AGENDA
June 7, 2017
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Hall of Justice
District Attorney Law Library
850 Bryant Street Room 322
San Francisco, CA 94103

Note: Each member of the public will be allotted no more than 3 minutes to speak on each item.

1. Call to Order; Roll call.

2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below (discussion only).

3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from March 1, 2017 (discussion & possible action).

4. Staff Report on Sentencing Commission Activities (discussion & possible action).

5. Legislative Work Group Update (discussion & possible action).


8. Presentation on Blueprint for Shared Safety: Survivor-Centered and Trauma-Informed by Anna Cho Fenley, Project Director and Marisa Arrona, Local Safety Solutions Project Director, Californians for Safety and Justice (discussion & possible action).

9. Members’ Comments, Questions, Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion & possible action).

10. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Above, as well as Items not Listed on the Agenda.

11. Adjournment.
SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SAN FRANCISCO SENTENCING COMMISSION
Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the San Francisco Sentencing Commission, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. These comments will be made a part of the official public record, and brought to the attention of the Sentencing Commission. Written comments should be submitted to: Tara Anderson Grants & Policy Manager, San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, 850 Bryant Street, Room 322, San Francisco, CA 94102, or via email: tara.anderson@sfgov.org

MEETING MATERIALS
Copies of agendas, minutes, and explanatory documents are available through the Sentencing Commission website at http://www.sfdistrictattorney.org or by calling Tara Anderson at (415) 553-1203 during normal business hours. The material can be FAXed or mailed to you upon request.

ACCOMMODATIONS
To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Tara Anderson at tara.anderson@sfgov.org or (415) 553-1203 at least two business days before the meeting.

TRANSLATION
Interpreters for languages other than English are available on request. Sign language interpreters are also available on request. For either accommodation, please contact Tara Anderson at tara.anderson@sfgov.org or (415) 553-1203 at least two business days before the meeting.

CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES
To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)
Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: www.sfgov.org/sunshine.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE:
Administrator
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683.
Telephone: (415) 554-7724
E-Mail: soft@sfgov.org

CELL PHONES
The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

LOBBYIST ORDINANCE
Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and web site http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/
1. Call to Order; Roll call
District Attorney George Gascón welcomes everyone to the 19th Sentencing Commission meeting and calls to order at 10:07 AM.

2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below (discussion only)
No public comments received.

3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from December 4, 2016 (discussion & possible action)
District Attorney Gascón asked commission members to review minutes from the previous commission meeting and made a motion to accept the minutes from December 14, 2016; the motion was seconded by Dr. Steven Raphael. Motion passed.

4. Staff Report on Sentencing Commission Activities (discussion & possible action)
Tara Anderson provided the staff report:
As a follow-up to the California Justice Policy Center concept paper, staff educated state representatives on the California Justice Policy Center and received information about the feasibility of introducing the Sentencing Commission-like legislation for state-wide adoption. Due to the continued conflict of the membership and authority of such a body, the legislature appears to be in the position that a ballot initiative or Governor action would be required.

Mrs. Anderson informed the Commission that Alissa Skog, Policy Fellow will be exclusively working on the recidivism dashboard funded by the MacArthur Innovation Fund awarded to the city and County of San Francisco.

The timeline of new and existing work groups discussed:
• Possible sunset for Young Adult Court Workgroup, which has been reporting on progress and enrollment.
• LEAD workgroup will continue to meet depending on available funding.
• Subcommittee on state-level legislation will be time limited and convening a few times during the year.
• Sentencing Commission Staff will collaborate with Reentry Council and report on our Criminal Justice Master Plan process for the June SC Meeting.
• Staff are still identifying objectives for the Behavioral Health, Mental Health & Substance Abuse and Justice and Data Sharing work group.

Membership transitions: Eric Henderson of the Ella Baker Center in Oakland was appointed by the Reentry Council to serve in the seat for a person representing an agency that serves formerly incarcerated persons. New SC rosters were shared with Members.

