

AGENDA

ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 PUBLIC SAFETY

ASSEMBLYMEMBER REGINALD B. JONES-SAWYER SR., CHAIR

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 2015
1:30 P.M. - STATE CAPITOL ROOM 437

VOTE ONLY ITEMS		
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
0690	GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES	2
ISSUE 1	2014 DROUGHT FUNDING	2
ISSUE 2	CHILD VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING FUND - AB 764 (SWANSON) CH. 465, STATUTES OF 2011	2
ISSUE 3	AMERICAN RED CROSS, CALIFORNIA CHAPTERS FUND- AB 511 (PAN) CH. 451, STATUTES OF 2013	2
ISSUE 4	RELOCATION OF THE RED MOUNTAIN COMMUNICATIONS SITE, DEL NORTE COUNTY	3
7870	VICTIM COMPENSATION AND GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BOARD	3
ISSUE 5	MISSING CHILDREN'S REWARD PROGRAM	3

ITEMS TO BE HEARD		
ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
0690	GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES	4
ISSUE 1	INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN	4
ISSUE 2	HEADQUARTERS COMPLEX, RANCHO CORDOVA: PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK OPERATIONS CENTER	7
7870	VICTIM COMPENSATION AND GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BOARD	10
ISSUE 3	TRANSFER OF THE GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BOARD TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES	10
5225	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION	14
ISSUE 4	CDCR - 2014 RECIDIVISM REDUCTION ALLOCATIONS	14
5227	BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS	18
ISSUE 5	RECIDIVISM REDUCTION IN THE COMMUNITY	18
7120	CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD	27
ISSUE 6	SUPERVISED POPULATION WORKFORCE TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM	27

VOTE ONLY ISSUES**0690 GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES****ISSUE 1: 2014 DROUGHT FUNDING**

The Governor's Budget proposal includes a one-time augmentation of \$4.372 million (General Fund) to cover costs associated with the current drought.

The funds will be used to pay the cost of existing staff redirected to work in support of the state's response to the drought. Many of the OES' positions are funded with federal funds. As such, when staff is redirected to support a state emergency and there is no federal declaration, the costs are not allowable under federal grants. Such costs need to be covered by state funds – primarily the General Fund.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Conform to action taken in Budget Subcommittee #3 hearing on March 4, 2015.

ISSUE 2: CHILD VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING - AB 764 (SWANSON) CH. 465, STATUTES OF 2011

The Governor's Budget proposal includes \$451,000 in 2015-16 and \$250,000 in 2016-17 (Child Victims of Human Trafficking Fund) to support the distribution of monies collected pursuant to the provisions AB 764.

AB 764 authorized the addition of the "Child Victims of Human Trafficking Fund" to the personal income tax return form as a voluntary contribution fund.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve proposal as budgeted.

ISSUE 3: AMERICAN RED CROSS, CA CHAPTERS- AB 511 (PAN) CH. 451, STATUTES OF 2013

The Governor's Budget proposal includes \$400,000 (American Red Cross, California Chapters Fund) in 2015-16 to support the distribution of monies collected pursuant to the provisions AB 511.

AB 511 created the "American Red Cross, California Chapters Fund" and adds it to the state personal income tax return form as a voluntary contribution fund.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve proposal as budgeted.

ISSUE 4: RELOCATION OF THE RED MOUNTAIN COMMUNICATIONS SITE, DEL NORTE COUNTY

The Governor's Budget proposal includes \$1.261 million (General Fund) for the working drawings phase of the OES' plan to relocate critical public safety communications equipment and operations currently housed at Red Mountain to three new communications sites.

The Red Mountain Communications Site currently provides critical communication functionality for state and local law enforcement, medical, and fire rescue entities (including 9-1-1 dispatch). The United States Forest Service and the Six Rivers National Forest Plan requires all communication facilities currently operating on Red Mountain to be removed by December 31, 2022. In order to meet this deadline, and to avoid interruption of public safety communications in the northwestern portion of the state, OES contends that this project must begin as soon as possible.

This project was initially authorized by the 2014-15 Budget Act. The entire project is expected to cost roughly \$20 million.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve proposal as budgeted.

7870 VICTIM COMPENSATION AND GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BOARD**ISSUE 5: MISSING CHILDREN'S REWARD PROGRAM**

The Governor's Budget proposal includes trailer bill language that would shift funding responsibility for the Missing Children's Reward Program from the Victims Compensation and Government Claims Board's Missing Children Reward Fund (MCR) to the Restitution Fund.

The MCR was established in 1986 with a one-time transfer of \$24,000 from the Victim Witness Assistance Fund to provide additional financial incentive (up to \$500) for witnesses providing information related to the whereabouts of missing children.

To date, no funds have been dispensed from this account. The requested trailer bill language would shift funding responsibility to the Restitution Fund providing greater capacity to pay rewards or claims.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve proposal as budgeted.

ITEMS TO BE HEARD

0690 GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

ISSUE 1: INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN

The issue before the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposal to provide \$500,000 from the Restitution Fund to increase support for the Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) non-competitive grant program to \$1 million per year.

PANELISTS

- Governor's Office of Emergency services
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Public Comment

BACKGROUND

The intent of the ICAC Program is to provide funding to better ensure that local law enforcement agencies are adequately equipped to investigate computer crimes that target our youth; to provide educational programs aimed at law enforcement officers, teachers, parents, and children; to serve as a forensic resource to law enforcement agencies within each service area; to pursue the prosecution of cases at the local, state, and federal level; and to participate in nationally-coordinated investigative efforts.

