Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)  
Agenda  
Monday, February 25, 2013 - 3:30 pm

Monterey County Probation Department  
Juvenile Hall Large Conference Room  
1420 Natividad Rd., Salinas, CA 93906

Welcome  
Welcome & Introductions – Chief Real

Public Comment (limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

Regular Agenda

1. Approve Meeting Minutes  
   A. Meeting 11/19/12

2. Monterey County Community Corrections  
   A. Data collection coordination  
      a. Establish a due date for submitting data to Marie Glavin  
   B. General updates  
      a. Probation  
      b. Sheriff  
         a. Introspect Update  
      c. Behavioral Health  
      d. Department of Social and Employment Services (DSES)  
      e. Courts/ Legal  
      f. MCCLEOA

3. FY 2013-14 AB 109 Funding

4. Other/ Announcements  
   A. Schedule date of next meeting – (May 13th)

5. Adjournment

Brown Act information: If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. A person with a disability who requires a special modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting should contact the Monterey County Probation Department at (831) 755-3913 as soon as possible, and at a minimum 24 hours in advance of any meeting.
Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)
Action Minutes
Monday, November 19, 2012 - 3:30 pm

Juvenile Hall Large Conference Room
1420 Natividad Road, Salinas, CA 93906


1. Welcome/ Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Public Comments (limit 3 minutes per speaker)
Action: There was no public comment.

3. Regular Agenda
3.1. Approve the CCP Meeting Minutes of October 15th.
Action: Meeting minutes were approved. (Motion: Jeffrey Bud/ Second: Manuel Real/ Vote: Unanimous).

3.2. Monterey County Community Corrections
A. Data collection coordination
Action: Updates received. Management Analyst (MA) III Robin Rodriguez gave a presentation on the results of the data collected for the first year of realignment, from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012 (Attachment 1). The Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) continue to work on a statewide component to measure data.

B. Receive general updates from CCP members
Action: Updates received.
   a) Probation reported the following:
      • Three DPOs assigned to the Pretrial Services Unit are presently supervising 12 offenders.
      • One Probation Aide has been assigned to the Adult Placement program.
      • Five offenders are participating on the Home Detention Program (HDP).
      • Probation continues to work on increasing the program count for the Adult Day Reporting Center (ADRC).
      • The Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) training for adult officers will be held on December 12th and 13th.

   b) The Sheriff’s Office reported the following:
      • The population at County Jail is at 1,056.
      • AB 109 data for the month of October: 357 AB 109 inmates; 235 1170 (h), 84 parolees sentenced, and 38 parolees not sentenced.
      • Introspect staff gave an update on their program since the last CCP meeting (Attachment 2).
      • Fire Camp Update: The Sheriff’s Office was planning to enter into contract with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) for the purpose of sending AB 109 inmates sentenced to county time to State Fire Camps; however, after reviewing the requirements, only one from a total of 25 inmates qualified for the program.
c) Behavioral Health (BH) reported that, since January 2012, approximately 146 offenders have been referred for psychological assessments. BH hired a Psychiatric Social Worker previously employed at the state prison to assist with realignment activities. Staff continues to work on the evidence-based curriculums for AB 109 clients.

d) Department of Social and Employment Services (DSES) reported that, to date, 33 offenders have been referred for housing services; of those, 15 were placed. The recommendation to transfer administrative oversight for the Office for Employment and Training (OET) from DSES to the Economic Development Department was rescheduled to the December 11th Board of Supervisors meeting.

e) Chief Rodriguez reported that it is unknown how state funding for Proposition 30 will be distributed amongst law enforcement agencies.

4. Second Annual Conference on Public Safety Realignment
Action: Chief Real, District Attorney (DA) Dean Flippo, Sheriff Scott Miller, Public Defender James Egar, Deputy DA Berkley Brannon, Chief Deputy Jeff Budd, and Commander John Mihu attended the Second Annual Conference on Public Safety Realignment held on November 1st and 2nd in Sacramento. Professor Joan Petersilia gave a presentation on the data that is being collected to evaluate the outcomes of the realignment. The conference information is available electronically.

5. Other/Announcements
   a. Date of next meeting: Monday, February 25th at 3:30 p.m. at the Juvenile Hall Large Conference Room.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Elizabeth Balcazar,
Administrative Secretary
Monterey County Probation Department
IN CALIFORNIA, 71% OF JAIL BEDS ARE OCCUPIED BY PRETRIAL DETAINEES, which is higher than the national average of 61%. The release of offenders is based on their ability to pay bail versus their risk of flight or of committing a new offense. This can result in detainees who are low risk for flight and committing new crimes, remaining in jail prior to trial because they cannot afford to pay their scheduled bail amounts, while others who are higher risk being released because they have the financial means to meet their bail requirements.