Mrs. Anderson provided an overview of the listing of free and in kind research support included in the meeting materials. Mrs. Anderson emphasized that the list is merely an inventory of resources known to SC staff. The list does not serve as a particular endorsement of any single agency or entity. Mrs. Anderson explained the variation in types of research support provided by each entity and used Betagov as a research institute for practice as an example. Lastly, Mrs. Anderson encouraged members to contact SFDA office staff with any questions about the process for accepting free research support as staff has recent experience that they are happy to share.

5. Recidivism Work Group updates (discussion only)

Mrs. Anderson reported on Sentencing Commission (SC) Recidivism Workgroup. Sentencing Commission staff submitted an application to the MacArthur Safety and Justice Challenge to continue the work of the Recidivism Workgroup and the development of a Recidivism Dashboard. Originally, MacArthur indicated that San Francisco was too far along in reducing our jail population to participate in the national initiative, however, we were subsequently invited to and applied for a small fifteen-month grant to support innovation to which the SC was awarded. The work related to this grant will be completed under the auspice of the Recidivism Workroup.

The workgroup will focus on recidivism cohort development by reviewing individual-level incarceration, supervision, and criminal justice data. It will also develop a dashboard system for informed decision-making and resource allocation. The goal is to have an internal facing dashboard to be used by decision-makers to affect policy, and an external-facing dashboard for the community/public. The project includes Tech industry collaboration with JUSTIS to help develop and launch a public interface.

6. LEAD Work Group updates (discussion only)

Colleen Chawla Deputy Director of Health/Director of Policy & Planning from the Department of Public Health (DPH) provided an update on LEAD Workgroup. On February 1, DPH submitted the LEAD application for a 26 month $5.9 million grant. Partners of the grant application included DPH, DA, Public Defender, Sheriff, Adult Probation, BART Police. Two Community-based organizations Glide and Felton Institute will receive part of the grant funds with services focusing on different areas of the city (Tenderloin and Mission). Two key components of the grant include
extending hours of the CASC to 24/7, expanding the case managers’ flexibility, referring 250 people to LEAD, 200 pre-booking referrals, and 200 social contact referrals. Application results will be announced in April 20, 2017. In addition, Mrs. Chawla noted that the Prop-47 grant funds ($6 million applied for) and LEAD grant fund money will work in tandem to support dual diagnosis needs, peer services, and community-based treatments.

7. Annual Review of San Francisco Sentencing Trends by Maria McKee, Office of the District Attorney (discussion & possible action)

Maria McKee, Principle Analyst, presented Superior Court and District Attorney data on felony filings. 2016 showed an increase in felony filings and the felony filing rate, which may be associated with better investigations and improved collaboration between SFPD and SFDA. DA caseload data shows there were more felony than misdemeanor filings in 2016, whereas in 2015 the reverse had been true. In terms of felony convictions, the lowest number of convictions occurred in 2015; there was a slight uptick in both probation grants and state prison sentences in 2016. In 2016, 23% of felony sentences were prison, and 70% were felony probation. The length of time from arrest to conviction for felonies is 245 days (4% increase from 2015) and 217 days for misdemeanors (15% increase). In 2016, there were 1,179 felony sentencings total. 62 of those were associated with felony trial convictions (5%). In January 2017, SF has already seen 200% increase in misdemeanor trials. According to the Superior Court, San Francisco has the highest misdemeanor trial rate in the state at 5-6% versus other jurisdictions at 0.2%. More stats available on corresponding documents.

8. Presentation on the Realignment Sentencing Trends by Tara Agnese, Adult Probation Department (discussion & possible action)

Tara Agnese presented Superior Court case management system data and split sentencing trends. A visual representation was provided showing split and straight sentences from 2011-2016. Male/female breakdowns in 2016 were highlighted with a racial disparity of 63% black and 29% Caucasian for split sentencing. Chief Nance questioned the lack of representation of Latinos within the dataset, which is due to race categorization issues in CMS.

Data from Judicial Council on realignment was presented and Agnese noted it is important to look at San Francisco and make healthy comparisons for research.