Cal OES requires each ICAC Task Force to follow the guidelines and protocols based upon the national ICAC guidelines/protocols for the investigation of child exploitation crimes. For further information regarding the national ICAC guidelines/protocols, please refer to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention internet link: www.ojjdp@doj.gov

Program Goals

Each ICAC Program Applicant is expected to meet each of the following program goals:

- Serve as a resource for communities and agencies within its geographic service area.
- Conduct both proactive and reactive investigations into the computer/technology crimes perpetrated against children and youth.
- Serve as a forensic resource to affiliate agencies and other agencies within the task force's geographical area of service.
- Assist with the effective prosecution of cases at the appropriate level.

- Respond to referrals from agencies (other task forces, federal partners, cyber tips, etc.).
- Engage in law enforcement and community outreach activities to include training, prevention, and educational activities.
- Formalize law enforcement partnerships through a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
- Participate in nationally-coordinated investigations

Historical Program Funding

Funding for the ICAC Program is derived from State Restitution funds with no match requirement. This funding opportunity serves to expand the activities of the five existing California ICAC Task Forces. The ICAC Task Force Program was created to assist local law enforcement agencies to enhance their investigative response to offenders who use the internet, online communication systems, or other computer technology to sexually exploit children. Funding for this and any subsequent year is subject to the continued appropriation in the California State Budget, as well as the satisfactory performance in meeting the ICAC Program's objectives.

In 2007-08, California's four federally recognized ICAC grant programs received \$1 million for operations from the State Restitution Fund (\$250,000 each for San Diego Police Department, Los Angeles Police Department, San Jose Police Department, and Sacramento Sheriff's Office).

In 2008-09, funding was reduced to \$500,000 (State Restitution Fund) statewide (reduced per program funding to \$125,000 each for San Diego Police Department, Los Angeles Police Department, San Jose Police Department, and Sacramento Sheriff's Office).

In 2011-12, the Fresno County Sheriff's Office became a federally recognized ICAC program; however, funding remained flat resulting in a reduction in funding to existing participants (per program funding was reduced to \$100,000 each for San Diego Police Department, Los Angeles Police Department, San Jose Police Department, Sacramento Sheriff's Office, and Fresno County).

2014-15 Grant Cycle

The funding cycle for the 2014-15 grant awards is 12 months (July 1, 2014, to June 30, 2015). A total of \$500,000 in funds is available for approved program activities during the grant cycle. Distribution of the award amount is allocated at \$100,000 for each recipient (San Diego Police Department, Los Angeles Police Department, San Jose Police Department, Sacramento Sheriff's Office, and Fresno County).

Additional information on the ICAC program can be found at:

<http://www.calema.ca.gov/GrantsProcessing/layouts/Displtem.aspx?List=a0ffeea6-5a86-4de1-b7d8-268add1d7015&ID=172&Web=345b2b9e-94a0-43c4-aebb-c89984ba6450>

QUESTIONS FOR OES

- 1) Will you please provide details on how this funding is currently being used?
- 2) Will you please provide details on how the proposed program expansion will augment the current service level?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve proposal as budgeted.

ISSUE 2: HEADQUARTERS COMPLEX, RANCHO CORDOVA: PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK OPERATIONS CENTER

The issue before the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposal to provide \$1.528 million (General Fund) to support the preliminary planning phase of the OES' plan to design and construct a new Public Safety Communications Network Operations Center at the OES' headquarters complex in Rancho Cordova.

PANELISTS

- Governor's Office of Emergency services
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Public Comment

BACKGROUND

California Public Safety Microwave Network (CAPSNET), which consists of more than 500 microwave towers and vaults across the state, has been in service for over 50 years and has evolved into a critical public safety communications network that the state's emergency responders depend on. The Office of Emergency Service (OES)' Public Safety Communication (PSC) Division oversees the operation of the state's microwave network through the Network Operations Center (NOC), located in Sacramento. The NOC serves several functions including:

- Serving as a central hub for all microwave circuits across the state.
- Monitoring all microwave system alarms.
- Monitoring all facility alarms that are connected to the alarm system.
- Troubleshooting circuits on analog backbone routes.
- Helping field staff to troubleshoot analog basebands and paths on analog backbone routes.
- Helping field staff to calibrate and perform preventive maintenance of the analog paths that traverse the system.
- Other staff operations duties as directed, including after-hours dispatching and trouble ticket reporting.

Problem

With the NOC playing key roles in the operation of the CAPSNET, it is critical that this facility remains functional at all times. Currently, the NOC is the state's single point for PSC staff to monitor the network, troubleshoot outages, and perform system repairs for the entire microwave system. Therefore, if the NOC were to become damaged or destroyed, the state's microwave network would be severely impacted potentially debilitating the state's public safety radio communications. The California Highway

Patrol, Department of Transportation, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and other public safety agencies depend on the microwave network for public safety radio communications for daily operations and responding to emergencies.

In addition, the existing NOC has been identified as seismically unsafe. The earthquake that occurred on August 24, 2014 in the Napa Valley was felt in the Sacramento area, underscoring the NOC's potential vulnerability to earthquakes and the need to diversify the NOC's single point of failure to ensure the critical microwave routes remain fully functional in times of need.

The Public Safety Microwave Network Strategic Plan released in March 2011 identified the need to establish a redundant NOC location; this need was reiterated in the Public Safety Microwave Network Roadmap issued in June 2013. OES has been working to modernize the microwave network and reduce the dependency on the antiquated analog feeds to the NOC by converting the microwave network from analog to digital. This will allow OES to decentralize all of the circuit terminations to the current NOC location and increase the resilience of the network.

Converting to digital requires installing new antennas, radios, and equipment to establish a secure, digital network in place of the current analog system. Upon completion of the next phase of the project connecting the Sacramento area microwave (referred to as the Sacramento Ring), all the circuits that connect at the current NOC location will instead interconnect at microwave vaults/towers (hubs) around the Sacramento Area. This interconnectivity will provide an opportunity to design and construct another NOC at a different location and eliminate the single point of failure that exists today.

