr. Waterman proposes that \$232,000 is suddenly the right number to allocate coincidentally the amount that he proposes to strip from the P.D. He will vote no because having made the decision to study where the gaps are in order to determine what CBO's need, it is premature for Dr. Waterman to spit out numbers without having a basis to know what the needs and funding requirements are. Waterman – Stated that putting the money into CBO's does not mean it will be spent. It means it is there for when the full committee decides what the priorities are. Essentially, he is trying get them back where he thought they were last time; the rollover money was much less than he thought. He has a certain logic for this.

McNally – Asked for clarification that the subcommittee will develop information for service gaps. The RFP would then go out addressing what the expectations of the subcommittee are so they are not committing resources until the whole process ends. They are just plugging in a budget item for future allocations if it is needed. It seems like a reasonable proposal.

MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SECOND DRAFT PLAN AND PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE EXCEPT MOVE \$232,000 FROM THE PUBLIC DEFENDER TO CBO's FOR TOTAL ALLOCATION OF \$23,451,975 WITH \$9,934,431 TO SHERIFF, \$8,832,000 TO PROBATION, \$3,332,526 TO MENTAL HEALTH/SUBSTANCE ABUSE, \$250,000 TO ETR, \$232,000 TO DISTRICT ATTORNEY, \$166,509 TO STREET INTERDICTION TEAM, \$670,940 TO CBO's, AND \$33,569 TO CONTINGENCY

ROLL CALL VOTE: Kuge -Yes; McNally (for Bush)-Yes; Green-Yes; Moore (for Titus)-No; Youngblood-Yes; Waterman-Yes; Williamson-Yes; Skaggs (for Alvarez)-Yes; Holiwell (for Cheadle)-Yes; Corson-Yes; Goh-Yes; Lewis-Yes; Frazier-Yes; Merickel-Yes

Waterman-Green: Ayes – 13; Noes – 1

MOTION PASSED

7) Carryover of Unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 Funds

Review and discuss worksheet detailing carryover amounts for unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 funds (Fiscal Impact: \$3,449,838) –

Kuge – Stated that the carryover is approximately \$3.4 million, but does not take into account unbilled items for the fourth quarter. The \$3.4 million consists of \$2.1 million from the Sheriff and \$1.2 million from Probation. The other departments, ETR, Mental Health, and SIT, would keep their carryover money because they are non-General Fund departments.

Waterman – Stated he thought the carryover for Probation and Sheriff was originally around \$500,000 and then after discussion it was reduced to near the high \$300,000, almost \$400,000. When the worksheet came out; it is listed as \$312,000. This is one reason why the minutes not being available is unfortunate. Kuge – Indicated that it was his error in the calculation. Waterman – Referenced the footnotes stating, "These numbers accurately reflect correct amounts based upon recalculations." Kuge – Stated he added wrong. Waterman – Asked how much the balance went down and was it only Probation or was it other departments. Merickel – Probation is putting money back into the CBO and contingency fund of \$312,180. Kuge – Probation was initially asking for \$830,000, but since his addition was wrong, it ended up at \$872,000. It was an error in his calculation but \$312,000 is their carryover amount. Waterman – Stated he understood that is what Probation is proposing but that is not what was voted on last time. He has a problem with that kind of methodology that the numbers changed based on recalculation. Kuge – Stated that County Counsel indicated a new motion is needed anyway. It is just Probation's proposal. He wanted to clarify the numbers. They can stick with the original numbers. Waterman – Stated he does not know what the original numbers are; that is the problem.

Rebecca Jamison, Probation – Stated that upon review of her written notes from the last meeting, she had \$887,680 carryover for Probation. The worksheet shows \$887,820 so Probation was off by approximately \$100. Her notes show the Sheriff indicated \$2.1 million based on the numbers because Mr. Nilon said at the last meeting he would work with Probation, which was done, to make sure those numbers are correct because they did not have exact amounts at the last meeting. Ms. Quigley even said, "We think we know what it is going to be, but we're not sure." Probation staff worked with the CAO's office to get the correct numbers and there were some miscalculations. Once all the accurate numbers were received from the Sheriff, the amounts were compared with the CAO's information and these were the exact dollar amounts.

