AB 109 from October 1, 2011 to Present

in Nevada County

Public Safety Realignment:

- Transferred responsibility from the state to counties for portion of criminal justice population
- Non-serious, non-violent crimes are no longer prisoneligible as a controlling offense
- Some inmates exiting state prison are now supervised by county probation instead of state parole
- Provides formula-based funding to counties for implementation and sustainability
- Mandates that county correction agencies employ evidence based practices and alternatives to custody to reduce recidivism

CCP Executive Committee

- Chief Probation Officer-Michael Ertola
 Sheriff-Keith Royal
- District Attorney-Cliff Newell
- Public Defender-Keri Klein
- Grass Valley Police Chief-Alex
 Gammelgard
- HHSA Director-Michael Heggarty
- Courts Designee-Tonya Clark

PRCS : Post Release Community Supervision

Offenders who were in state prison or on parole prior to October 1, 2011 for a non-nonnon offense as their controlling offense

MS: Mandatory Supervision

Offenders convicted of a non-nonnon after October 1, 2011, sentenced to prison but serving the time locally in county jail with probation acting as the supervising agent for the remainder of the sentence

Mandatory Supervision 1170(h)(5)(a) 1170(h)(5)(b)

Straight Sentence, no period of Supervision

Split Sentence A period of custody time followed by a period of supervision

AB109 in Nevada County

Average Daily Jail Population of AB 109 Offenders in Nevada County

20

Includes:

Parole Revocations Straight Sentences Split Sentences (MS) PRCS- Revocation, Flash Incarceration

AB109 Demographics for Nevada County

Demographics	
Male	53
Female	9
Avg. Age	38.21

Types of Current Offenses AB109 Clients for Nevada County

Sanctions	
Theft	13
Drugs	20
Sex	1
Domestic Violence	2
DUI	0
Violence	1
Vandalism	1
Vehicle Theft	6
Weapons	12
Escape	1
Evasion	5

Residence Location

Nevada City (proper)	1
Grass Valley (proper)	7
Truckee (proper)	5
Transient/Transitional Housing	9
Penn Valley	2
County Jurisdiction	31
NSJ	1
Out of County (pending transfer)	6

Sanctions

Technical Violations	Majority are failing to report or +UA
Flash Incarcerations 1-10 days	22
Revocations	30 (16 individuals)
Arrests for New Law Offense	16
New Convictions	5

Adult Recidivism Definition

Recidivism is defined as conviction of a new felony or misdemeanor committed within three years of release from custody or committed within three years of placement on supervision for a previous criminal conviction

~ Board of State and Community Corrections Press Release September 25, 2014

Parole Recidivism Rate in 2010 was 50% in Nevada County

Average Recidivism Rate Post Realignment for AB109 Offenders in California Counties was 40% as of 2014

As of August 2015, Nevada County's AB109 Recidivism Rate was 14.25% (38/261)

http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/Annual/CalPris/CALPRIS 12010.pdf

Evidence Based Practices in Nevada County

- Electronic Monitoring (GPS)
- o Home Detention
- Flash Incarceration
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy
- Moral Reconation Therapy
- Validated Risk Assessments
- Motivational Interviewing
- Random Drug Testing
- Reward/Sanction Matrix
- Treatment based on Criminogenic Needs

Collaboration Opportunities

- Behavioral Health Therapist
- Social Services Eligibility Worker
- Nevada Union Adult Education
- Common Goals
- Alliance for Workforce Development
- John Muir Academy
- Sierra Community College
- Victor Family Services

AB109 Allocations

AB109 Future Allocations for Nevada County

2015-2016

Base Allocation Estimated Growth One Time Portion Actual Allocation 1,933,341 491,014 292,902 2,717.257

2016-2017

Base Allocation2,027,755Estimated Growth80,310Estimated Allocation2,108,065

2015-2016 Contingency Budget

Contingency Realignment Fund

\$1,284,084

- Health Care, Mental Health
- Employment Vocational Training
- Housing
- Unanticipated Increase in Population
- Capital Facilities Fund
 - DRC
 - Jail ReEntry Program

\$600,000

\$1,884,084

Nevada County CCP Sustainability Plan

- Data drives all decision making
- Maximize efficiencies by using best practices
- Custody is not cost effective
- Long term custody has proven unsuccessful in reducing recidivism
- Supervision + Treatment + Pro-Social Opportunities is proven to be cost effective and reduce recidivism
- Maximize alternative sanctions in lieu of long term custody

Flash, GPS, increased treatment/testing/reporting
Goal is 100% split sentences (1170 h 5 b)

2012 Prop 30

 The passing of Prop 30 guarantees continuation of AB109 funding for California Counties.

 However, the amount of funding in future years is unknown.

No General Fund will be used in this plan

Board Of Supervisors Approval

 The CCP plan will be deemed accepted by the board unless the board rejects the plan and sends it back to the CCP for further consideration, which requires a 4/5ths vote of the Board of Supervisors

Thank You

• Any Questions?