Currently, inspecting or repairing microwave circuits or radio equipment at a remote site typically requires a minimum of two technicians, one of whom must be at a single hub location. Some conditions require additional technicians located at other remote sites. Troubleshooting and aligning the network's analog routes that terminate at the NOC are a significant challenge as the analog terminations can only be troubleshot and maintained by on-site controlled equipment at the NOC. The circuits are hardwired at the hub and the microwave routes terminate at the same hub so moving these terminations would be an extremely costly and time consuming effort. Moreover, moving the terminations would simply move the test and access point to another location without providing redundancy.

As such, the proposed project's scope also includes PSC working with a vendor to develop, test, and install remote interface test appliance (RITA) devices to eliminate the need for changes in hardwiring. Without implementing a RITA solution the cross-connections for more than 500 circuits would need to be hardwired and up to six microwave paths would need to be routed to the new, proposed NOC location at the OES headquarters. The significant staff hours, cost to duplicate the hardwiring and an outage to public safety radio service make this a non-viable option.

Strategically locating the RITA devices will allow PSC technicians to troubleshoot and repair radio channels and microwave circuits without requiring a technician to be physically present at the existing NOC location. The advantage gained is the ability to perform testing and diagnosis from remote locations. This remote access will allow testing and repair of circuits from remote sites that may not be accessible to personnel during inclement weather. This remote access feature, along with the completion of the Sacramento Ring, will allow OES to perform the NOC's functions at an alternative location.

When a new NOC is developed at the OES headquarters complex, the existing NOC will continue to act as a radio vault like others in the public safety microwave network backbone and will also serve as the secondary NOC. Moving the primary microwave NOC and having a secondary NOC available will build in the redundancy described in the Public Safety Microwave Network Strategic Plan and in the Public Safety Microwave Network Roadmap.

One-time costs will include the construction of a telecommunication tower and one digital microwave pathway to provide an alternative path to connect to the microwave network. The current towers at the OES headquarters complex cannot support the additional weight loading and antenna placement for the microwave equipment that will be needed. Because the existing OES headquarters has been deemed an essential services building per the California Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act of 1986, any additions or modification to the facility must meet essential services criteria and be approved by the Division of the State Architect within the (DGS).

QUESTIONS FOR OES

- 1) Will you please provide a summary of the proposal and why it is necessary?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approve proposal as budgeted.

7870 VICTIM COMPENSATION AND GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BOARD**ISSUE 3: TRANSFER OF THE GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BOARD TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

The issue before the Subcommittee is the Governor's proposal to:

- 1) shift the Government Claims Program from the Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board to the Department of General Services beginning in 2016-17
- 2) allocate \$634,000 from the statewide surcharge administered by the Department of General Services to support the Government Claims Program.

PANELISTS

- Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Public Comment

BACKGROUND (PROVIDED BY LAO)

The Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (VCGCB) is a board within the Government Operations Agency that is comprised of three members: the Secretary of the Government Operations Agency, the State Controller, and a Governor's appointee. The VCGCB's primary responsibilities are administering four of the state's victim programs and the Government Claims Program. The Governor's 2015-16 budget proposes \$122 million (primarily from the Restitution Fund and federal funds) and 267 staff for VCGCB.

Government Claims Program. The Government Claims Program processes claims for money or damages against the state. Generally, anyone who wishes to file a lawsuit against the state or its employees must first go through the process administered under this program. In these cases, litigation against the state can only move forward to the courts if the board rejects or denies a claim. For example, a vendor doing business with the state could file a claim if it is not paid in a timely manner or if there is a financial dispute with its contract. If the board approves the claim, the state is required to pay it. If the board denies the claim, the vendor is allowed to bring suit against the state in court.

This process was established to allow the state to avoid litigation costs. In recent years, the program has processed roughly 7,000 claims annually.

As part of the 2004-05 budget package, the Legislature authorized a fee-based funding structure for the Government Claims Program. Specifically, the program charges a \$25 filing fee to the individual or company submitting each claim against the state. The program also charges state departments for all claims that the board approves by applying a charge of up to 15 percent of the dollar value on all approved claims. The resulting revenue is used to fund the staff who administer the Government Claims Program. The practice of charging departments for approved claims was established to incentivize departments to better manage their contracts to avoid having disputes that must be handled by the Government Claims Program.

The 2014-15 Budget Act includes 12 positions and \$1.5 million for the Government Claims Program. However, due to a shortfall in revenue from the above funding structure, VCGCB has reduced the number of staff for the Government Claims Program to nine positions and \$1.3 million. While the specific amount of revenue available in the current year is not yet known, the administration indicates that even with the reduction in staffing the program could have a deficiency and require General Fund support in 2014-15. The administration estimates that revenue will continue to fall short of the amount necessary to support the program in future years.

Department of General Services (DGS). The DGS is responsible for providing a broad range of services to state departments. The DGS generally funds its operations through fees charged to client departments. One such fee is known as the “statewide surcharge.” The statewide surcharge is intended to provide an equitable method for DGS to recover costs that are not connected to specific services received by individual client departments. The surcharge is assessed on all state departments based on their staffing levels. Currently, the surcharge generates about \$35 million per year.

LAO ASSESSMENT

Program Shift to DGS Is Reasonable. We find that shifting the Government Claims Program to DGS is reasonable. This is because the Government Claims Program provides services to all state departments, which is consistent with the existing responsibilities of DGS.

Existing Government Claims Funding Structure Appears Successful. The existing funding structure for the Government Claims Program was established to create incentives for departments to better manage their contracts and settle issues on their own. The incentive model for the program appears to have been successful at reducing the number of claims that are made against the state. For example, prior to the

establishment of the funding structure, VCGCB received roughly 10,000 claims annually. In 2013-14, under the new funding structure, VCGCB received 6,300 claims.