Chief Nance asked about the commentary or argument/effect of 1170(h). Agnese replied by stating that county sentencing is largely driven by politics and existing values. She also stated counties that used pre-sentencing risk/needs assessment reports had better outcomes than counties that did not.

9. Presentation on Sentencing Reform in California and Public Safety by Professor Steven Raphael, Goldman School of Public Policy (discussion & possible action)

Dr Raphael presented on sentencing reform in California and public safety. His research showed that provisions of AB109 enables greater use of non-custodial alternatives for both pre-trial and convicted inmates, and nearly all parole revocations are now served in county jail with 180-day maximum. Prop 47 reclassifies drug offenses from felonies to misdemeanors, and requires misdemeanor sentencing for petty theft, receiving stolen property, and forgery/writing bad check (less than $950). Realignment caused a large decline in prison and jail population and a reduction in
racial disparities with no effect on violent crime, and a small effect on property crime, specifically, motor vehicle theft. Dr. Raphael noted ways in which decarceration in California could affect crime rates: general deterrence, rehabilitation (specific deterrence), and incapacitation.

10. Members’ Comments, Questions, Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion & possible action).

No items were proposed.

11. Public Comments:

Laura Thomas representing the Drug Policy Alliance provided data to the commission on San Diego and Los Angeles counties Prop 47 impact on drug arrests.

Freda Randolph Glenn on behalf of Karen Roye provided a reentry council update. At the last meeting for Reentry Council on February 23, they appointed Eric Henderson for the SC. The Council heard a presentation from Francisco Ugarte regarding the importance of representation of immigrants both documented and undocumented with regards to immigration consequences associated with arrest and conviction.

Tara Anderson provided the Family Violence Council update on behalf of Jerel McCrary
The last meeting of the Family Violence was on February 17th and included a report on the cooperative restraining order clinic and RSVP project provided training to 50 bailiffs on best practices on dealing with cases of sexual assault and domestic violence. Bridgette McCaw from Kaiser Permanente shared on the newly developed family violence prevention program focusing on intervention in health care clinics and community prevention efforts. Dr. Lee Kimber (SFDPH) voted to approve revisions in the existing policy on giving victims a choice on whether or not they choose involvement from law enforcement.

12. Adjournment

Chief Nance moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:41am. Simin Shamji seconded this motion. All members voted in favor. The meeting adjourned.
Sentencing Commission Appointment to the LEAD SF Policy Committee

6/7/2017

I. Overview

The LEAD SF Policy Committee is comprised of high-level representatives of each participating public agency and contracted service provider to develop a shared vision and process for diverting individuals away from the criminal justice system, taking into account each agency’s responsibilities and objectives.

To ensure representation of those most impacted by LEAD the Department of Public Health (DPH) proposed that two community representatives who serve on the Jail Workgroup, and one community member each from the SF Sentencing Commission (which advises the city on sentence reform) and the Reentry Council (which coordinates local efforts to support adults exiting SF County Jail) will be nominated by their group’s co-chairs to serve on the KSPC. Additional community representation will come from community organizations that advocate for homeless people, criminal justice system involved individuals, and substance users. Community members will receive a stipend for participation.

