

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

(San Francisco Administrative Code 5.1)

Draft MINUTES

Tuesday, September 29, 2009

10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Auditorium

State Building

455 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94102

Members Present: Public Defender Jeff Adachi, Steve Arcelona, Chief Patrick Boyd, Mary Campbell, Joaquin Diaz de Leon, Glenn Eagleson, Tommy Escarcega, Armel Farnsworth, Barbara Garcia, Chief Yador Harrell, District Attorney Kamala D. Harris (arrived after Agenda II.), Sheriff Michael Hennessey, Gerald Miller, Captain Al Pardini, Karen Roye, the Hon. Kevin Ryan, Chief William Siffermann, Eddy Zheng.

Members Absent: ShaMauda Bishop, Hon. James McBride, Duriel Gilmore.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 am by Sheriff Hennessey, who welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Reentry Council, and introduced the four Council Co-Chairs; Roll Call established that a quorum was present.

II. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of July 17, 2009

Sheriff Hennessey invited committee members to review minutes from previous Reentry Council meeting, and then entertained motion to adopt minutes. Chief Siffermann moved to adopt the minutes, Mr. Arcelona seconded the motion, and the minutes were adopted by unanimous vote.

III. Update on Subcommittee Meetings Proceedings & Interest

Jessica Flintoft, Council Staff, provided overview of preliminary interest and participation in five subcommittees. The Reentry Council established five subcommittees at its July 2009 meeting, and each of the five subcommittees has convened once since then. The subcommittee meetings enjoyed high participation to date, with more than 100 people participating, with individual subcommittee meetings averaging approximately 20 participants. Co-Chairs and staff are working together to finalize membership and size of subcommittees on an ongoing basis. Each initial subcommittee meeting was led by Reentry Council staff and conducted according to a standard structure, such that each subcommittee discussed its primary topic in terms of four main categories corresponding with charge of Reentry Council: Needs, Barriers, Existing Programs, and Funding Sources. Jessica explained the format and its outcomes for each of the five subcommittees, and an overview of the topics covered by each subcommittee:

- Subcommittee on Civil Rights & Civic Engagement of Formerly Incarcerated People

Conversation on voting rights; obtaining government-issued identification; lifetime collateral consequences of criminal records; civic participation and engagement of formerly incarcerated people in community and government.

- Subcommittee on Self-Sufficiency of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals
Conversation on education; employment (including training, placement, local capacity for hiring); access to and eligibility for public benefits; personal development and advocacy skills.
- Subcommittee on Health & Well Being of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals
Conversation on housing; physical health, including preventive primary care and medications; behavioral health, including inpatient and outpatient services; and well being, including volunteerism and other community relationships that may prevent recidivism.
- Subcommittee on Welfare & Safety of Families, Victims & Communities
Conversation on children and families of people who are currently or formerly incarcerated, including the quality of contact during incarceration, issues of custody/reunification, access to support services, benefits and housing; victims of returning offenders, including notification of release, restorative justice programs; communities to which people are returning.
- Subcommittee on Community Justice & Alternatives to Incarceration (9/18/09)
Conversation on collaborative courts and diversion; sentencing and early release; probation and parole.

Mr. Miller asked whether the number of subcommittees and subcommittee topic areas was sufficient. Jessica responded that five subcommittees, meeting bimonthly, would be ideal because subcommittees, like the full Reentry Council, will be subject to quorum requirements (once their permanent membership is determined), and current staffing resources make administering more frequent meetings a challenge.

Ms. Roye thanked the Reentry Council staff for their efforts in organizing subcommittees. She asked for further detail on how subcommittees were surveyed. Jessica explained that, while no actual survey was taken of subcommittee participants, the format of each subcommittee's first meeting included the opportunity for small group discussions, which were segmented along lines of four dimensions of each issue (needs, barriers, programs and funding sources).

Following up, Ms. Garcia asked for an opportunity to sit down with staff to try to do a gap analysis in each of these areas. Jessica affirmed that this was the intention, and noted that Agenda Item 6 would present some more detail about the process to develop this analysis.

Mr. Arcelona noted that overlap between subcommittees may be inevitable, and asked what was being done to address that overlap. Jessica explained that there are two ways that staff can help to address redundancy: at least in this first round of subcommittee meetings, because each meeting was facilitated by staff and organized along a standard format, staff was able to prevent significant overlapping of discussion areas. In the future, whether or not staff facilitates meetings, staff will be present at all subcommittee meetings, and able to advise subcommittee members as to what topics are being addressed by other subcommittees.

Public Defender Adachi complimented Council and Staff on the impressive turnout for the first round of subcommittee meetings and asked Ms. Flintoft to describe attendees in terms of the

communities, perspectives, departments and organizations that have been represented, as well as which of these have been under-represented. Further, he asked where there might be areas for improvement in terms of outreach for specific communities or interest groups. Ms. Flintoft offered to send the full list of subcommittee attendees with their given affiliations. She also named several of the departments and community-based organizations that had participated, acknowledging that more outreach could be done in terms of victim's rights organizations, and noted room for improvement in terms of active participation by San Francisco Police Department and from housing partners, including both DPH and HSA. Also, while some community groups and neighborhood associations have been involved, Ms. Flintoft acknowledged that outreach in neighborhoods and communities could be improved.

Public Comment:

An unidentified member of the public asked for specific information on which committee addresses mental health needs. Jessica noted that the Health and Well Being subcommittee is the subcommittee that most directly addresses such needs.

Javarre Wilson of the Black Coalition on AIDS, who said he missed all of the subcommittee meetings but wished to be considered for permanent membership, asked how his interest could be noted. Jessica noted that Mr. Wilson was not the only one in this position, and noted that she had spoken with him and with others who wished to be considered. She explained that the names of interested individuals have been collected and will be included along with the names of people who did attend subcommittee meetings as the co-chairs proceed with the process of appointing permanent members to the subcommittees. Sheriff Hennessey reiterated that no formal appointments to subcommittees have yet been made, and added that one question yet to be decided dealt with the size of the formal subcommittees, which requires balancing the desire to appoint as many interested parties as possible with mindfulness of quorum requirements to which subcommittees are subject. Mr. Farnsworth added that, while permanent appointments will be limited, nobody will be excluded from participating in subcommittee meetings, which are all open to the public.