Shifting Program Funding to the Statewide Surcharge Loses Incentives. Under the Governor's proposal, the Government Claims Program would no longer be supported by filing fees and charges to departments beginning in 2016-17. The program would receive all of its funding from the statewide surcharge. By eliminating the existing funding structure, the proposal would also eliminate the associated incentives that appear to be effective. While the statewide surcharge may be an appropriate source to partially fund the Government Claims Program, we do not believe it should be used to fully fund the program. This is because only utilizing the statewide surcharge would result in all departments paying the costs to support the program, regardless of whether any claims are filed against them.

LAO RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Approve Governor's proposal to shift Government Claims Program to DGS, but make this shift in 2015-16.
- 2) Approve the Governor's proposal to partially fund the program with the DGS statewide surcharge in 2015-16.
- 3) Adopt an alternative to the Governor's ongoing funding proposal beginning in 2016-17 by approving a funding structure similar to what the Governor proposes for 2015-16.

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff concurs with the LAO's assessment. Specifically, staff is concerned with the idea that offending departments would no longer be held individually responsible for their actions resulting in claims and litigation against the state. Meanwhile, state entities operating in a manner that avoids claims and litigation against the state would be forced to shoulder additional costs. Furthermore, based on claim filing data, it appears the fee and surcharge have been effective in reducing the number of claims filed against the state. It would be unfortunate if the proposed change resulted in a rebound in the number of claims filed against the state.

Considering the above, and acknowledging the program's solvency issues, staff suggests a blended funding mechanism that continues to incentivize desired behaviors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Approve Governor's proposal to shift Government Claims Program to DGS.
- 2) Approve the Governor's proposal to partially fund the program with the DGS statewide surcharge in 2015-16.
- 3) Adopt an alternative to the Governor's ongoing funding proposal beginning in 2016-17, by approving a funding structure that continues to incentivize desired behaviors.

5225 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION**ISSUE 4: CDCR - 2014 RECIDIVISM REDUCTION ALLOCATIONS**

The issue before the Subcommittee is an update on the 2014 Recidivism Reduction allocations made to the CDCR.

PANELISTS

- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Public Comment

BACKGROUND

In September 2013, the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed, SB 105 (Steinberg and Huff), Chapter 310, Statutes of 2013 to address the federal three-judge panel order requiring California to reduce its prison population to no more than 137.5 percent of system-wide design capacity by December 31, 2013. SB 105 provided the CDCR with a \$315 million (General Fund) appropriation in 2013-14. SB 105 also authorized the department to enter into contracts to secure sufficient inmate housing to meet the court order and to avoid the early release of inmates which might otherwise be necessary to comply with the Court's order. Lastly, SB 105 specified that if the federal court modified its order, a share of the any resulting savings from the \$315 million appropriation would be deposited into the newly-established Recidivism Reduction Fund (RRF).

Upon enactment of the 2014-15 Budget, the amount of SB 105 savings deposited in the RRF was \$91 million. The following chart on the next page provides updated information on some of the 2014 RRF allocations made to the CDCR.

Recidivism Reduction Programs Update	RRF (in millions)	Projected Expenditures*	Summary of key events:
Community Reentry (CDCR)	20	7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2014- Proposals sent out. • September 2014-28 proposals received. Ten were discussed as potential sites for FY 14/15. Two sites were discussed for FY 15/16. • December 2014-Designs and Environmental Standards conducted visits and completed assessments. • January 2015-DRP and DAI met with potential contractor to discuss draft scope of work (SOW). Design and Environmental Standards revisited potential sites. • SOW has been completed; legal has reviewed it and currently negotiating per day rate with prospective bidders. (Please see RRF Attachment A for the Male Community Reentry Program draft SOW) • DAI currently drafting memos regarding classification, endorsements, exclusionary criteria, etc.
Cognitive Behavioral Treatment at Contracted Facilities (CDCR)	3.794	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 23, 2014 – Contract for a Substance Abuse Treatment program at California City executed. • November 4-5, 2014 – MCCF site visits and initial discussions of programming for the facilities. • November 21, 2014 – Meeting between CDCR and GEO Group on Reentry Hub programming at three sites. • January 6, 2015 – Sent draft SOW to GEO for review. (Please see RRF Attachment C for the Desert View Modified Community Correctional Facility In-State Contracted Facility Reentry Program draft SOW) • Current Status – Pending SOW questions and Budget Rate Sheets from GEO. • Space issues need to be resolved before an expansion into public entity MCCF's can be viable.
Case Managers at Parolee Outpatient Clinics (Pilot)	2.487	1.3	<p>The pilot program hiring will be rolled out, in phases, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase I – Counties of Sacramento (4 LCSW's) and Los Angeles (6 LCSW's / 1 Supervisor) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application process ended (November 2014) ○ Short hold-up due to paperwork issues with Office of Personnel Services (OPS). This was corrected and everything is