Realignment under Assembly Bill 109 has placed new responsibilities onto county governments on how they manage adult offenders. As a result, many counties are ill prepared to effectively implement changes that would meet realignment goals. In December 2011, California Forward (CA Fwd)—a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization devoted to improving the performance of government in California—established the Partnership for Community Excellence (PCE) to provide counties with the information they need to make smart decisions in regards to the 2011 Public Safety Realignment Act. CA Fwd’s latest report provides accurate, practical, evidence-based information to local leaders and agencies so they have the best knowledge base available to determine how pretrial programs can assist their local jurisdiction. Approximately, 55% of California’s 58 Counties plan to add new jails or expand lockups. This second report focused on pretrial programs provides:

- Summary of national pretrial best practices;
- Experiences and lessons learned from 5 California counties that have effectively implemented pretrial programs;
- Suggestions related to tracking and data collection analysis;
- Things to consider when implementing a pretrial program; and,
- Resources, including technical assistance available to counties.

WHAT IS A PRETRIAL PROGRAM?
Pretrial programs focus on a detainee’s risk to commit new crimes and/or failure to appear in court.

BEST PRACTICES: 5 CA COUNTIES
Brief Summaries of Case Studies
For full details, please see report

MARIN COUNTY
In 2011 the Adult Services Division of the Marin County Probation Department contracted with Leaders in Community Alternatives (LCA) to provide pretrial services. LCA pretrial services staff is based in the Marin County Probation Department, working in cooperation with the Marin County Sheriff’s Department and the courts. LCA excludes certain detainees from an evaluation based on established criteria. Utilizing the Ohio Risk Assessment System - Pretrial Assessment Tool (ORAS-PAT) the staff is able to conduct 10 to 15 minute face-to-face interviews taking into consideration seven risk variables to provide a score that serves as an objective risk assessment of the detainee. Further evaluations are conducted to verify community ties, flight risk, and danger to self or others. Detainees are released based on their risk assessment with recommendations for appropriate supervision or follow-up.

Program highlights (January to May 2012):
- 79% pretrial detainees appeared for their court date with no further incidents
- 9% had new charges filed
- 9% failed to appear
**SANTA CLARA COUNTY**

Santa Clara’s Office of Pretrial Services was established as a separate agency in 1971 and is currently staffed by 47 full-time employees who mostly work with low-end felony detainees. With a station in the jail booking area as well as phone and computer access to the courts, the office has no need to wait for courts to be in session to make release recommendations. The Virginia Pretrial Release Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI) is used for initial screening to determine the likelihood of appearance in court and new offenses. VPRAI examines factors such as current charges, pending charges, criminal history, residence, employment, primary caregiver, and history of drug abuse. The pretrial services staffs Own Recognizance (OR) and Supervised OR with an average length of supervision of 120 days. Pretrial cases are also assessed for substance abuse, employment, and housing by other appropriate county agencies.

Program highlights (January to March 2012):
- 88% appeared for their court date
- 98% had no new offenses

**SANTA CRUZ COUNTY**

Santa Cruz County has initiated several reform efforts in the last ten years to improve services for youths and adults under their supervision. Through a collaborative effort between the Probation Department and the Sheriff’s Department, the county has effectively streamlined many of the processes to conduct best practice risk assessments. The county’s pretrial services program was expanded upon to include stationing four deputy probation officers in the jail booking area, thereby forming a new unit. The staff also utilizes VPRAI, which is connected to the Sheriff’s booking case management system and allows an essential interconnection for vital information. Other factors such as employment and residency are also considered during the evaluation and recommendation process. The unit has been successful in large part due to its well-established relationship with the courts and the Sheriff’s Department.

Program highlights:
- Non-sentenced jail population of 53.8% is far below the state average of 71%

**SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY**

The San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Inc (SFPDF) was established in 1976 and operates nine different pretrial best practice programs that have significantly reduced San Francisco’s un-sentenced population over the last 35 years. Of SFPDP’s nine programs, three demonstrate innovative approaches to the real needs of their clients and the gaps that exist within the San Francisco judicial system. The Supervised Pretrial Release program (SPR) and the Own Recognition program (OR) are both designed to serve felony defendants and provide judges with real alternatives to detention pending trial. A third program focuses specifically on homeless felony defendants, providing intensive one-on-one case management, counseling and life skills services.