II. Eligible Sentencing Commission Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies &amp; Bodies</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Member of a nonprofit org serving victims chosen by the Family Violence Council** | Jerel McCrary  
  Attorney |
| **Member of non-profit org working with ex-offenders chosen by the Reentry Council** | Eric Henderson  
  Technology and Administrative Specialist  
  Ella Baker Center for Human Rights |
| **Sentencing Expert chosen by the Board of Supervisors** | Theshia Naidoo  
  Senior Staff Attorney  
  Drug Policy Alliance |
| **Academic Researcher with expertise in data analysis appointed by the Mayor** | Steven Raphael PhD  
  Professor  
  Goldman School of Public Policy  
  University of California Berkeley |
### III. LEAD SF Policy Committee Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Garcia</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Barbara.Garcia@sfdph.org">Barbara.Garcia@sfdph.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Scott</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:William.Scott@sfgov.org">William.Scott@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Gascón</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:George.Gascon@sfgov.org">George.Gascon@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Fletcher</td>
<td>Adult Probation Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Karen.Fletcher@sfgov.org">Karen.Fletcher@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence McCarty</td>
<td>BART Police</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TMcCart@bart.gov">TMcCart@bart.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Thomas</td>
<td>Drug Policy Alliance</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lthomas@drugpolicy.org">lthomas@drugpolicy.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Gilbert</td>
<td>Felton Institute</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agilbert@felton.org">agilbert@felton.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyriell Noon</td>
<td>Glide Harm Reduction</td>
<td><a href="mailto:knoon@glide.org">knoon@glide.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Adachi</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeff.Adachi@sfgov.org">Jeff.Adachi@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Coleman</td>
<td>Reentry Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acoleman@glide.org">acoleman@glide.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estela Garcia</td>
<td>Roadmap to Peace</td>
<td><a href="mailto:estela.garcia@ifrsf.org">estela.garcia@ifrsf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Sentencing Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Hennessy</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Vicki.Hennessy@sfgov.org">Vicki.Hennessy@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Kiss</td>
<td>Tenderloin Health Improvement Partnership</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jennifer.Kiss@DignityHealth.org">Jennifer.Kiss@DignityHealth.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Salinas</td>
<td>Workgroup to Re-envision the Jail Replacement Project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrea.salinas@ucsf.edu">andrea.salinas@ucsf.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Calderon</td>
<td>Workgroup to Re-envision the Jail Replacement Project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joe.Calderon@sfdph.org">Joe.Calderon@sfdph.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The San Francisco Sentencing Commission
City & County of San Francisco
(Administrative Code 5.250 through 5.250-3)

Legislative Work Group Update

6/7/2017

The San Francisco Sentencing Commission passed a motion to convene a Legislative Work Group on December 14, 2017. The Legislative Work Group first met on April 25, 2017. During this meeting attendees discussed work group name, priorities and timeline. The proposed work group name, purpose, priorities and timeline are detailed below for discussion and possible action.

Name: Sentencing Policy and Legislation Work Group (SPL)

Purpose: The SPL will serve three primary roles:

(1) Conduct regular review of proposed and enacted sentencing policy and legislation;

(2) Make recommendations for positions on proposed sentencing policy and legislation;

(3) Identify areas for sentencing reform and explore opportunities for change in policy or law where applicable.

The SPL will have regular communication with and representation from, the Re-entry Council’s Legislation, Policy, and Practices Subcommittee. This will limit unnecessary duplication of work, ensure informed decision-making, and the best use of time for those participating in the SPL and making recommendations.

Priorities: The SPL has identified the following priorities for the remainder of 2017.

- Monitor the implementation of Prop 57 and provide regular updates to the Sentencing Commission.

- Identify a specific item for policy or legislative reform and set planned activities for pursuit of those sentencing reform efforts in 2018.

Timeline: The SPL will meet no less than 3 times a year in alignment with the state legislative calendar and full Sentencing Commission meetings to ensure that active bill decisions are timely and meaningful. Lastly, in December 2018 the Sentencing Commission will re-evaluate the progress and purpose of the SPL and will determine if the SPL will sunset or continue activities.
Agenda Item 5

Prop 57
Proposition 57: CRIMINAL SENTENCES. PAROLE. JUVENILE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND SENTENCING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.

1. Allows parole consideration for persons convicted of nonviolent felonies, upon completion of prison term for their primary offense as defined.

2. Authorizes Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to award sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, or educational achievements.

3. Requires Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to adopt regulations to implement new parole and sentence credit provisions and certify they enhance public safety.

4. Provides juvenile court judges shall make determination, upon prosecutor motion, whether juveniles age 14 and older should be prosecuted and sentenced as adults for specified offenses.
Proposition 57: CRIMINAL SENTENCES. PAROLE. JUVENILE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND SENTENCING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.