			<p>moving through the hiring process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All interviews for Phase I LCSW's completed (January 2015) ○ 9 tentative LCSW offers completed (made & accepted) (January 2015) ○ 1 pending tentative LCSW offer, candidate is out of the country (January 2015) ○ The interviews for the supervisor position are completed (January 22, 2015). Pending Tentative Offer to be made. ○ Anticipate completion by April 2015 ● Phase II – San Francisco (2 LCSW's) and Santa Clara (2 LCSW's) Counties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ahead of schedule for advertisements (February 2015) ○ Certification lists ordered (January 2015) ○ Anticipate completion by May 2015 ● Phase III – Kern (2 LCSW's) and San Diego (4 LCSW's) Counties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ahead of schedule for advertisements (February 2015) ○ Certification lists ordered (January 2015)
Cal-ID Expansion (CDCR)		1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● August 29, 2014 – Initial meeting between CDCR and DMV on Interagency Agreement Expansion ● September 29, 2014 – Sent draft SOW to DMV for review ● November 21, 2014 – Meeting between CDCR and DMV on expansion ● November 21, 2014 – CDCR distributed statewide policy memorandum on Cal-ID Expansion ● November 26, 2014 – Hired Cal-ID Unit supervisor ● December 2014 – Began advertising for CDCR institutional staff ● December 31, 2014 – Received SOW edits from DMV ● February 2, 2015 – Training for Trainers scheduled for staff that will provide training statewide on the Cal-ID process
Community Colleges Grants for Inmate Education (CDCR)	2	2	<p>Phase 1: Interagency Agreement initiation and pre-program work (December 2014 to January 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interagency Agreement between CCCCCO and CDCR ● California Community Colleges Board approval & CDCR final approval

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey of colleges currently serving inmates <p>Phase 2: Interagency Agreement finalization and program development (January to March 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire staff • Program development and process for site selection <p>Phase 3: Sites chosen and program launched (March-June 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot sites selected • CCCCO staff will provide technical assistance to college/prison pilot sites <p>Phase 4: Monitoring and evaluation of program (Spring 2015 to 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCCO staff to monitor progress and provide program oversight • Refine best method for assessing and evaluating final program outcomes
--	--	--	--

QUESTIONS FOR THE CDCR

- 1) Please provide a brief update on the above-mentioned RRF funded programs and any related issues the Legislature should be aware of.

5227 BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ISSUE 5: RECIDIVISM REDUCTION IN THE COMMUNITY

The issue before the Subcommittee is an update on the 2014 allocation for Recidivism Reduction in the Community.

PANELISTS

- Board of State and Community Corrections
- Lee Seale, Chief Probation Officer, Sacramento County Probation Department
- Toni White, Criminal Defense Attorney and Co-Founder of ASCEND
- Christine Morse, Criminal Defense Attorney and Co-Founder of ASCEND
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Public Comment

BACKGROUND

The Board of State and Community Corrections' 2014-15 budget included an \$8 million appropriation, from the Recidivism Reduction Fund, in support of Recidivism Reducing programs operated by nongovernmental entities in California's communities.

Specifically, this funding stream was established to create a statewide competitive grant program intended to fund community recidivism and crime reduction services, including, but not limited to, delinquency prevention, homelessness prevention, and reentry services. The program parameters and county grant specifics are included in Penal Code Section 1233.10.

Penal Code Section 1233.10 reads as follows:

(a) Upon agreement to accept funding from the Recidivism Reduction Fund, created in Section 1233.9, a county board of supervisors, in collaboration with the county's Community Corrections Partnership, shall develop, administer, and collect and submit data to the Board of State and Community Corrections regarding a competitive grant program intended to fund community recidivism and crime reduction services, including, but not limited to, delinquency prevention, homelessness prevention, and reentry services. The funding shall be allocated to counties by the State Controller's Office from

Item 5227-101-3259 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2014–15 according to the following schedule:

Alameda	\$250,000	Mariposa	\$10,000	Santa Clara	\$500,000
Alpine	\$10,000	Mendocino	\$25,000	Santa Cruz	\$50,000
Amador	\$10,000	Merced	\$50,000	Shasta	\$50,000
Butte	\$50,000	Modoc	\$10,000	Sierra	\$10,000
Calaveras	\$10,000	Mono	\$10,000	Siskiyou	\$10,000
Colusa	\$10,000	Monterey	\$100,000	Solano	\$100,000
Contra Costa	\$250,000	Napa	\$50,000	Sonoma	\$100,000
Del Norte	\$10,000	Nevada	\$25,000	Stanislaus	\$100,000
El Dorado	\$50,000	Orange	\$500,000	Sutter	\$25,000
Fresno	\$250,000	Placer	\$50,000	Tehama	\$25,000
Glenn	\$10,000	Plumas	\$10,000	Trinity	\$10,000
Humboldt	\$50,000	Riverside	\$500,000	Tulare	\$100,000
Imperial	\$50,000	Sacramento	\$250,000	Tuolumne	\$25,000
Inyo	\$10,000	San Benito	\$25,000	Ventura	\$250,000
Kern	\$250,000	San Bernardino	\$500,000	Yolo	\$50,000
Kings	\$50,000	San Diego	\$500,000	Yuba	\$25,000
Lake	\$25,000	San Francisco	\$250,000		
Lassen	\$10,000	San Joaquin	\$250,000		
Los Angeles	\$1,600,000	San Luis Obispo	\$50,000		
Madera	\$50,000	San Mateo	\$250,000		
Marin	\$50,000	Santa Barbara	\$100,000		

(b) For purposes of this section, “community recidivism and crime reduction service provider” means a nongovernmental entity or a consortium or coalition of nongovernmental entities, that provides community recidivism and crime reduction services, as described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (c), to persons who have been released from the state prison, a county jail, a juvenile detention facility, who are under the supervision of a parole or probation department, or any other person at risk of becoming involved in criminal activities.

(c) (1) A community recidivism and crime reduction service provider shall have a demonstrated history of providing services, as described in paragraph (2), to the target

population during the five years immediately prior to the application for a grant awarded pursuant to this section.