Tomiquia Moss asked how the subcommittees' work will be considered and combined with the Council's efforts given that the subcommittees will be meeting bimonthly. Jessica explained that the relationship between the subcommittees and the Council is a work in progress and that, while the full Council meets three times each year, that does not limit Council members' participation to those meetings alone. As Council members' staff participate in subcommittee work, the lines of communication between both bodies will be kept open. Ms. Roye added that because the full Council will review and approve the final Council report (based on subcommittee work), the Council will necessarily be aware of all the efforts of the subcommittees. Mr. Zheng expressed his belief that good communication between the subcommittees and the full council will be critical and should remain a point of focus. Sheriff Hennessey explained that the subcommittees may make any type of recommendation, whether for new programs, for ending current programs, or for new legislation, among other things, but that those recommendations, even if accepted by the Council, are not necessarily binding. Sheriff Hennessey suggested that the Council should pick and choose the recommendations it makes. Mr. Zheng discussed the importance of being aware of all funding options for any recommended programs or legislation before making such recommendations, and Ms. Roye noticed Council members' active participation not only at Council meetings, but also in the time between meetings.

IV. Proposed Process to Appoint Reentry Council Representative to WiCAC

Sheriff Hennessey acknowledged that the Council's representative to WiCAC has been Shirley Melnicoe, retiring executive director of Northern California Service League, and extends invitation to public to attend her retirement celebration, scheduled for Wednesday September 30. He introduced Mr. Eagleson of the SF Office of Economic & Workforce Development to provide background on this agenda item. He provided an overview of the WiCAC, including the U.S. Department of Labor's requirement that cities create a policy body (Workforce Investment Board) to oversee its Workforce Systems. In San Francisco, this body is the WISF, and it comprises membership in the percentages required by the federal legislation, with representation from business, labor, justice, and others. San Francisco Ordinance 0270-07 has created the Workforce Investment Community Advisory Committee (WiCAC) as an advisory committee to the workforce board, with members drawn from the staff and/or board members of 501(c)3 organizations as well as appointees from the Board of Supervisors, the Transition Aged Taskforce, the Homeless Coordinating Board and the Reentry Council. A process for selecting and appointing a representative from the Council has not been established. Ms. Flintoft presented the staff's three-step proposal for the process to determine an appointee from the Council, including a deadline of Friday, January 8, 2010, by which time all interested staff and/or board members of 501(c)3 organizations should email reentry.council@sfgov.org to express their interest and include their name, title, organization and contact information along with a brief description of their relevant experience and skills and a brief description of their ability to make regular reports to the Council and its subcommittees, as requested. Staff would then circulate this information, and all interested individuals whose information was received by the deadline would then appear before the Council at the January 26, 2010 meeting to answer any questions of Council members. After this, the Council would appoint a representative to the WiCAC. Mr. Eagleson reiterated that candidates for the appointment should be staff and/or board members of their particular organization.

Sheriff Hennessey called for a motion to accept the proposed process. Mr. Farnsworth moved to accept, the motion was seconded by Public Defender Adachi, and approved unanimously.

V. Presentation on San Francisco Reentry Services and Programs by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency

Carolina Guzman of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency presented the findings of research conducted with funding from a grant that was awarded prior to the formation of the Reentry Council, through the San Francisco Safe Communities Reentry Council. The PowerPoint slides used in her presentation were included in the distributed information to members of the Council and the public in attendance, as part of Agenda Item V. She began by reviewing the purpose of the Reentry Council as stated in its founding legislative language. She then explained that the NCCD's assessment addresses the requirement of the Council to "provide accurate and comprehensive information about programs that serve the reentry population." She noted that the goals of the NCCD's research were to compile information about current programs and services in place that have an impact on the reentering population, whether they are intended specifically for this population or not, and to identify and develop processes for collecting information on target populations, services and capacities for development of a "program model matrix." Methodology included informant interviews with key staff from participating agencies

about reported services followed by analysis of those interviews to highlight common themes, which were validated by two independent research associates at NCCD. The identified themes were included as the sixth slide in the presentation.

Ms. Guzman explained that defining the reentry population is complicated by the reality of the many possible ways that individuals navigate through the criminal justice system (mapped on Slide 10). Because of the widely varying needs that individuals in the system have, NCCD identified a commensurate need for centralized, shared information between agencies and departments (for example, with regard to individuals' medical treatments and medication and other information that may be needlessly duplicated). Slide 13 identified gaps and overlaps in reported services. In particular, housing and employment services are identified as gaps, whereas screening and assessment services and mental health and substance abuse services are areas of at least some overlap provided by multiple agencies. Some of the challenges identified by the NCCD include the development of a formal mental health discharge plan with direct linkage to community providers; strengthening family support for individuals; establishing transitional housing units; augmenting gender-responsive models; and addressing employability at the regional level, Bay Area-wide. NCCD identified areas of opportunity, or things that respondents agreed would be positive, including a focus on common goals, information sharing, continuity of care, coordinated case management, shared assessment tools, relevant outcome measures and the establishment of an inter-departmental planning process.

Ms. Garcia asked about the connection between health issues and the physical health component of the research. Ms. Guzman affirmed that these connections and questions are important as we move forward.

DA Harris expressed the need to educate young parents in parenting skills with the goal of ending cycles of criminal behavior and incarceration. She asked what was learned about young parents' needs for such education and skills training. Ms. Guzman acknowledged that several departments reported working with this target group. She noted that challenges include continuing services to young parents once they are out of the system, and emphasized that continuity of care between departments and then, subsequently, back in the community, is a key challenge. DA Harris also noted that slide 14 in the presentation did not include the family track as a challenge, adding that there is a known lack of community services available, and therefore family issues should have been included. Ms. Guzman agreed.

Mr. Miller noted the lack of community-based organizations included in the survey, and Ms. Guzman explained that the study deliberately focused solely on the 14 departments encompassed by the Reentry Council. Ms. Flintoft reiterated that the limited scope of this project was intentional, and said that subsequent research may look at CBOs and other organizations. Ms. Escarcega asked whether there is any participatory research that looks at individuals currently in the system. Ms. Guzman acknowledged that such research programs do exist, and that this information will be shared with the Reentry Council.

