

*As adopted on 5/26/2010.*

# Subcommittee on Health and Well Being of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals

## Reentry Council of the City & County of San Francisco

---

### MINUTES

Wednesday, March 31, 2010  
3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.  
Room 278  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Members Present: Joyce Crum, Kathleen Culhane, Kwanzaa Duviyani, Na'im Harrison (Arrived after Agenda II), Edna James, Martin Jones, Christopher Lloyd, Catherine McKee, Ronald Sanders (Arrived after Agenda II), Shira Shavit, Inna Verdiyana, Kyong Yi.

Members Absent: Mary Campbell, Mike McLoone, Naomi Prochovnick, Marc A. Sabin

Others in Attendance: Kim Clark, Isaiah Hurtado, Kate Monico Klein, Vallan Tyree

*Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.*

#### **I. Introductions and Review of Agenda.**

Shira Shavit gave an overview of the agenda, asked for introductions from attendees, and asked for questions.

#### **II. Review and Adopt Minutes of December 9, 2009 and January 13, 2010.**

Members reviewed both sets of minutes. Edna James asked about the amount of detail included in the minutes. Jessica Flintoft explained that full detail on meeting conversations are always available in the additional meeting materials, and suggested that staff could explicitly reference these additional meeting materials in meeting minutes. Dr. Jones moved to adopt the draft minutes from December 9, 2009 and January 13, 2010. Christopher Lloyd seconded, and the motion passed unanimously at 3:17 p.m.

#### **III. Update on Chair and Members of Subcommittee.**

Shira Shavit presented an update on the recent meeting of the subcommittee chairpersons, with special attention to attendance rules. Jessica Flintoft explained the changes to membership of this subcommittee. The current membership is now 16 people, and quorum is now set at nine.

#### **IV. Development of Education & Outreach Plan to Maximize Access to Services for Transient Registered Sex Offenders.**

Jessica Flintoft reviewed the goals for this meeting: to understand the law and policy related to residency, transient registration, and GPS tracking; to identify outreach and education strategies to ensure SF service and housing providers understand law; develop communication protocols for service providers and parole, as needed. She reviewed the current law and policy related to residency, and noted the current definition of residence used by parole.

---

Minutes of March 31, 2010

Minutes refer to additional meeting materials, all of which are available online at [www.sfreentry.com](http://www.sfreentry.com), filed under meeting body's name and date.

As adopted on 5/26/2010.

# Subcommittee on Health and Well Being of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals

## Reentry Council of the City & County of San Francisco

---

Shira explained that the new policy, as outlined in memo, allows for individuals receiving treatment or certain services, an allowance is made for patients/clients to remain in the same location. She also explained that other exceptions can be made, but those are very extreme cases. Group discussion included the role that varying impacts that individual parole officers can have, especially with regard to making exceptions for seriously ill parolees; the lack of a clear mechanism for appealing denials at the parole officer level (possibly at district or even the state level); and the benefits that would come from knowing what service providers' criteria are in accepting or refusing individuals.

Jessica Flintoft suggested that a working group work on the first two items below – draft a parole grievance policy for cases where individuals are denied; and draft a revised state regulation that either excepts San Francisco or modifies regulatory language so that the case in SF would be ameliorated. Catherine McKee suggested that the current parole memo might actually be a sufficient policy change, if it were adequately disseminated and enforced. Other possible action steps include:

*LOCAL OFFICE UNIT SUPERVISORS:* Have parole make denial criteria and process more transparent and enforceable. Identify appeal entity.

*STATE PAROLE:* Change state law. Change policy for parole in San Francisco. Possibility of getting an exception made for SF - Change parole regulations for San Francisco.

*SERVICE PROVIDERS:* Educate service providers on the law and survey reasons for their program policies.

*POLICYMAKERS:* Make the case for 290s in SF; Discrimination of 290s in SF v. other places; Mapping; Stories of providers trying to place 290s; Public Safety and Public Costs – explain this. Changes to Parole Regulations/Policy could include: Draft possible (1) exception for SF (2) change the policy altogether (3) detail what the current exception states and disseminate it.

Individuals volunteered to join this working group to pursue the above goals:

Shira Shavit, Vallan Tyree, Catherine McKee, Kate Monico Klein, Ron Sanders – agree to bring a draft to the next meeting of this subcommittee.

### **V. Review and update on literature review, surveys of programs, and focus groups of individuals. (discussion and possible action)**

Jessica Flintoft referred to the meeting materials for her three-part update. She asked members to review the literature listed and help fill in any gaps they notice.

Dr. Jones said that participants in the 70 Oak Grove focus group were excited to participate, and suggested holding similar groups periodically.

Jessica Flintoft reviewed the six focus groups that had been held so far, and briefly described each.

Christopher Lloyd offered to help Jessica pull together additional focus groups.

She asked for help identifying agencies/individuals who could participate in the group of families of currently-incarcerated state prisoners. Suggestions included Communities United Against Violence, Friends Outside, Centerforce.

---

Minutes of March 31, 2010

Minutes refer to additional meeting materials, all of which are available online at [www.sfreentry.com](http://www.sfreentry.com), filed under meeting body's name and date.

*As adopted on 5/26/2010.*

# **Subcommittee on Health and Well Being of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals**

## **Reentry Council of the City & County of San Francisco**

---

### **VI. Review, discussion, and recommended changes of first draft sections on programs and needs as related to health and well-being.**

Jessica Flintoft began by reviewing the handout on Housing Needs, and invited group to work through the blank housing sheet, as well as the remaining sheets.

Group discussed terms' definitions; offered additional input to the program model matrix.

Jessica Flintoft asked individuals to look at remaining sections of the document on their own time and to contact her directly with feedback.

### **VII. Review and discuss AB1900 Pregnant Inmates and Wards—Least Restrictive Restraints.**

Kathleen Culhane explained the legislation, which would apply to state and county facilities (additional information included in the meeting materials), noting its support from the ACLU, All of Us Or None, Legal Services for Prisoners with Children, etc., and she asked that the subcommittee consider asking the RC to support, as well. Jessica discussed options for recommendation, including a resolution by the Board of Supervisors and possibly enlisting the help of the City's lobbyist.

Kathleen Culhane made a motion to put this on the RC agenda, Edna James seconded, and the motion passed unanimously at 5:50pm.

### **VIII. Update on other relevant legislation or policy.**

None offered.

### **IX. Update on other relevant funding opportunities.**

None offered.

### **X. Consideration of any short-term actions to bring to Reentry Council on April 20<sup>th</sup>.**

No additional actions, apart from the plan of action around the transient sex offenders and the letter of support (draft) for AB 1900.

### **XI. Public comment on items not listed on the agenda.**

Kim Clark suggested several additional service providers for inclusion in the survey, suggested that additional foreign language focus groups be held, and noted her observation around the need for transgender housing. She also asked about medical benefits aside from GA, SSI, and Healthy San Francisco, and asked how to deal with that population.

### **XII. Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 5:55p.m.