(2) A community recidivism and crime reduction service provider shall provide services that are designed to enable persons to whom the services are provided to refrain from engaging in crime, reconnect with their family members, and contribute to their communities. Community recidivism and crime reduction services may include all of the following:

- (A) Self-help groups.
- (B) Individual or group assistance with basic life skills.
- (C) Mentoring programs.
- (D) Academic and educational services, including, but not limited to, services to enable the recipient to earn his or her high school diploma.
- (E) Job training skills and employment.
- (F) Truancy prevention programs.
- (G) Literacy programs.
- (H) Any other service that advances community recidivism and crime reduction efforts, as identified by the county board of supervisors and the Community Corrections Partnership.
- (I) Individual or group assistance with referrals for any of the following:
 - (i) Mental and physical health assessments.
 - (ii) Counseling services.
 - (iii) Education and vocational programs.
 - (iv) Employment opportunities.
 - (v) Alcohol and drug treatment.
 - (vi) Health, wellness, fitness, and nutrition programs and services.
 - (vii) Personal finance and consumer skills programs and services.
 - (viii) Other personal growth and development programs to reduce recidivism.
 - (ix) Housing assistance.

(d) Pursuant to this section and upon agreement to accept funding from the Recidivism Reduction Fund, the board of supervisors, in collaboration with the county's Community Corrections Partnership, shall grant funds allocated to the county, as described in subdivision (a), to community recidivism and crime reduction service providers based on the needs of their community.

(e) (1) The amount awarded to each community recidivism and crime reduction service provider by a county shall be based on the population of the county, as projected by the Department of Finance, and shall not exceed the following:

(A) One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in a county with a population of over 4,000,000 people.

(B) Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in a county with a population of 700,000 or more people but less than 4,000,000 people.

(C) Twenty five thousand dollars (\$25,000) in a county with a population of 400,000 or more people but less than 700,000 people.

(D) Ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) in a county with a population of less than 400,000 people.

(2) The total amount of grants awarded to a single community recidivism and crime reduction service provider by all counties pursuant to this section shall not exceed one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000).

(f) The board of supervisors, in collaboration with the county's Community Corrections Partnership, shall establish minimum requirements, funding criteria, and procedures for the counties to award grants consistent with the criteria established in this section.

(g) A community recidivism and crime reduction service provider that receives a grant under this section shall report to the county board of supervisors or the Community Corrections Partnership on the number of individuals served and the types of services provided, consistent with paragraph (2) of subdivision (c). The board of supervisors or the Community Corrections Partnership shall report to the Board of State and Community Corrections any information received under this subdivision from grant recipients.

(h) Of the total amount granted to a county, up to 5 percent may be withheld by the board of supervisors or the Community Corrections Partnership for the payment of administrative costs.

(i) Any funds allocated to a county under this section shall be available for expenditure for a period of four years and any unexpended funds shall revert to the state General

Fund at the end of the four-year period. Any funds not encumbered with a community recidivism and crime reduction service provider one year after allocation of grant funds to counties shall immediately revert to the state General Fund.

Board of State and Community Corrections

Community Recidivism Reduction Grants Survey on County Progress

No.	County Name	Question 1: Has your county completed the development of your competitive grant award process?	Question 2: When do you anticipate disbursing the Community Recidivism grant awards to the selected community service provider(s)?
1	Alameda	No	60-90 days.
2	Butte	Yes	60-90 days.
3	Calaveras	Yes	June 10, 2015.
4	Colusa	Yes	May - June 2015.
5	Contra Costa	Yes	July 1, 2015.
6	El Dorado	In progress	Before December 2015.
7	Glenn	No	Unsure.
8	Humboldt	No	Fiscal Year 15/16.
9	Kern	No	August 1, 2015.
10	Kings	Yes	April 20, 2015.
11	Lake	No	Unknown.
12	Lassen	Yes	Disbursed in March 2015.
13	Madera	County declined to pursue	Not applicable.
14	Marin	Yes	Done.
15	Mariposa	Yes	May 2015.
16	Mendocino	Yes	June 5, 2015.
17	Merced	Yes	Within 6 months.
18	Modoc	In progress	Beginning of Fiscal Year 15/16.
19	Mono	County declined to pursue	Not applicable.
20	Monterey	Yes	Within the next 6 weeks.
21	Napa	Yes	Within the next 60 days.
22	Orange	In progress	Fall 2015.
23	Placer County	In progress	Within the next 120 days.
24	Plumas	Yes	Start of 2016 Fiscal Year.
25	Riverside	No	By the end of the current Fiscal Year.
26	Sacramento	Yes	In the coming months.
27	San Benito	No	July 1, 2015.
28	San Bernardino	Yes	Contracts will be effective August 1, 2015.
29	San Diego	No	Unsure.
30	San Joaquin	In progress	April 2015.
31	San Luis Obispo	Yes	June 2015.
32	San Mateo	Yes	June/July 2015.
33	Santa Barbara	Yes	Within next 30 days.
34	Santa Cruz	In progress	June-July 2015.
35	Shasta	Yes	May 2015.
36	Siskiyou	No	Fiscal Year 2014-2015.
37	Solano	Yes	May 2015.
38	Sonoma	No	June 2015.
39	Stanislaus	Yes	May 2015.
40	Tehama	No	Unsure.
41	Trinity	Yes	Prior to June 30, 2015.
42	Tuolumne	Yes	After April 7, 2015.
43	Yolo	Yes	May 2015.
44	Yuba	Yes	April 2015.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY'S PROGRESS ON FUNDING RECIDIVISM REDUCTION IN THE COMMUNITY

To date, no funds have gone out to providers; however, contracts are in place and ready to be signed after the CCP obtains the County Board's approval. The following is a list of community based organizations slated to receive grant funding and their future contractual obligations (as specified in their grant proposals):

1. Strategies for Change

- Contractor shall employ one half-time Reentry Case Manager (RCM) who will work twenty hours per week and carry a caseload of up to twenty participants.
- The RCM will complete assessments to identify needs and resources to develop a reentry plan specific to the participant.
- The RCM will deliver post release reentry services, improving both day to day functioning and overall quality of life.
- RCM shall complete a weekly schedule of events for participants, to include weekly meetings for ongoing needs assessment, risk identification, follow up, and outcome tracking.
- RCM will conduct home visits with each participant bi-weekly until stable.
- RCM will work with clients for 4-6 months, as necessary.
- Contractor shall provide community outreach through the distribution of brochures, flyers, public service announcements, and direct contact with treatment providers, community centers, and other locations where released individuals will have access.