Mr. Boyd asked about the survey's capacity to do qualitative assessment of the ability of providers to do thorough service provision. Ms. Guzman responded that the survey was qualitative and exploratory, and in that sense it brought a lot out about the need for better coordination between services, even where many service providers do exist. Probation officers, for instance, don't always have systematic methods for identifying available services for their clients, and instead base their referrals on personal experience and personal contacts. Ms.

Guzman said that the question of how this can be standardized and expanded is an example of the level of detail in the survey. Sheriff Hennessey asked whether this presentation marked the end of NCCD's contract on this topic, and Ms. Guzman said it did.

Mr. Eagleson noted as a challenge to meeting the employment needs of the reentering population the reality of a relatively low demand for jobs that do not require specialized skills or training in San Francisco. Ms. Guzman noted that the NCCD's interviews yielded a gap in job preparedness skills training, and agreed that the number of available jobs represents another challenge.

Mr. Zheng noted that slide 9, which mapped the many paths in the criminal justice system, did not include individuals who are subsequently deported, and did not specifically highlight recidivating individuals. He also adds that, despite challenging economic conditions, there are still employment opportunities for formerly incarcerated individuals, and suggests that reentry programs are most effective when they begin at the beginning of incarceration.

Chief Harrell asked if the research suggested the need for a universal definition of the reentry population. Ms. Guzman said that a universal definition for the entire reentry population may not necessarily achieve the objectives of the Council, because of the wide array of individuals and circumstances it would encompass. She said that a continuum of definitions may be more useful, especially from the research perspective.

Mr. Farnsworth said that outreach should start inside prisons, but it also has to start with families and young parents, in order to end cycles. He said that education is a key to ending these cycles, and that it poses a significant barrier to successful reentry. He suggested that better information, more easily accessible, would be a critical component of any outreach.

Ms. Campbell offered her own personal experience with regard to the parenting education that is offered in prisons, and noted Friends Outside as one organization that offers classes to parents in prison. She noted that one challenge she observed was that, although she was able to take parenting classes, women had very little contact with their children due to the remote location of the state prisons, and that the contact that she did have was complicated emotionally and logistically. She said that it is a challenge for incarcerated parents to maintain close connections with their children, even if they are served by good parenting classes and other resources. She reiterated importance of formerly incarcerated expertise on the Reentry Council.

Public Defender Adachi asked Ms. Guzman for three suggested actions stemming from the findings. He also asked for Ms. Guzman's opinion on what would be useful to obtain in any future research efforts, especially noting the lack of quantitative information about who needs services. For suggested actions to be taken, Ms. Guzman noted that the subcommittees that have already begun meeting constitute one important step, as just by convening they improve common understandings and common interests. The specific dialogues that take place in the subcommittees constitute a second recommended action. A third goal identified by Ms. Guzman was to identify and profile target groups who are being helped, but she acknowledged that we may not be ready to do this yet because we may not have adequately defined successful outcomes, especially considering that successful outcomes vary from person to person. Intermediately, dialogue that leads to a better understanding of the population may be another important next-step action.

Public Comment:

Sharon Darcy from Chico, California shared that she was here to learn about the Reentry Council because they would like to create one in Chico. She spoke about the importance of having expungement services available, and asked how it was incorporated into the Council. Sheriff Hennessey responded that expungement is a topic included in at least one subcommittee's discussions and forthcoming recommendations.

Anthony Jenkins shared his experience as a formerly incarcerated individual, and expressed concern about a lack of educational services in prison, even compared with services that used to be offered in federal prisons.

Yvette Smith of Centerforce noted that family reunification was not mentioned in the presentation, and added that Centerforce does provide services at San Quentin State Prison, including parenting classes. She asked what government agencies also do that sort of work. Ms. Guzman explained that NCCD's study was not intended to include organizations like Centerforce, and thanked Ms. Smith for bringing their efforts to her attention.

Kim Clark thanked previous speakers and asked whether there could be educational opportunities for prisoners who already have a GED to extend their education while incarcerated. Sheriff Hennessey said that both San Francisco State University and San Francisco City College do have programs specifically for formerly incarcerated individuals. Mr. Farnsworth added that tuition for those programs can be entirely covered through a private foundation in San Francisco. In response to a question about educational opportunities outside of San Francisco and California, Sheriff Hennessey said that the subcommittees can review current offerings and review the possibility of expansion.

Santos Kia shared the difficulty he had identifying available resources, noting that his parole officer was not able to provide much assistance in this regard. He added that he concurred with previous comments describing the challenges to maintaining family relationships that face incarcerated individuals. He further expressed a need for medical treatment and employment opportunities for reentering individuals. Mr. Farnsworth addressed comments by encouraging attendance at one of the weekly PACT meetings, which are designed to help coordinate available services to recently paroled individuals. He further recommended the Transitions program for parolees seeking medical care.

Ms. Escarcega thanked all formerly incarcerated individuals who have spoken for sharing their experiences, and offered to meet personally with anyone interested.

Richard Jimenez from Walden House suggested that CBOs should consider their strengths and weaknesses as well as think about collaborative partnerships with other organizations as they seek to meet the needs of returning individuals. He hoped that subcommittees would think about strategies when it comes time to lobby elected officials for funding or legislation.

Mark Thomas asked about statistics on the number of individuals reentering in San Francisco, as well as current recidivism rate information. Sheriff Hennessey responded that San Francisco's recidivism rate is high, and noted that more than 50% of those released from County Jail returning within the first 12 months. Public Defender Adachi encouraged people to visit <http://sfreentry.com> for an assessment including both probationers and parolees.

Sheriff Hennessey thanked Ms. Guzman for her report and concluded the agenda item.

VI. Proposed Process and Timeline for Development of At Least Annual Reports Presentation

Jessica Flintoft reviewed the requirements involved in the report, which is included in the duties outlined in SF Administrative Code 5.1-4. As an advisory body to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, the Council is required to report on four categories at least annually: Identifying funding streams; identifying programs; identifying unmet needs of reentry population; identifying barriers to successful reentry in local, state and federal law.

Ms. Roye suggested going through the city controller's office to get a complete understanding of funding that is already available and already utilized.

Mr. Zheng asked how the Council would go about writing grants for any identified funding. Ms. Flintoft responded that staff will write the at-least-annual report, which will include identified funding sources, but subsequent steps have not yet been identified.

Regarding identifying programs, Ms. Garcia confirmed that once again the controller is a good resource to simplify this effort.