Kuge – Stated Probation asked for \$887,680, which is up \$140 from the last meeting. Waterman – Indicated that it was not his recollection that the carryover now is \$312,000 because he remembers thinking that he was trying to get it back up closer to \$1 million. One reason he made the motion to put the money back to Probation because he knew this other money was out there. Merickel – Clarified that there was discussion last meeting with the Sheriff that they were not sure if their carryover was going to be \$2.5 or \$2.1 million due to some type of funding that they might have been reimbursed for which he does not think they were. The amount could then have been anywhere between \$300,000 and \$700,000 after speaking with the CAO's office. That is when it went from \$700,000 back down to the \$300,000. Kuge – Added that \$312,000 came from Probation and the \$232,000 was added to make it \$544,000. The Sheriff gave back the \$232,000 to the Public Defender's office. So wouldn't that make the accurate number would be \$544,000? Sandra Quigley – \$312,000 is the accurate carryover for Probation's plan and the Sheriff's plan. Kuge – Stated the difference was whether or not the Sheriff would be getting that reimbursement, which they did not. Rosemary Wahl, Sheriff's Department – Concurred that when the Sheriff came to the meeting they thought the carryover was \$2.5 million. They needed the additional \$400,000 to cover expenses and they thought they might have alternative funding to cover that. Kuge – Indicated that funding did not come through. The \$400,000 would have put it up to \$700,000.

Waterman – Stated that given the motion last time, he would have put the CBO amounts at about \$1 million. Kuge – The total carryover for the Sheriff and Probation is \$312,364. Sandra Quigley – Asked Dr. Waterman if he wanted to revisit the department plans. Waterman – Answered no, he just wanted the explanation because the numbers kept drifting.

Kuge – Stated that with the carryover of \$3,449,838, the Sheriff listed out their department needs which were close to \$2.1 million and Probation indicated \$887,820. He will get public comment first, but asked if a motion is needed? Or could the two motions between six and seven be combined? Devin Brown, County Counsel – Stated that because there were two recommendations to the Executive Committee, there needs to be two separate votes, one for each recommendation. Kuge – Stated that a motion and second is needed to recommend the carryover plan to the Executive Committee.

Public Comments: NONE

Sandra Quigley – Recommended that since there were bills still being paid, to include in the motion that any differences be placed in contingencies. Kuge – Stated that it could be stated that the remaining carryover would go

to the CBO amount. Waterman – Requested that the amount be identified. Kuge – Stated that they do not know the exact amount. Waterman – Indicated that there will be millions of dollars to spend so it is not like they cannot absorb a \$12 bill out of their regular account. Sandra Quigley – Stated she is concerned that if the motion is to carry forward \$312,364, they may end up with a different amount of let's say \$312,360. Youngblood – Indicated that there is no way to avoid that, because they do not know the actual numbers. Sandra Quigley – Affirmed that and stated that sometimes when a bill is paid and if it is paid within 30 days, there is a discount creating a difference. The county is going through that process now. Kuge – Asked if this would be a CBO/Mental Health contingency fund. Waterman – Corrected that it is a contingency/CBO fund. Waterman – Stated he feels like they need to say \$312,000 and not leave it open ended. Kuge – Agreed and if there is \$10 more that they have to pay, then they will find a way to pay it. If the bills come out short or more, then it is up to the department to make that up somehow.

Waterman – Indicated that the CCP will struggle with the regular budget as to how to get an adequate amount for CBO's. Asked if the Sheriff and Probation has room to kick in some additional funds from the rollover into funding for CBO's and if their requests are barebones? Asked if the departments really need \$1 million for security cameras or \$52,000 for cars? Kuge – Answered this is barebones. They could easily justify much more, but wanted to give CBO's money. Probation does not want to deplete their amount to where they cannot do their job properly. Youngblood – Agreed with Kuge and stated these carryover funds are for infrastructure. The list was cut down as much as possible. Waterman – Stated that answers his question. The public needs to know whether or not this is padding; whether these are extra funds or if it is absolutely essential. Kuge – Stated that they are not padding and the Sheriff is not either. They have cut down and could justify much more. There is not enough money for everybody.

MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR CARRYOVER OF UNEXPENDED FY 11/12 AB 109 FUNDS TOTALING \$3,449,838 WITH \$2,099,816 FOR SHERIFF, \$887,820 FOR PROBATION, \$55,582 FOR STREET INTERDICTION TEAM, \$94,256, AND \$312,364 FOR CONTINGENCY/CBO's

ROLE CALL VOTE: Kuge-Yes; McNally (for Bush)-Yes; Green-Yes; Moore (for Titus)-No; Youngblood-Yes; Waterman-Yes; Williamson-Yes; Skaggs (for Alvarez)-Yes; Holiwell (for Cheadle)-Yes; Corson-Yes; Goh-Yes; Lewis-Yes; Frazier-Yes; Merickel-Yes

Youngblood-McNally: Ayes – 13; Noes – 1

MOTION PASSED

8) Staff Request to Postpone Statistics/Data Reports Scheduled for July 25, 2012

Discuss staff request to postpone presentation of statistics/data reports, originally scheduled for July 25, 2012, due to consideration of time spent on FY 12/13 plan and allocations –

Rebecca Jamison, Probation – Stated that approximately six months ago she proposed quarterly statistics reports and suggested the July 25, 2012 meeting date to present the information. However, due to the length and discussion of recent CCP meetings, since she is the only person handling all CCP and Realignment activities and only given two weeks between CCP meetings, there has been approximately three days not counting holidays and vacations to prepare about 20 pages of minutes, agendas, and make sure everything is correct. She has not been able to work on the 4th quarter statistics. She has not received any information from the departments because they are currently handling end of year processing and budgets. Since she would have difficulty obtaining information from the departments at this time, she requested to present the reports at a future meeting. Kuge – Asked how long she would need to pull that information together. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 22nd. Would that be enough time or is more time needed? Rebecca Jamison – Suggested more time because between there is budgeting and she will be on vacation. She has not taken time off because she has made a point to be available. Many staff are on vacation and they know how difficult it is to get the information that she will need. Kuge – Asked if another month be sufficient? Sometime in September? Rebecca Jamison – Answered September would be good.

Kuge – Stated that Ms. Jamison is requesting an additional two months to get the data together which means a meeting on September 19th because the second week, Dr. Waterman will not be available. Waterman – Stated that it is generally the second week which would be the 12th.

Corson – Asked Ms. Jamison if this statistical information would be critical to the analysis of gaps in looking at what they will fund CBO's. Jamison – Answered yes, that is part of the rationale for delaying it because she wants to make sure it is accurate and includes as much information as possible. Also, she has been receiving additional

requests for information and statistical information from other departments. She would like to include some of those things because they have come up during the discussions. It takes a tremendous amount of time.

Corson – If they need the information for the RFP process, then they are looking at an RFP in October at the earliest. He wants the CBO's to know that because there are some programs that may be sunseting and it will be a concern. Some of the programs have been supporting what has been going on as far as work and keeping these people from reentering the system. They can have a smaller group meet and look at the analysis in an objective way to bring it back and at that point determine what the categories are. Waterman – Stated that he was hoping it would be faster than that. Corson – Affirmed he did too and the subcommittee had already talked about meeting next week.

Kuge – Stated that the subcommittee could meet earlier to develop priorities and then get the data. Corson – Added that they know that it is going to be things like treatment, housing, and domestic violence. Merickel – Stated Probation has the six month data. Youngblood – Offered to donate staff to help to expedite the process and he also has data. Merickel – Stated that Ms. Jamison is the hardest working person. If things are not done, it is not because she is not working. She works non-stop and he appreciates everything she does. Waterman – Stated not to wait until September.

Goh – Asked that if the subcommittee needs specific data have Ms. Jamison to prioritize. Corson – Stated that if the CCP is comfortable with six month data and the current stuff they can get from the key departments, then that is great. Youngblood – Stated that if they have to wait until October or November, then some of the non-profits that provide services will be out of business and they will be in trouble. Kuge – Stated that he thinks they can rely on the six month data plus any updated information that can be provided by the Sheriff and Probation but for Ms. Jamison to present all that current data to this group, she would need that help.

Corson – Stated he does not want to come back in August and say this is what they are seeing and then saying they are still waiting for the analysis. McNally – Indicated that it would be a validation, because he does not think the data will change significantly. Suggested moving forward and utilize the data when it becomes available.

Jamison – Stated that they have a lot of data from the Sheriff's Department. She and Greg Gonzales talk quite often and share a lot of information. She does not wait three months, she gathers the information; however, putting in into a formalized report to the extent it was done last time is a tremendous amount of work. The subcommittee can get started tomorrow. As they go along through the process, she can provide preliminary information as she has a lot already.

