

The decisions made by the ESC in the following pages  
have yet to be approved by the BSCC Board.

**BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
SENATE BILL (SB) 1022 ADULT LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM  
EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE  
DECEMBER 20, 2012 MEETING MINUTES**

<b>COMMITTEE CHAIR:</b>	Dean Growdon, Sheriff, Lassen County
<b>CO-CHAIR:</b>	Leroy Baca, Sheriff, Los Angeles County
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Board of State and Community Corrections 660 Bercut Drive Sacramento, CA 95811
<b>CONVENED:</b>	<b>ADJOURNED:</b>
December 20, 2012 1:05 pm	December 20, 2012 2:39 pm

**Present:**

**Executive Steering Committee Members:**

Dean Growdon, Sheriff, Lassen County; William D. Gore, Sheriff, San Diego County; Steve Freitas, Sheriff, Sonoma County; Terri Daly, Chief Administrative Officer, El Dorado County; Larry Spikes, County Administrative Officer, Kings County; Joni Gray, County Supervisor, Santa Barbara County; Federal Glover, County Supervisor, Contra Costa County; Scott MacDonald, Chief Probation Officer, Santa Cruz County; and Stephanie James, Chief Probation Officer, San Joaquin County.

**Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) Staff:**

Bob Takeshta, Deputy Director; Gary Wion, Deputy Director; Leslie Heller, Field Representative; Charlene Aboytes, Field Representative; John Kohls, PhD., Corrections Consultant; and, John Berner, PhD., Corrections Consultant.

**Minutes Prepared By:** Charlene Aboytes

Sheriff Dean Growdon welcomed the group. Ms. Heller asked that the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) members at each of the remote telephonic location sites introduce themselves. Sheriff Growdon then turned the floor over to Mr. Takeshta who covered general housekeeping topics and the introduction of Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) staff. Mr. Takeshta indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to have a focused discussion regarding the ESC's comments from their review of the draft Request for Proposals (RFP). He emphasized that this was a public meeting and that there would be opportunity for public comment. Sheriff Growdon acknowledged that the ESC received letters from the City and County of San Francisco, the County of San Mateo and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Referencing the draft SB 1022 Adult Local Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Financing Program Proposal Form, dated December 7, 2012, the committee reviewed the

**The decisions made by the ESC in the following pages  
have yet to be approved by the BSCC Board.**

comments provided by ESC member Mr. MacDonald. After considerable discussion, the committee agreed to the following changes to the proposal form.

**SECTION 4: NARRATIVE  
PROGRAM SPACE PROPOSALS**

D. Response to Realignment

Item 4. This sentence now reads: "Indicate the approach to alternatives to incarceration and how the program will assist in reducing the impact of realignment to the jail population."

Item 6. This sentence now reads: "Describe the approach to the principles and objectives of evidence-based programming that will be incorporated to reduce recidivism."

Item 7. This sentence was not accepted by the committee.

Item 9. This section now reads: "Describe the target population and the estimated numbers of individuals to be served daily and annually in the program space. Describe how these estimates were determined."

F. Budget Review and Reasonableness

Item 3. This section now reads: "Describe steps that the county has taken to minimize costs of this project. Include:

- a) Ways in which this project is planned that allows for the leveraging of other funds, e.g., federal funds, etc. for both construction and program delivery."

**BEDS AND PROGRAM SPACE PROPOSALS**

B. Project Need

Related to the Beds

Item 6. This section now reads: "Discuss the current approach to reducing the need for beds. Include:

- a) The range of alternative to incarceration that are currently in place.
- b) Data showing the effectiveness/impacts of these alternatives.
- c) Describe any plans underway or future plans to implement alternatives to incarceration and their anticipated results."

Related to the Program Space

Item 11. This sentence now reads: "Describe the gaps and deficiencies in current programming for custody and non-custody offenders and which of these gaps or deficiencies will be addressed with proposed program space funding."

Item 12. This sentence now reads: "Describe the need for programming that could assist with the jail population management."

**The decisions made by the ESC in the following pages  
have yet to be approved by the BSCC Board.**

D. Response to Realignment

Related to the Beds

Item 2. This section now reads: “Describe the use of offender assessments(s) and other interventions to address the jail impact caused by realignment. Include:

- a) Objective tools or instruments used to address the need to manage the population, such as pre-trial assessments, etc.
- b) If there are no assessments used at this time, describe what plans exist for using assessments in the future.
- c) Alternative programs implemented with the specific intent to safely reduce the jail population.”

Related to the Program Space

Item 5. This section now reads: “Describe the programming to be conducted in the new program space. Include:

- a) How the program space will foster a quality reentry model and seamless reentry process.
- b) A description of the collaborative partnerships that will provide services within the program space and provide continuity through the reentry and community supervision process.
- c) Sources of financial support (i.e., Medi-Cal, other federal sources, etc.) that will be accessed to aid in the delivery of programs.”

Item 7. This sentence now reads: “Indicate the approach to alternatives to incarceration and how the program will assist in reducing the impact of realignment to the jail population.”

F. Budget Review and Reasonableness

Item 3. This section now reads: “Describe steps that the county has taken to minimize costs of this project. Include:

- a) Ways in which this project is planned that allows for the leveraging of other funds, e.g., federal funds, etc. for both construction and program delivery.”

Item 4. This sentence now reads: “Detail the cost effectiveness of this construction project including from a population management perspective.”

Item 5. This section was not accepted by the committee.

A discussion followed regarding the similarity in language between the narrative discussion points/rating criteria for the Program Space Proposals and the narrative discussion points/rating criteria for the Beds and Program Space Proposals (as it relates to program space only). The committee agreed that both sections, as it relates to program space, should read the same.

**The decisions made by the ESC in the following pages  
have yet to be approved by the BSCC Board.**

The following individuals offered public comment: David Takashima, Senior Advisor for the Mayor of San Francisco; Diana Zuniga, Californians United for a Responsible Budget; and Lieutenant Brian Flicker, Butte County Sheriff's Department.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:39 pm.