Mr. Farnsworth suggested that the process should capture cost-per-unit considerations in addition to outcomes.

Sheriff Hennessey asked if staff would produce the draft report, and Jessica Flintoft stated that the first half of the draft report is planned for distribution at the Council's January meeting, while the second half of the draft report is planned for the Council's Spring meeting.

Regarding unmet needs, Ms. Roye suggested that the members and attendees of the subcommittees can serve as a resource for information because of the wide range of experiences that they represent.

Jessica Flintoft then outlined the planned staff processes for collecting information, including a "secondary" process that will encompass a literature review, summary review of relevant needs assessment, review of reported outcomes of current programs or services, partial review of available funding sources, and research into statutory and regulatory barriers to reentry. The "primary" research would include a survey of current programs serving the reentry population with assessment in terms of funding, programs, and needs. It would also include 3-5 focus groups of formerly incarcerated individuals, in order to identify individual-level information regarding both needs and barriers. Jessica Flintoft suggested that a second round of subcommittee meetings begin in October, and that subcommittees would then have an opportunity to discuss focus group and survey questions.

Mr. Zheng asked if at least one focus group could be conducted inside a jail or prison, and Jessica agreed.

Ms. Roye moved that the proposed process and timeline be approved, Chief Siffermann seconded, and the process was unanimously approved.

VII. Public Comment on items not listed on Agenda

Allyson West from the California Reentry Program, invited Council members and the public to CRP's resource fair at San Quentin State Prison on October 23rd.

VIII. Council members' comments, questions, and requests for future agenda items

Mr. Diaz de Leon asked which departments represented on the Council could be expected to be involved in the subcommittees' work. Sheriff Hennessey reiterated that departmental affiliations at the subcommittee level will become clearer once the membership of each subcommittee has been determined, which will be done in the next few weeks. He also said that it is possible that subcommittee representatives will be reporting directly to the Council at the next meeting. Jessica Flintoft encouraged all of the departments represented on the Council to be represented on at least one subcommittee. Ms. Garcia added that she and Mr. Arcelona would work to ensure that representatives from HSA and DPH are in attendance at the appropriate subcommittees.

Public Defender Adachi acknowledged the Reentry film and photography exhibit on September 22nd at the Public Library, and expressed his desire for events like that to continue, as they are a good way to bring new people into the conversation around reentry. Mr. Farnsworth asked whether there was a Reentry Summit planned for this year. Ms. Flintoft responded that no summit was planned for this year, but that there may be one planned for fall 2010.

Mr. Zheng suggested that conversations around reentry often neglect to address the needs of the lifer population, noting that such long-term incarceration raises larger questions around the expense of incarceration versus the potential value of releasing reformed individuals to serve their communities. Once released, he also noted that returning individuals face a lack of peer support, and suggested peer sponsors, along with publicizing stories of individuals' successful reentry into their communities. He also asked about recent changes in policy at San Quentin in terms of the lifer population, and the impact that those changes may have on programs and services.

Mr. Miller noted that the notion of a San Francisco Reentry Court had been raised in a subcommittee and expressed a desire for that topic to be discussed further.

Chief Boyd asked for schedule details on upcoming Council meetings, it was confirmed that the next meeting is scheduled for January 26, 2010 at the Public Library, while the subsequent meeting is tentatively set for April 20, 2010 10:00am-12:00pm, location to be determined.

Ms. Escarcega raised the issue of prisoner voting rights, and asked about a process for getting the Council to consider a resolution on the issue. She provided detail about get out the jail vote efforts. Sheriff Hennessey asked for clarification about what specific issue it is that Ms. Escarcega would like the Reentry Council to consider. Ms. Escarcega requested a resolution from this Council. Sheriff Hennessey offered to work with Ms. Escarcega and staff to develop a resolution to consider at the next Reentry Council meeting. Ms. Roye suggested that Ms. Escarcega provide a presentation on the topic as well as some background materials and documentation so that Council members can reach an informed position before considering a resolution. Ms. Escarcega thanked her for the suggestion.

IX. Adjournment

Sheriff Hennessey entertained motion to adjourn. Motion to adjourn is made and seconded, approved unanimously at 12:07p.m.

**Update on Subcommittees & Timeline for Development of the Annual Report
Reentry Council
January 26, 2010**

Update on Subcommittees

Five subcommittees are active:

1. Civil Rights & Civic Engagement of Formerly Incarcerated People
2. Self-Sufficiency of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated People
3. Health & Well Being of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated People
4. Welfare & Safety of Families, Victims, & Communities
5. Community Justice & Alternatives to Incarceration.

Since the September 29th meeting, the Co-chairs and staff worked together to develop a process to finalize members of subcommittees. All interested individuals completed a Statement of Interest application. The Statement surveyed their interests, skills, meeting day and time availability, and subcommittee choice. Individuals were limited to one subcommittee per person in order to maximize opportunities for participation across subcommittees. Further, individuals were advised that subcommittee members would be held to the same attendance requirement as Council members are, i.e., no more than two unexcused absences in a 12-month period. These applications were due November 5th, reviewed and approved shortly thereafter, and subcommittees each convened once in the month of December.

95 individuals were selected for 5 subcommittees. Subcommittees have established meeting dates and places for all of 2010, public rosters, and have each selected their own chairperson. Staff held an orientation for chairpersons to develop ground rules for subcommittee meetings, review public meetings laws, and to discuss how to effectively meeting administration responsibilities with staff. Subcommittee members have begun to work with staff to develop focus groups of affected individuals, surveys of programs and correctional partners, and bibliographies of key literature to be reviewed for the development of the annual report. Further, subcommittees have set as standing subcommittee agenda items each of the following: relevant funding opportunities; relevant legislative or policy issues; short-term actions to be brought to Council.

Staff have developed internal systems to manage multiple public meetings and associated requirements, including meeting attendance and noticing requirements. Staff has developed the external website <http://sfreentry.com>. All meeting information for all Council and subcommittee meetings are made available there, including but not limited to agendas, meeting materials, draft meeting minutes, final meeting minutes, calendar of upcoming meeting dates, rosters of members, and background information about the Council's formation and history. The IT Unit of the Public Defender's Office developed this website using software that is free of cost and easy for staff to regularly update. In early November, the Reentry Council brought on half-time associate Michael Klinger, through funding provided by the San Francisco Foundation, and full-time assistant Jeaneane Young, through the JOBS NOW! Program. The website and staffing additions have been critical to the administration of the Council.