2. Pacific Educational Services

- Contractor shall provide Moral Reconciliation Therapy to include substance abuse and criminal thinking treatment.
- Contractor shall provide these services in 90 minute groups, two times per week.
- Contractor shall provide at least 1,200 90 minute group sessions.
- Contractor shall provide counseling services to a minimum of 40 participants for 50 minute individual sessions.
- Contractor will provide at least 120 50 minute individual sessions.

3. Ascend

- Contractor shall provide Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for one year.
- Contractor shall provide services to 10-12 offenders.
- Contractor shall provide services for no less than 4 months and no more than 12, per the grant period.
- Contractor will provide an average of no less than two three-hour classes per week of assistance to each client.
- Contractor shall assign homework and field trips.

- Contractor shall provide mentoring as needed.
- Contractor shall provide a daily check-in to each offender, including holidays, weekends, and sick days.
- Contractor will assess students referred by court, probation, law enforcement, the career center, or who is self-referred.
- Contractor shall admit students on a staggered basis, so that 1-3 students will be admitted each month for the first six months.

4. Volunteers of America

- Contractor shall hire 1 Direct Services staff member to provide services.
- Contractor shall provide services to assist in transitioning clients from residential facilities to their own living quarters for one year.
- The Direct Services staff member will connect in person with client on a weekly to bi-weekly basis for three months after exiting the program.
- The Direct Services staff member shall assist the client with connecting to other services offered both within the agency and outside of VOA.
- Contractor shall provide a 90 day reintegration program upon exiting the residential program.
- Contractor shall serve approximately 25 clients per quarter once they have successfully completed the reintegration program.
- Contractor will work with clients referred by probation, Department of Human Assistance, and their own program.

5. Eternity Challenge

- Contractor shall employ one Full Time Employee (FTE) to provide 40 hours of mentorship, coaching, and comprehensive community service navigation per week for an average of 24 clients in one of several transitional houses.
- Services are to be provided at the following transition housing locations:
 1. 1117 Carmelita, Sacramento, CA 95838 – 30 day Orientation house
 2. 5933 Sutter, Carmichael, CA 95608 – Sutter Long Term Housing
 3. 1515 Nogales St, Sacramento, CA 95838 – Women's Transition units
 4. 4141 Soledad, Sacramento, CA 95820 – Restoration House/Recovery units
 5. 4200 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677 – Primary intake and assessment
- This FTE will provide an average of no less than two hours per week of assistance to each client.
- Contractor shall employ one FTE to assist formerly incarcerated employees, and an additional 24 employees hired in 2015/16.
- This FTE will provide on the job training and career coaching, along with community service navigation.

- Each staff person will receive an initial 16 hours of training and an additional six hours of training per month in: recovery and reentry issues, mentoring skills, communication, coaching skills, and team building.

All contract scopes also include the following:

- Statistics/data regarding the program services and objectives shall be maintained by the Contractor and monthly reports shall be submitted to the County regarding the type and quantity of services.
- An annual report related to program services and statistics will be provided by the Contractor prior to September 1st of each year to the County.

ASCEND

WHAT is Ascend?

An action-based, cognitive behavioral, personal growth program that addresses the needs of each student, and *can be done in lieu of jail time if the judge approves*. Ascend addresses the *underlying cause* of criminal behavior rather than the traditional approach of *managing only the symptoms*. In a positive, uplifting environment, students become aware of the thinking patterns that led them to criminal behavior. The concept of criminal thinking patterns, and awareness of the same, is a constant theme. Through this process, Ascend reduces recidivism and makes our community safer. Throughout the program, students are taught to apply the themes of getting the right information and making the right decision to better their health, increase their education, move toward a career, avoid crime and violations of probation, manage their time and finances, build a pro-social network, and develop pro-social attitudes. The aim of teaching students to change their criminal thinking patterns and gain the skills to make positive life changes allows them to *exceed* the goal of staying out of custody and *achieve* the goal of living a fulfilling life. In this way, an ex-offender becomes a positive, productive member of the community.

WHERE is Ascend?

Classes are held Tuesdays and Thursdays, 4:30 to 7:30 p.m., at the Hillsdale Career Center, 5655 Hillsdale Blvd., off of Madison Avenue in Sacramento. The program may be attended, if the judge approves, by anyone who otherwise qualifies and can get transportation to that location, including people in counties outside of Sacramento.

WHEN did Ascend come into existence?

The Sacramento Criminal Justice Cabinet approved Ascend in December of 2010 and classes began in the summer of 2011. Ascend was developed over a 2-year period, utilizing evidence-based principles. The curriculum and ongoing instructor training are provided by Sacramento State University and the classroom is provided by the Sacramento Works Career Center.

WHY are judges ordering people into Ascend, sometimes in lieu of their jail time?

Incarceration provides punishment but rarely results in a one-time fix that prevents the person from committing more crime. Incarceration loses its value as a deterrent when a person is repeatedly incarcerated and, in some cases, incarceration makes it *more* likely that a person will return to crime.

Incarceration is also incredibly expensive and not a permanent option for the majority of offenders. ALL actors in the criminal justice system and in government recognize this. Beyond its value as punishment, incarceration does little to transform an offender into a positive, productive member of society. More people are arrested and more people are in jail in the United States than in any nation in the world. But the U.S. also has the highest rate of recidivism (going back to jail), so the system is not working.