Program highlights:
- 3% failure to appear rate among defendants with both felony and misdemeanor charges in the Structured Pretrial Release Program
- 73% successfully completed the Pretrial Diversion Program
- 15% of Pretrial Diversion Program defendants failed to comply with the court-ordered components of the program

**YOLO COUNTY**

The Yolo County Probation Departments’ pretrial program was developed in 2010 by funding received from the Byrne Grant to help relieve overcrowding. The Pretrial Services Unit worked closely with the district attorney, public defender, sheriff and the court to establish the initial criteria for the program. The unit uses the ORAS-PAT risk assessment tool for all eligible defendants to develop full recommendation reports that are then reviewed by the probation department to check criminal history, contact victims and confirm release addresses and community ties. The unit provides community supervision for each defendant released on Supervised OR, while high-risk defendants are seen weekly in face-to-face meetings or home visits.

Program highlights:
- 98% appeared for their next court date
- 95% did not commit new offenses
- 90% of all recommendations from the program were accepted by the court
Monterey County
Community Corrections Partnership

AB109 Statistical Report for
Fiscal Year 2012/2013
2nd Quarter: October 2012 – December 2012

February 25, 2013
### Community Corrections Partnership: Probation Data through December 2012

#### Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/11</th>
<th>12/11</th>
<th>1/12</th>
<th>2/12</th>
<th>3/12</th>
<th>4/12</th>
<th>5/12</th>
<th>6/12</th>
<th>7/12</th>
<th>8/12</th>
<th>9/12</th>
<th>10/12</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/12</th>
<th><strong>TOTALS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Received for PRCS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active PRCS Supervisions (End of Month)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>310</td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Who Absconded Before PRCS Supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warrants Issued (excluding those that absconded before)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### **Total Number of Individuals who have had a Warrant Issued**

|                      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | **122**  |

#### **Number of Active Warrants Remaining (End of Month)**

|                      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | **112**  |

#### **Number of Flash Incarcerations**

|                      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | **147**  |

#### **Number of Days Flashed Each Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/11</th>
<th>12/11</th>
<th>1/12</th>
<th>2/12</th>
<th>3/12</th>
<th>4/12</th>
<th>5/12</th>
<th>6/12</th>
<th>7/12</th>
<th>8/12</th>
<th>9/12</th>
<th>10/12</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/12</th>
<th><strong>1340</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of CR-300 Waivers Accepted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### **Number of CR-300 PRCS Revocation Petitions Filed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>63</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### **Number of PRCS Cases Terminated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/11</th>
<th>12/11</th>
<th>1/12</th>
<th>2/12</th>
<th>3/12</th>
<th>4/12</th>
<th>5/12</th>
<th>6/12</th>
<th>7/12</th>
<th>8/12</th>
<th>9/12</th>
<th>10/12</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/12</th>
<th><strong>165</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful Terminations: No Custodial Sanctions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Terminations: Jurisdiction Expired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Terminations Due to a New Law Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Terminations Due to a Technical Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (transferred, deceased)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### **1170(h)(5)(b) Split Sentences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/11</th>
<th>12/11</th>
<th>1/12</th>
<th>2/12</th>
<th>3/12</th>
<th>4/12</th>
<th>5/12</th>
<th>6/12</th>
<th>7/12</th>
<th>8/12</th>
<th>9/12</th>
<th>10/12</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/12</th>
<th><strong>TOTALS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Individuals Sentenced to a Split Sentence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Mandatory Supervisions (End of Month)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warrants Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Active Warrants (End of Month)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Supervision Revocation Petitions Filed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New law Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Mandatory Supervision Cases Terminated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Terminations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminations Due to a New Law Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminations Due to a Technical Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Expired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (transferred, deceased)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monterey County Probation Department: Quarterly Data for July 1, 2012 – September 30, 2012

PRCS Demographic Data:
Active Cases as of December 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRCS Arrests: 27 by Other Law Enforcement Jurisdictions
From: October 1, 2012 - Dec 31, 2012

- Salinas PD: 48%
- Monterey PD: 7%
- CHP: 11%
- Federal: 7%
- Sherriff’s Dept: 4%
- Monterey Penninsula: 7%
- Marina Public Safety: 4%
- Soledad PD: 4%
- Out of County: 15%
- Total Number of Arrests by Monterey County Probation from October 1, 2012 – December 31, 2012: 86

Geographic Residence of PRCS Individuals

- Salinas: 57%
- Monterey Penninsula: 24%
- South County: 12%
- North County: 7%
# Monterey County Jail