Timeline for Development of the Annual Report

SF Administrative Code 5.1-4 outlines the Reentry Council's powers and duties, which include reporting on the follow four categories of information in at least annual reports to the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, any City department or program identified by the Council in a report, and the public:

1. Identifying Funding Streams at the local, state, and federal level that that is earmarked or available for services or programs designed to serve individuals exiting the criminal justice system. Identify the conditions, restrictions, or limitations on each funding stream.
2. Identifying Programs, and the capacity of each, that serve individuals exiting the criminal justice system who reside in San Francisco or who will be released to San Francisco.
3. Identifying Unmet Needs of Reentry Population, and propose ways to meet those needs based on existing research and best practices.
4. Identifying Barriers to safe and successful reentry presented by local, State, and Federal law, and propose ways to reduce the impact of these barriers.

Process for Collecting Information

Staff is working with subcommittees to conduct the following secondary research:

- Literature review of current research on relevant needs and best practices;
- Summary review of relevant needs assessments of our reentry population;
- Review of reported outcomes of current programs or services, including but not limited to: published evaluations, published performance measurement data;
- Partial review of available federal, state, local, and private funding sources related to reentry;
- Research to identify specific statutory and regulatory barriers to reentry, and related best practices to reduce impact of such barriers.

Status: subcommittees and staff have compiled a 17-page preliminary working bibliography of such resources, available at <http://sfreentry.com>.

Staff is working with subcommittees to conduct the following primary research:

- Conduct a survey of programs currently providing services to reentry population to assess program-level information in areas of 1) funding, 2) programs, and 3) needs. Distribute survey directly to government-run and community-based programs, and through local departments/agencies that fund community-based programs. Utilize pertinent subset of information for an update of the *Getting Out & Staying Out* Resource Guide.

Status: to be completed in February 2010.

- Conduct 3-5 focus groups of formerly incarcerated individuals, with effort to make sure that focus groups are composed of individuals representative of broader reentry population. Purpose is to identify individual-level information in areas of 3) needs and 4) barriers.

Status: 1 focus group of survivors held 1/21/10. All to be completed in February 2010.

Updated Timeline

Date	Action Step
October — November 2009	Staff begins conducting secondary research based on input received at 1st round of subcommittee meetings. Develop preliminary design for primary research.
December 2009 – January 2010	With subcommittees, finalize content of surveys and focus groups, and to provide key literature in 5 subject areas to staff.
January – February 2010	Staff and Subcommittee volunteers conduct program surveys and focus groups. Relevant departments and agencies request survey responses and assist in setting up focus groups.
February— March 2010	Subcommittees review findings from program surveys and focus groups, and provide feedback on staff draft of Unmet Needs and Programs report sections. Staff drafts to be made available for public input through website.
April 20, 2010	Reentry Council reviews draft sections on Unmet Needs and Programs, as presented by subcommittees and staff.
April—May 2010	Subcommittees provide feedback on staff draft of Barriers and Funding report sections. Staff drafts to be made available for public input through website.
Summer 2010 (meeting date TBD)	Reentry Council reviews full draft report including sections on Unmet Needs, Programs, Barriers, and Funding. Full report is considered for adoption. Within 30 days of issuance, any city department identified in the report may provide a written response that will be included.
Fall 2010 (date TBD)	Present final report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Subcommittee on Civil Rights & Civic Engagement of Formerly Incarcerated People
Update to Reentry Council
January 26, 2010

Dates of Meetings:

August 21, 2009
December 10, 2009
January 14, 2010

Members of Subcommittee:

See Subcommittee Roster.

Overview of Topics:

- Voting rights and access to the vote: accurate information about the law and access to voter registration materials and absentee ballots.
- Obtaining necessary government-issued identification: driver's license/state ID, social security card, birth certificate, tribal identification.
- Lifetime collateral consequences of criminal records: barriers to housing, employment, licensing, and impacts of lifetime registrations.
- Civic participation and engagement of formerly incarcerated people in community and government: ways to create positive opportunities for the voices of formerly incarcerated in civic bodies.

Actions to Date:

- Selection of Randy Stortroen as Chairperson.
- Volunteers working on development of survey of programs and of correctional partners.
- Volunteers developing focus groups for incarcerated and formerly incarcerated people.
- Volunteers developed bibliography of literature on needs and best practices related to civil rights & civic engagement.

Next Steps:

- Complete all program surveys, surveys of correctional partners, and focus groups.
- Develop draft report of needs and programs related Civil Rights & Civic Engagement.
- Begin research to assess funding available & regulatory/legislative barriers to reentry.

Points for Today:

- Pleased that Council is hearing two items related to subcommittee's efforts today:
 - Agenda Item VI. Access of County Jail Inmates to Information about Voting Rights, and
 - Agenda Item IX. Presentation on Efforts to Count Reentry Population in 2010 Census.

Subcommittee on Community Justice & Alternatives to Incarceration
Update to Reentry Council
January 26, 2010

Dates of Meetings:

September 18, 2009

December 14, 2009

Members of Subcommittee:

See Subcommittee Roster.

Overview of Topics:

- Collaborative Courts and Diversion: increasing capacity of collaborative courts, reentry court, increased services.
- Sentencing and Early Release: increase services and coordination, ensure safety, increase capacity.
- Probation and Parole: improving supervision, more clinical support and access to resources.

Actions to Date:

- Selected Chairperson Richard Jimenez.
- Volunteers working on development of survey of programs and of correctional partners.
- Volunteers developing focus groups for victims and communities.
- Volunteers developed bibliography of literature on needs and best practices related to community justice and alternatives to incarceration.

Next Steps:

- Complete all program surveys, surveys of correctional partners, and focus groups.
- Develop draft report of needs and programs related Community Justice & Alternatives to Incarceration.
- Begin research to assess funding available & regulatory/legislative barriers to reentry.

Points for Today:

- Looking forward to hearing from SF Superior Court and partners about plans for responding to State's Parolee Reentry Court solicitation at next subcommittee meeting.
- Pleased to have parole on subcommittee to keep us informed about how implementation of Non-Revocable Parole (which took effect 1/25/10) will impact parolees in San Francisco.