Most people on probation or parole who want to change their life habits need helpful, personalized guidance to do so. Judges understand this and are giving people, depending on the case, a chance to change their lives. Judges recognize that the best route to protect the community is to address the underlying cause of criminal behavior rather than repeatedly managing the symptoms. Many judges look to incarceration to punish offenders while also seeking effective rehabilitation for offenders so that they can stop the cycle of recidivism.

If you or a loved one would like to participate in the Ascend program we recommend you contact Dan Koukol, to assist you in making the request. Mr. Koukol is very familiar with Ascend and is known statewide as a criminal sentencing expert.

QUESTIONS FOR THE BSCC

- 1) Please provide a brief progress report on the Recidivism Reduction in the Community program.

7120 CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD**ISSUE 6: SUPERVISED POPULATION WORKFORCE TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM**

The issue before the Subcommittee is an update on the 2014 allocation in support of the Supervised Population Workforce Training Grant Program.

PANELISTS

- California Workforce Investment Board
- Bob Lanter, Executive Director, California Workforce Association
- Erika Rincón Whitcomb, senior associate, PolicyLink
- Department of Finance
- Legislative Analyst's Office
- Public Comment

BACKGROUND

The Board of State and California Workforce Investment Boards' (CWIB) 2014-15 budget included a \$1 million appropriation, from the Recidivism Reduction Fund, in support of Supervised Population Workforce Training Grant Program as created by AB 2060 (V. M. Perez) Chapter 383, Statutes of 2014.

AB 2060 created the Supervised Population Workforce Training Grant Program, administered by the CWIB, to provide grant funding for vocational training and apprenticeship opportunities for offenders under county jurisdiction who are on probation, mandatory community supervision, or post-release community supervision.

Specifically, AB 2060:

- 1) Established the Supervised Population Workforce Training Grant Program to be administered by CWIB.
- 2) Required the grant program to be developed and implemented, as specified; and funded, upon appropriation from the Legislature, using money from the Recidivism Reduction Fund. The bill also provides that implementation of the program is contingent upon the CWIB Director notifying the Department of Finance that sufficient moneys have been appropriated for this specific grant program.

3) Require CWIB to administer the grant program as follows:

a) Develop criteria for the selection of grant recipients through a public application process, including the rating and ranking of applications that meet threshold criteria.

b) Design the grant program application process to ensure all of the following occurs:

i) There is fairness and competitiveness for smaller counties;

ii) There is fair and equitable geographic distribution of grant funds; and,

iii) There is greater consideration given to counties that have demonstrated a collaborative working relationship with local workforce investment boards and that currently have in place a workforce training program for the supervised population.

4) Requires the grant program to be competitively awarded through at least two rounds of funding, as specified, and provides that each county is eligible to apply but that a single application may include multiple counties applying jointly. Requires each application to include a partnership agreement between the county or counties and one or more local workforce investment boards that outline the actions each party agrees to undertake as part of the project proposed in the application:

5) Requires, at a minimum, each project proposed in the application to include a provision for an education and training assessment for each individual of the supervised population who participates in the project.

6) Provides that eligible uses of grant funds include, but are not limited to, vocational training, stipends for trainees, and apprenticeship opportunities for the supervised population. States that support services and job readiness activities are to serve as bridge activities that lead to enrollment in long-term training programs.

7) Provides that preference is to be awarded to applications for the following:

a) An application that proposes matching funds, including, but not limited to, moneys committed by local workforce investment boards, local governments, and private foundation funds;

b) An application submitted by a county that currently administers or participates in a workforce training program for the supervised population; and,

c) An application that proposes participation by one or more nonprofit community based organizations that serve the supervised population.

8) Requires an application to meet the following requirements:

a) Set a specific purpose for the use of the grant funds, as well as provide the baseline criteria and metrics by which the overall success of the grant project can be evaluated;

b) Define the specific subset of the supervised population, among the eligible supervised population that the grant money will serve;

c) Define the industry sector or sectors in which the targeted supervised population will be trained, including the current and projected workforce within

the region for those jobs, the range of wage rates, and the training and education requirements within those industry sectors; and,

d) Define the general methodology and training methods proposed to be used and explain the manner in which the progress of the targeted supervised population will be monitored during the grant period.

9) Requires a grant recipient, as a condition of receiving funds, to agree to provide information to CWIB in sufficient detail to allow CWIB to meet specified reporting requirements

10) States that eligible uses of grant funds include, but are not limited to, vocational training, stipends for trainees, and apprenticeship opportunities for the supervised population.

11) Requires grant recipients to report annually to CWIB regarding their use of the funds and workforce training program outcomes upon completion of the grant period.

12) Requires CWIB to submit a report, as specified, to the Legislature, using the reports from the grant recipients, by January 1, 2018, containing all the following information:

a) The overall success of the grant program, as specified;

b) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the grant program, as specified;

c) A recommendation on the long-term viability of local workforce investment board and county collaborations on workforce training programs for the supervised population;

d) A recommendation on the long-term viability of county workforce training programs for the supervised population; and,

e) In considering the overall success and effectiveness of the grant program, the report shall include a discussion of all of the following:

i) Whether the programs aligned with the workforce needs of high-demand sectors of the state and regional economies;

ii) Whether there was an active job market for the skills being developed where the member of the supervised population was likely to be released;

iii) Whether the program increased the number of members of the supervised population that obtained a marketable and industry or apprenticeship board-recognized certification, credential, or degree;

iv) Whether the program increased the number of the supervised population that successfully completed a job readiness basic skill bridge program and enrolled in a long term training program;

v) Whether there were formal or informal networks in the field that support finding employment upon release from custody; and,

vi) Whether the program led to employment in occupations with a livable wage.

13) Establishes that the provisions of this bill will sunset on January 1, 2021, unless extended.

QUESTIONS FOR THE CWIB

- 1) Please provide a brief progress report on the Supervised Population Workforce Training Grant Program.