Waterman – Indicated that the original suggestion was to have an administrative coordinator in Mental Health run the RFP's; however does not think that is a good use of the funds to shell out \$100,000 for a staff member to do RFP's for \$900,000. There are various other departments such as Department of Human Services and maybe ETR that do RFP's for social services and they can share the work, or if that does not work, worst case scenario would be have someone internally to do all the work. They can fill it with an extra help person for a period of time using that money. He does not want to do that, but there are limits to what his staff can do especially if they try to do four or five RFP's. Kuge – Commented that he thinks Mental Health would be in charge of the RFP's. Waterman – Stated he asked the subcommittee to not think of this as Mental Health being in charge of the RFP's; it must be a group effort. Kuge – Affirmed that people are going to have to help. Waterman – Asked Mr. Kuge if he will help. Kuge – Answered that his staff certainly will. There are departments here that would be willing to help out in the process. Sheriff Youngblood said he would help out with this process. Waterman – Stated it depends on what the RFP's are for and who has commonalities in those areas. Kuge – Reiterated every department would be willing to participate. Lewis – Stated that ETR would be willing to help. Waterman – It is something that actually the public should know, they are not spending money on administrative duplication but really trying to put every dollar into community services. Kuge – Affirmed that using existing staff to do that rather than spending more money to have a person do that is a better use of public funds.

Public Comment: NONE

MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POSTPONEMENT OF PRESENTATION OF THE STATISTICAL/DATA REPORTS FOR THE NEXT MEETING TO BE HELD ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 AT 8:30 A.M., PROBATION OFFICE, 5121 STOCKDALE HIGHWAY

Youngblood-McNally: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

- 9) Next CCP Meeting
To be determined –

Kuge – Asked that since they have a CCP meeting tentatively scheduled for August 22nd, do they want to move it to September 19th? Williamson – Stated it matters what happens with the Executive Committee vote. Kuge – Asked if they want to hold off on setting a meeting date prior to September 19th? Suggested they could adjourn as the CCP, then convene as the Executive Committee and then reconvene as the CCP. Moore – Suggested they consider a motion to adopt whatever meeting schedule the Executive Committee adopts. Kuge – Asked County Counsel if that is ok. Brown – Answered yes.

MOTIONED TO ADOPT THE MEETING SCHEDULE APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Moore-Williamson: All Ayes
MOTION PASSED

- 10) ADJOURNED AS CCP AT 11:30 A.M.

CONVENED TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT 11:30 A.M.

Executive Committee Members: Chief Kuge, Judge Bush, District Attorney Green, Public Defender Titus, Sheriff Youngblood, Director Dr. Waterman, Chief Williamson

ROLL CALL: All members present except for the following, Bush (Terry McNally for Bush), Titus (Konrad Moore for Titus)

- 1) Minutes from Executive Committee Meeting of June 27, 2012 –

Chief Kuge apologized for the minutes not being ready; minutes will be provided in a timely manner from this point forward.

MOTIONED TO TABLE APPROVAL OF JUNE 27, 2012 MINUTES TO NEXT MEETING
Williamson-Waterman: All Ayes
MOTION PASSED

- 2) Public Presentations

The public is provided the opportunity to comment on agenda items at the time those agenda items are discussed by the Executive Committee. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the Executive Committee. Executive Committee members may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification and, through the Executive Committee, make a referral to staff for factual information or request staff to report back to the Executive Committee at a later meeting. **SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD PRIOR TO MAKING A PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.**

NO ONE HEARD

- 3) Executive Committee Member Announcements or Reports

Executive Committee members may make an announcement or a report on their own activities. They may ask a question for clarification, make a referral to staff or take action to have staff place a matter of business on a future agenda (Gov. Code Sec. 54954.2[a]) –
NONE MADE

- 4) Establish Subcommittee to Determine Service Gaps and Recommendation of Evidence-Based Approaches (Waterman)

Discuss full CCP recommendation of the creation of a subcommittee for service gap analysis and recommendation of evidence-based approaches, subsequently leading to development of an RFP (request for proposal) process for service providers (Fiscal Impact: None) –