Subcommittee on Health & Wellbeing of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated People
Update to Reentry Council
January 26, 2010

Dates of Meetings: September 1, 2009; December 9, 2009; January 13, 2010.

Members of Subcommittee: See Subcommittee Roster.

Overview of Topics:

The Subcommittee on Health & Wellbeing of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated People of San Francisco adopts the definition of health as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease. This broad definition emphasizes social and personal resources, as well as physical capacities. We characterize well-being as the state in which an individual realizes his or her own abilities, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to his or her community. Incarcerated individuals experience disproportionately higher rates of infectious and chronic diseases, substance abuse, mental illness and trauma than the general population. Upon release from incarceration they face significant barriers to healthy reintegration into their communities, including a higher risk of death. Therefore the promotion of health and well being in this vulnerable community involves access to healthcare services as well as the creation of living conditions and environments to support people to adopt and maintain healthy lifestyles.

In that vein, the subcommittee has identified 4 primary areas of focus: housing, physical health, mental and behavioral health, and well-being.

- Housing: emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent safe affordable housing.
- Physical Health: open access to care, ongoing primary care, preventative care, vision, dental care, including nutrition, recreation/exercise, access to medications
- Mental and Behavioral Health: inpatient and outpatient services to address mental health, substance abuse, co-occurring disorders, and other behavioral health issues.
- Well-Being: giving back to the community, mentorship, recidivism prevention, support, family reunification

Actions to Date:

- Selected Co-Chairs Sasha Hauswald and Dr. Shira Shavit.
- Volunteers working on development of survey of programs and of correctional partners.
- Volunteers developing focus groups for incarcerated and formerly incarcerated people.
- Volunteers developed bibliography of literature on related needs and best practices.

Next Steps:

- Complete all program surveys, surveys of correctional partners, and focus groups.
- Develop draft report of needs and programs related Health & Wellbeing.
- Begin research to assess funding available & regulatory/legislative barriers to reentry.

Points for Today:

- Subcommittee will begin dialogue with State Parole to develop strategies to maintain access to services and treatment for transient registered sex offenders.

Subcommittee on Self Sufficiency of Currently & Formerly Incarcerated People
Update to Reentry Council
January 26, 2010

Dates of Meetings:

August 25, 2009

December 16, 2009

January 20, 2010 (continued due to lack of quorum)

Members of Subcommittee:

See Subcommittee Roster.

Overview of Topics:

- Education: including literacy/basic, secondary, post-secondary.
- Employment: training, placement, retention, job readiness.
- Financial Obligations and Money Management: child support, fines, fees, becoming banked, repairing credit.
- Public Benefits: eligibility for and access to Food Stamps, WIC, SSI, GA, CalWORKS, Medi-Cal, etc.
- Personal Development & Advocacy Skills: problem solving skills and personal advocacy needed to navigate systems, challenges, and become as self-sufficient as possible.

Actions to Date:

- Selected Chairperson Mark Thomas.
- Volunteers working on development of survey of programs and of correctional partners.
- Volunteers developing focus groups for incarcerated and formerly incarcerated people.
- Volunteers developed bibliography of literature on needs and best practices related to self sufficiency.

Next Steps:

- Complete all program surveys, surveys of correctional partners, and focus groups.
- Develop draft report of needs and programs related Self Sufficiency.
- Begin research to assess funding available & regulatory/legislative barriers to reentry.

Points for Today:

- Pleased that Council is hearing an item related to subcommittee's efforts today:
 - Agenda Item V. Appointment of Reentry Council Representative to WiCAC. Both applicants are members of the Self Sufficiency Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee looks forward to working with either as WiCAC appointee.

Subcommittee on the Welfare & Safety of Families, Victims, & Communities
Update to Reentry Council
January 26, 2010

Dates of Meetings:

September 10, 2009

December 3, 2009

January 21, 2010

Members of Subcommittee:

See Subcommittee Roster.

Overview of Topics:

- Children and Families of people who are currently and formerly incarcerated: quality contact during incarceration, custody/reunification, access to benefits and housing, support to families during reentry
- Victims of returning offenders: restorative justice, notification of release, supportive services, ensure safety.
- Communities to which people are returning: ensure safety, high poverty and high unemployment areas, better coordination of community around individual's return.

Actions to Date:

- Selected Chairperson Elizabeth Brett.
- Volunteers working on development of survey of programs and of correctional partners.
- Volunteers developing focus groups for victims and communities.
- Volunteers developed bibliography of literature on needs and best practices related to families, victims, and communities.

Next Steps:

- Complete all program surveys, surveys of correctional partners, and focus groups. Staff completed focus group of survivors on 1/21/10.
- Develop draft report of needs and programs related Families, Victims, and Communities.
- Begin research to assess funding available & regulatory/legislative barriers to reentry.

Points for Today:

- Subcommittee is addressing the issue of continuity of services from incarceration through release, in particular services to assist parents and children.
- Subcommittee is addressing how to ensure interests of victims, communities, and families receive enough attention in subcommittee discussions.

The Reentry Council called for individuals interested in serving as the Council's appointee to the Workforce Investment Community Advisory Committee (WiCAC). Statements of interest were due no later than 5:00pm on Friday, January 8, 2010. The following documents are included.

1. Background and Process Overview
2. Statement of Interest: Krystal Koop
3. Statement of Interest: Marcy Orosco

***WiCAC Representative Brief Statement of Interest
Reentry Council***

Background

The Reentry Council will appoint one individual to serve as its representative on the Workforce Investment Community Advisory Committee (WiCAC), which was established by Ordinance 0270-07 and is designed to advise the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) board on the City's workforce needs and solutions to meet them. The WiCAC will identify the "on-the-ground" workforce challenges, and recommend solutions to close gaps in the workforce development infrastructure. The WiCAC is composed of seven members that are staff and/or board members of 501(c)3 organizations. They serve terms of two years, for no more than two consecutive terms. The Reentry Council appoints one member to the WiCAC in order to reflect the workforce development challenges and solutions for formerly incarcerated people. To read more about the WiCAC and the WISF, visit <http://oewd.org/WISF-Board.aspx>.

Process

At its September 29th meeting, the Reentry Council adopted the following process for appointing an individual to serve as the Reentry Council's appointee to the WiCAC.