## Population Analysis of Total Jail Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October 2012</th>
<th>November 2012</th>
<th>December 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total inmate population:</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Males</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Females</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Un-Sentenced Inmates</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sentenced Inmates</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AB109 Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parole Violators</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parole Violators Booked With New Local Charges</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parole Violators Serving Jail Time as a Result of a Parole Violation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Offenders Sentenced to Local Custody Under 1170(h)(5)(A)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of 1170H Commitments through 12/31/2012: **336**

## Alternatives to Custody

### Jail: Work Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Referred:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants at the End of the Month:</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Aftercare Participants:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Behavioral Interventions: Day Reporting Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Home Confinement (Voluntary) Applicants Accepted:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Voluntary Participants:</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Detention Program (Involuntary) Accepted:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Involuntary Participants:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Probation Department: Pre-Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Inmates Interviewed and Assessed:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Inmates Released on Pre-Trial:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number that failed to appear for Court:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number arrested while out on Pre-Trial:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Inmates released on Pre-Trial through 2-25-2013: **29**

### Probation Department: Placement Program from 10-1-2012 through 2-25-2013

- Total number of people to date who have been interviewed and assessed for placement: **98**
- Total number of people placed in Alcohol and Drug Residential programs: **53**
  - Of the 53 people placed, **43 were removed from the Jail**

### OR’s Resulting From Revised Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OR’s:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monterey County Social and Employment Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of clients receiving the following benefits:</th>
<th>Oct 2012</th>
<th>Nov 2012</th>
<th>Dec 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Fresh (Food Stamps)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Turning Point – AB109 Homeless Incentive Program (PRCS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Individuals Referred</th>
<th>Oct 2012</th>
<th>Nov 2012</th>
<th>Dec 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received Emergency Housing Stipend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Sustainable Housing Stipend</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained Secured Housing Without Stipend Assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Case Management Services</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Who Failed to Follow Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Kick-Start Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Individuals Referred</th>
<th>Oct 2012</th>
<th>Nov 2012</th>
<th>Dec 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Kick Start Workshop Participants:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants that Completed Kick Start Workshops</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Individuals that Received Employment Related Case Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Individuals Who Obtained Employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Individuals Who Received Financial Assistance for Employment Related Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monterey County Behavioral Health

**Quarterly Data: Oct – Dec 2012**

| Total Number of Clients Served by Behavioral Health: | 56 |
| Number of new clients referred and served: | 39 |
| Number of clients who received intensive mental health services through the System of Care | 4 |
| Number of clients who were assessed | 27 |
| Number of clients who received outpatient mental health services | 4 |
| Number of clients who participated in substance abuse residential treatment | 9 |
| Number of clients who participated in out-patient substance abuse treatment | 6 |
| Number of clients who received crisis intervention/hospitalization | 2 |

## Introspect – Provided in Monterey County Jail

**Enrollments from September – December, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>AB109 Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men’s Rehabilitation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices Program (1 week program)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberties Pride (8 week program)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s Section:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices Program (1 week program)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberties Pride (8 week program)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1) Because of the way the fiscal quarter and class schedules stagger across time, the numbers represent several different classes from other reporting periods

2) Due to Dec 2012 jail classification rules, Q & U pods are no longer mixed (resulting in half as many enrolled)
How to measure recidivism?

Berkley Brannon, ADA
Monterey County District Attorney’s Office
(831) 755-5253
brannonb@co.monterey.ca.us
Should we go to the trouble of measuring recidivism?
CDCR Outcome Evaluation Report
October 2012

http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Adult_Research_Branch/Research_Documents/ARB_FY
0708_Recidivism_Report_10.23.12.pdf
About 1/5th of inmates released from prison commit a new crime within the first year of their release.
38% of inmates released from prison commit a new crime within 2 years of their release
Three-Year Recidivism Rates by FY

About half of inmates released from prison commit a new crime within 3 years of their release
4.5.2 Commitment Offense