Kuge – Asked if a vote is needed on this item. Brown – Stated the vote at the CCP meeting was to recommend to the Executive Committee that a subcommittee be established, so a vote is needed for this item.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION BY CCP TO ESTABLISH A SUBCOMMITTEE AND APPOINT DR. CHRISTINE LIZARDI-FRAZIER, MR. TOM CORSON AND MS. PAT CHEADLE

Waterman-Youngblood: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

- 5) 2nd Draft – County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13
Review and discuss 2nd draft (as recommended by the full CCP) of County of Kern Public Safety Realignment Act Implementation Plan for FY 12/13 and make determination of FY 12/13 AB 109 funding allocations (Fiscal Impact: \$23,451,975) –

Moore – Requested his remarks, comments, and observations during the general meeting be incorporated into the request for approval. Kuge – Stated he will include them in the Board letter.

Public Comment: NONE

MOTIONED TO DIRECT CHAIRPERSON TO SUBMIT FINAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND ALLOCATIONS AS RECOMMENDED BY CCP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR APPROVAL
ROLE CALL VOTE: Kuge-Yes; McNally (for Bush)-Yes; Green-Yes; Moore (for Titus)-No; Youngblood-Yes; Waterman-Yes; Williamson-Yes

Youngblood-Waterman: Ayes – 6, Noes – 1

MOTION PASSED

- 6) Carryover of Unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 Funds
Review recommendation of full CCP for determination of carryover amounts for unexpended FY 11/12 AB 109 funds (Fiscal Impact: \$3,449,838) –

Public Comment: NONE

MOTIONED TO DIRECT CHAIRPERSON TO SUBMIT FINAL CARRYOVER PLAN AS RECOMMENDED BY CCP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR APPROVAL
ROLE CALL VOTE: Kuge-Yes; McNally (for Bush)-Yes; Green-Yes; Moore (for Titus)-Yes; Youngblood-Yes; Waterman-Yes; Williamson-Yes

Youngblood-Waterman: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

- 7) Staff Request to Postpone Statistics/Data Reports for July 25, 2012
Discuss staff request to postpone presentation of statistics/data reports, originally scheduled for July 25, 2012, due to consideration of time spent on FY 12/13 plan and allocations –

Williamson – Asked for clarification that the Plan will be proposed to the Board of Supervisors and a four-fifths vote is needed. If not, then the CCP must reconvene sooner. Kuge – Answered that is correct. Waterman – Stated that it is actually the other way around, a four-fifths vote is required to overturn it. Williamson – Asked when the Board of Supervisors meets. Kuge – Answered that it depends on when he can get in on the Board calendar. It cannot be July 24th because that is set aside for budget hearings. He will try for July 31st.

Public Comment: NONE

MOTIONED TO APPROVE CCP RECOMMENDATION TO POSTPONE PRESENTATION OF STATISTICS/DATA REPORTS TO THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 MEETING

Waterman-Youngblood: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

8) Next Executive Committee Meeting
To be determined –

Kuge – Stated he would like to schedule a meeting after the July 31st Board meeting if the Board does not approve the Plan. If it passes, then he could cancel the meeting because if the Board rejects the Plan, they will have to meet as soon as possible. He could send out a cancellation of that meeting if it is passed by the Board. He proposed August 15th so Dr. Waterman could attend. Waterman – Stated the Chair should set the meeting not based on his availability. Kuge – Asked for a motion to schedule a meeting on August 15th or 22nd.

Moore – Suggested authorizing the Chair to call a meeting in the unlikely event the Plan was not approved. Kuge – Answered he could do that. Youngblood – Asked if there was a requirement to announce the meeting date to the public meeting ahead of time. Kuge – Answered the notification timeframe is 72 hours and he would know on the 31st, he could announce in plenty of time. Moore – Asked if it is a question of timing, of how soon they need the next meeting. Kuge – Answered the Executive Committee is giving him the authorization to schedule a meeting depending on how the Board votes on the Plan.

Public Comment: NONE

MOTIONED TO AUTHORIZE CHAIRPERSON TO SET A MEETING PRIOR TO THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 MEETING, IF NEEDED, BASED ON OUTCOME OF JULY 31, 2012 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING

Moore-Green: All Ayes

MOTION PASSED

9) ADJOURNED AS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT 11:52 A.M.