Step I. By no later than 5:00pm on Friday, January 8, 2010, all interested individuals who are staff and/or board members of 501(c)3 organizations should submit a WiCAC Brief Statement of Interest to Reentry Council staff by downloading the Statement from <http://www.sfreentry.com>, and submitting it via e-mail, postal mail, or hand delivery. Read on for WiCAC Brief Statement of Interest and more.

Step II. Reentry Council staff will forward all WiCAC Brief Statements of Interest received by 5:00pm on Friday, January 8, 2010 to all members of Reentry Council for their review.

Step III. The Reentry Council will appoint its representative from this set of individuals at its Tuesday, January 26, 2010 meeting. All individuals who have submitted their WiCAC Brief Statements of Interest shall have the opportunity to appear before the Reentry Council at this meeting to answer any questions that Reentry Council members may have about their interest in being appointed.

WiCAC Brief Statement of Interest

If you are interested, please complete this WiCAC Brief Statement of Interest form. Statements must be received by no later than 5:00pm on Friday January 8, 2010. Statements must be e-mailed to reentry.council@sfgov.org or may be mailed/hand delivered to Jessica Flintoft, Reentry Council, 555 7th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

I. About You

Your Name: Krystal Koop

Your Job Title or Affiliation: Ex-Offender Navigator

501(c)3 Organization You Represent: Goodwill Industries of San Francisco

Website: www.sfgoodwill.org

Your Phone number: (415) 575-2113

Your Mailing address: 1500 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

Your E-mail address: kkoop@sfgoodwill.org

II. Your Interest

Please describe your relevant experience and skills needed to effectively represent the purpose of the Reentry Council on the WiCAC.

Goodwill is a long-standing and well-known non-profit organization that focuses on job readiness training, skill building and employment. The One Stop at Goodwill brings client triage, assessment, career advising and business services and most recently, a staff member focused on assisting formerly incarcerated individuals navigate through the workforce development system.

Career advisors work with individuals through the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) to provide individuals with services on life skills, career development plans, pertinent employment skills training programs and ultimately, placement.

The Business Services division primarily works to create partnerships with San Francisco Bay Area businesses to educate businesses on the incentives available to them by hiring low-income and at-risk potential employees. This is done through employer engagement and providing qualified and motivated individuals participating in any of Goodwill's programs. They have an excellent track record in regards to placement and long-term retention.

The newest program at Goodwill is the Ex-Offender Navigator program, which helps formerly incarcerated individuals with navigating the various programs and processes involved with the workforce development system, while focusing and supporting participants on how to navigate this system effectively with their specific needs surrounding their criminal background. The Navigator works to not only provide individualized attention and strategy for formerly incarcerated to achieve their career goals, they also work to partner with other community based organizations, businesses and city agencies to ensure that wraparound services are available and effective for this particular population.

This program was created as a result of the gaps within the One Stop System. It was understood that while the One Stops are beneficial to those that are able to utilize self-service resources, such as dislocated workers, many formerly incarcerated individuals were not able to utilize the One Stop system or other area workforce/training providers under this structure. The navigator program is currently attempting to close this gap by providing direct services to these individuals and assist the One Stop system to create a more user-friendly environment.

This program has also been working towards creating a larger community system in assisting formerly incarcerated with other beneficial community resources relating to overall stability, training, education and employment. This is being done through creating solid partnerships with outside organizations and agencies and working in tandem with these agencies on wraparound services and long-term interventions and planning.

Please describe your ability to make regular reports to the Reentry Council and/or its subcommittees, as requested.

If chosen for this committee, Goodwill would be able to make regular meetings, committee hearings and reports to the Reentry Council. As a current public participant in the Reentry Council and its Self-Sufficiency Subcommittee, it would be with great pleasure that Goodwill be chosen to participate in the WiCAC process.

I. About You

Your Name: Marcy Orosco

Your Job Title or Affiliation: Director of Harbor House Program

501(c)3 Organization You Represent: The Salvation Army

Website: www.harborhousesf.org

Your Phone number: 415.503.3022

Your Mailing address: 407 9th Street

Your E-mail address: marcy.orosco@usw.salvationarmy.org

II. Your Interest

Please describe your relevant experience and skills needed to effectively represent the purpose of the Reentry Council on the WiCAC.

I have been involved in workforce services for the formerly incarcerated almost 20 years. I personally had the first job fair “behind the bars,” in 1996. I am part of the community partnership of San Quentin and go there regularly as part of a incarcerated veterans team. I have a database of over 200 employers who hire felons. I have done marketing of the population as well as fund raising.

Please describe your ability to make regular reports to the Reentry Council and/or its subcommittees, as requested.

I am able to facilitate monthly reports with no problem, as long as I have a schedule of meetings prior. I am very familiar with government, county, and federal reporting standards and requirements.



Reentry Council City and County of San Francisco

The purpose of the Reentry Council is to coordinate local efforts to support adults exiting San Francisco County Jail, San Francisco juvenile justice out-of-home placements, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation facilities, and the United States Federal Bureau of Prison facilities (SF Admin Code, Section 5.1).

January 26, 2010

Hon. David Chiu, President
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear President Chiu and Members:

The Reentry Council hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors pass a resolution urging the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Corrections Standard Authority (CDCR/CSA) to adopt specific guidelines for county sheriffs and departments of corrections, in order to facilitate voting among eligible incarcerated individuals.

The Reentry Council of the City and County of San Francisco ("Reentry Council") was created by the Board of Supervisors in September, 2008 to coordinate local efforts to support adults returning from incarceration to the San Francisco community. As part of its charge, the Council is to identify barriers to safe and successful reentry and propose ways to reduce the impact of these barriers.

For most California residents, the right to vote is fundamental – and a critical way that individuals participate in our democratic society. Unfortunately, many incarcerated individuals are incorrectly denied this right due to misinformation in county jails. The California Constitution provides for the disqualification of electors who are "imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony." However, California courts have specifically held that this provision *does not apply* to convicted felons who are sentenced to county jail or placed on probation.

In San Francisco, the Sheriff's Department has implemented model protocols and procedures for ensuring that all inmates who are eligible to vote can do so. Unfortunately, these critical steps have not been taken in other counties, resulting in the disenfranchisement of eligible voters – and a fundamental barrier to civic engagement for these individuals. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Corrections Standards Authority (CDCR/CSA), which oversees all county jails, has been silent on this issue.

We thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Members of the Reentry Council of the City and County of San Francisco

FILE NO.

RESOLUTION NO.

1 [Urging the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitations to Implement Guidelines
2 to Ensure Voting Access for Eligible Offenders.]

3
4 **Resolution Urging the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s**
5 **Corrections Standard Authority to Adopt Specific Guidelines for County Sheriffs and**
6 **Departments of Corrections, in Order to Facilitate Voting Among Eligible Incarcerated**
7 **Individuals.**

8
9
10 WHEREAS, the right to vote is fundamental – and a critical way that individuals
11 participate in our democratic society; and

12 WHEREAS, California courts have specifically held that convicted felons who are
13 sentenced to county jail or placed on probation are entitled to vote; and

14 WHEREAS the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department has implemented model protocols
15 and procedures for ensuring that all inmates who are eligible to vote can do so; and

16 WHEREAS these critical steps have not been taken in other counties, resulting in the
17 disenfranchisement of eligible voters – and a fundamental barrier to civic engagement for
18 these individuals; and

19 WHEREAS the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s Corrections
20 Standards Authority (CDCR/CSA), which oversees all county jails, has been silent on this
21 issue; therefore be it

22 RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
23 hereby urges the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s Corrections Standard
24 Authority (CDCR/CSA) to adopt specific guidelines for county sheriffs and departments of
25 corrections, in order to facilitate voting among eligible incarcerated individuals.

Supervisor _____
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Update on New Funding Received to Implement Reentry Initiatives
since October 2009, as reported by Government Partners

As a regular informational update to the full Reentry Council, staff has started to compile a list of *recently awarded* private, state, and federal funding that will be used to provide in-custody or out-of-custody services to the adult reentry population. All 14 public agencies represented on the Council were asked to report on any relevant grants, contracts, or earmarks received since October 2009. Only funding actually awarded, not pending requests, are included in this update. Staff will maintain this list, and present it to the full Reentry Council at each meeting, as an informational update. The information provided below may not be complete, but is that which was reported by agencies to staff as of Friday January 22, 2010.

Funding Source:	ARRA
Funding Program:	Formula Grant to San Francisco
Amount Awarded:	\$415,000
Award Period:	18 months
Grantee:	SF Superior Court
Planned Activities:	Transitional Housing for CJC, BHC, Drug Court, Prop 36 Two Positions for Youth Treatment Education Court
Population to be Served:	Collaborative Court clients; Youth

Funding Source:	U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance
Funding Program:	2009 Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program
Amount Awarded:	\$190,000
Award Period:	up to 24 months
Grantee:	SF Superior Court
Planned Activities:	Transitional housing
Population to be Served:	Drug Court clients

Funding Source:	U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance
Funding Program:	2009 Second Chance Act Prisoner Reentry Initiative, Adult Demonstration Program
Amount Awarded:	\$600,000 per year
Award Period:	1 year, with possible extension of 2 additional years.
Grantee:	SF Department of Public Health, Community Behavioral Health Services
Planned Activities:	Continuum of services, treatment, housing, transitional employment for women in and exiting State Prison.
Population to be Served:	Women who will be paroled to SF.

Funding Source:	U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Funding Program:	2009 Second Chance Act Youth Offender Reentry Demonstration Program
Amount Awarded:	\$660,615 per year
Award Period:	1 year, with possible extension of 2 additional years.
Grantee:	SF Juvenile Probation Department
Planned Activities:	Juvenile reentry court with continuum of services for youth in and returning from out-of-home placements.
Population to be Served:	SF youth in out-of-home placements.

Funding Source:	CA Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation/CA Workforce Investment Board
Funding Program:	New Start Prison to Employment Program
Amount Awarded:	\$48,000
Award Period:	1 year
Grantee:	SF Office of Economic & Workforce Development
Planned Activities:	Advanced training through hundreds of state WIA approved providers.
Population to be Served:	SF parolees accessing employment services at One Stops and via Reentry Navigators.

Funding Source:	Metta Fund
Funding Program:	private grant
Amount Awarded:	\$80,000
Award Period:	2 years
Grantee:	SF Office of the Public Defender
Planned Activities:	Case management and placement services in supportive employment opportunities.
Population to be Served:	Clients with serious mental illnesses, including those served by Behavioral Health Court and Jail Psychiatric Services.



SF COUNTS: 2010 CENSUS STRATEGIC PLAN HIGHLIGHTS

The following was developed by OCEIA and the San Francisco 2010 Census Complete Count Committee

VISION: Residents from all communities in San Francisco are informed, engaged, participating fully in the democratic process and contributing to San Francisco's overall success.

MISSION: Mobilize and educate the public to ensure an accurate, fair and inclusive count of San Francisco's population during the 2010 Census.

OVERALL GOALS:

#1. CONDUCT EFFECTIVE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Identify and successfully develop effective approaches for informing and educating the general public about the importance of the 2010 Census to San Francisco and to its communities and people.

#2. CITYWIDE MOBILIZATION AND CALL TO ACTION

Motivate and inspire all residents to be counted and to participate fully in the city's Complete Count effort by taking personal leadership and encouraging their family members, friends and neighbors to do the same.

#3 OPEN ACCESS TO FULL AND INCLUSIVE PARTICIPATION

Identify barriers to participation for historically undercounted communities in San Francisco. Develop effective solutions and effective, street-smart outreach strategies tailored to their issues and needs that allow for full and inclusive participation.

#4 EFFICIENCY AND EFFICACY

Ensure that the City's outreach efforts are effective and efficient by:

- Identifying city and community assets and fully involving existing formal and informal networks;
- Leveraging outreach efforts and materials by the U.S. Census Bureau, and
- Supplementing existing materials and outreach with locally focused communications and tailored messages.

DESIRED OUTCOMES FOR SF COUNTS:

- #1.** A successful and accurate count of San Francisco's estimated 810,000 residents.
- #2.** Achieve a 70-75% questionnaire mail response rate, exceeding the U.S. Census Bureau's target of 65%.
- #3.** Successfully reach and include hard-to-count communities; reduce the undercount by at least 75%.
- #4.** Create momentum and a sense of a united San Francisco where all residents feel valued and included in the 2010 Census effort.
- #5.** Maximize the amount of funding obtained from the federal government.