Figure 8. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Commitment Offense

- Vehicular Manslaughter: 34.8%
- Sober: 40.4%
- Driving Under Influence: 42.2%
- Marijuana Other: 42.3%
- Manslaughter: 42.5%
- CS Manufacturing: 46.1%
- Attempted Murder Second: 48.0%
- Lewd Act With Child: 48.0%
- Kidnapping: 48.4%
- Rape: 52.0%
- CS Possession for Sale: 53.5%
- Marijuana Possession for Sale: 53.9%
- CS Sales: 56.0%
- Marijuana Sale: 56.2%
- Arson: 56.5%
- Sexual Penetration With Object: 56.8%
- Forged/Fraud: 57.1%
- Grand Theft: 61.5%
- Assault with Deadly Weapon: 62.4%
- Other Offenses: 63.1%
- Robbery: 63.3%
- Burglary - First Degree: 65.2%
- Other Assault/Battery: 65.2%
- Escape/Abscond: 65.4%
- Other Property: 65.8%
- Hashish Possession: 65.8%
- Oral Copulation: 66.5%
- CS Other: 66.6%
- CS Possession: 67.5%
- Burglary - Second Degree: 67.8%
- Possession Weapon: 67.9%
- Receiving Stolen Property: 70.2%
- Petty Theft With Prior: 71.3%
- Vehicle Theft: 72.8%
- Other Sex Offenses: 73.9%
Can we collect analogous data post-realignment and compare it to CDCR recidivism rates to judge whether crime is going up or down after implementation of realignment?

1170(h) PRCS
1170(h) offenders released for 1 year or more: Convictions within first year

- Total individuals: 14
- Percentage of released offenders: 7%
- Offenders convicted of new crimes within first year: 5
- First year conviction recidivism rate: 36%
- 1 additional offender convicted during second year of release: 43%
Apples to apples?

• Not all convictions appear on RAP sheets: CDCR recidivism rates may be underreported.
• However, CDCR recidivism rates are based on statewide data.
• Monterey county recidivism rates do not include crimes committed by our offenders in other counties: Our rates may be underreported.
Offenders on PRCS for 1 year or more:
Convictions within first year

- Total individuals: 181
- Percentage of PRCS offenders: 40%
- Offenders convicted of new crimes within first year of release: 50
- First year conviction recidivism rate: 28%

➢ This rate does not include pending cases
➢ 2 additional offenders convicted during second year of release
Monterey County Split Sentences

- Only 12 offenders have been released on mandatory supervision
- 3 have been convicted of a new crime: 25%
- 1 additional offender was in violation of MS
Offenders on PRCS for 1 year or more:
Convictions within first year

• Of 50 offenders, 32 convicted of one or more felonies
• 18 convicted of misdemeanor offenses
“Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.” John Adams

“There are three kinds of lies: Lies, damned lies, and statistics.” Mark Twain
PRCS — Anyone released from State Prison after October 1, 2011 who is a:

1. Current non-violent, non-serious offender (may have prior serious or violent offenses)
2. Sex offenders who are not High Risk Sex Offenders (HRSO) as defined by CDCR
3. Offenders who would otherwise have been on Non-revocable parole
4. Current parolees whose controlling offense is non-violent, non-serious and are in prison only on a violation.

Names used to describe PRCS:

- PRCS (preferred name used to describe)
- PVRTP (parole violator returned to custody)

Sentencing options include:

- Flash incarceration for up to 10 days
- Waiver for up to 180 days jail and/or modify conditions
- Court may revoke to jail for up to 180 days, modify conditions and terminate or continue PRCS

Important Facts:

- May discharge after consecutive 6 months with no violations
- Must discharge after a continuous year served with no violations
- Discharges by operation of law at the end of 3 years

1170(h) — Any felony offender who does NOT have a current or prior, serious felony (1192.7 (c) PC), violent felony (667.5 (c) PC) and no sex offenses that require registration and commits a crime that is non-serious, non-violent and a non-sex offense, if not placed on probation, will be sentenced to jail instead of prison to serve term. They can either be sentenced to serve the entire term of imprisonment and upon completion be released with no supervision, or they can be sentenced to serve a portion of their sentence and then be released to mandatory supervision for the remaining period of time.

Names used to describe 1170(h):

- 1170s (preferred name used to describe)
- Non Non Non
- NNN
- N3s
- County Jail Felon

Names used to describe Mandatory Supervision:

- Mandatory Supervision
- Split Sentence
- Hybrid
November 19, 2012: CCP Meeting

Update for CCP:
Projected rollout: January 7, 2013

Internal Preparation for AB109 extended program:
- Hired new bilingual (Spanish) staff member
- Organized and repurposing jail classroom space (in progress)
- Finalize assessment tools, tests
- Computer purchase (upon receipt of payment)

Preparatory Meetings:
- Met with Probation re: data collecting/reporting
- Met with jail commander and systems IT coordinator re: data flow
- Met with jail staff re: vocational training possibilities
- Filed community partner paperwork for CSUMB
- Inters/Service Learners
- Making initial contacts for speakers Bureau

Items outstanding:
- Information regarding Providers meeting
- Best Practices training, eg. Seeking Safety

Introspect will provide data to Robin Rodriquez of the Probation Department for the period of October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.