1. Allows parole consideration for persons convicted of nonviolent felonies, upon completion of prison term for their primary offense as defined.
2. Authorizes Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to award sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, or educational achievements.
3. Requires Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to adopt regulations to implement new parole and sentence credit provisions and certify they enhance public safety.
4. Provides juvenile court judges shall make determination, upon prosecutor motion, whether juveniles age 14 and older should be prosecuted and sentenced as adults for specified offenses.
Proposition 57

“A fundamental element of Proposition 57 is the realization that we are in the best position to know how individual inmates are programming and whether they are showing sustained positive behavior. Proposition 57 is a common sense reform that brings us closer to the days of indeterminate sentencing by placing the responsibility on the inmate to remain disciplinary free and to be actively programming.” ~Secretary Kernan
Parole Consideration

- Parole suitability process will be conducted after base term.
- It is not clear which specific crimes will make inmates ineligible for early parole. The list of 23 violent felonies in the state penal code does not include crimes such as assault with a deadly weapon, certain rapes, and some gang crimes.
- The Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) estimates that about 30,000 inmates currently in state prison would be eligible for early parole, as would an additional 7,500 inmates admitted in each year thereafter.
- The number of inmates who will be granted early release will be lower than 30,000.
Complex Credit Earning

CDCR credit-earning mechanisms:

- Good Time credit for good behavior;
- Milestone credits for completion of approved programs;
- Enhanced Milestone credits for extraordinary one-time achievements in long-term education; and
- Achievement credits for extensive work in Inmate Leisure Time Activity Groups (ILTAGs).
CDCR credit-earning rates

- Lifers, 3 strikers, violent felons etc receiving no more than 15% (0-15%) will now receive 20% credit.

- Anyone earning over 20% (including some 2nd strikers [non-violent]): receiving 20-33% will all now earn 33%.* excludes 290

- Inmate firefighters: some violent felony offenders (667.5) are now only earning around 15% credits, while other inmate firefighters are earning 2 for 1. New regs will feed the food, credit, for all inmates.
Enhanced Milestone Credits

- Program milestones: Currently only non-violent offenders are offered this programming; under new regs this will be available for all inmates and all receiving 12 weeks off sentence.

- Educational programs: Prop 57 calls for 1 time reduction off sentence for completion of AA/BA/GED degrees.

- Self Help: currently inmates who participate in these programs get no credit. New regs call for incentivizing completion of these programs with 1 month of sentence.
Notification to Victims & DAs:

• 30 days not enough time to process and inform DA and victims.

• CDCR may put release dates on the Inmate Locator.
Regulations and Certification

1) Notice of Proposed Change to regulations published
   - emergency regs going into effect approximately 20 days later (fully implemented in July)

2) Public hearing process to follow per APA.
Thank You

Questions, Comments or Follow Up

Tara Anderson
Tara.anderson@sfgov.org
X3-1203
Recidivism Workgroup Update
June 6, 2017

The San Francisco Sentencing Commission passed a motion to convene a Recidivism Workgroup (RWG) on December 18, 2014. The Workgroup is comprised of representatives from a cross-section of City and County departments, academic researchers, and an organization working with ex-offenders. As a first step, the RWG developed a countywide recidivism definition that measures subsequent criminal justice contact at the points of re-arrest, re-arraignment, and reconviction.

**Recidivism Workgroup Cohort**

The RWG defined the initial cohort as individuals convicted of a new felony or misdemeanor in calendar year 2013. Subsequent criminal justice contact by the cohort will be tracked for three years starting at the point of release from custody (or the day of conviction if an individual is convicted out-of-custody).

In calendar year 2013, 3,486 individuals were convicted in San Francisco.\(^1\) See Table 1 for a breakdown of dispositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Probation Sentence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Probation Sentence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Sentence</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail Split 1170(h)(5)(B)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail per 1170(H)(5)(A)/ Straight</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail w/ Probation Condition</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>80.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes Analysis**

With the cohort defined, the RWG will analyze outcomes and present to the Sentencing Commission at the September 13, 2017 meeting. This analysis will include the following:

- Subsequent criminal justice contact at the points of re-arrest, re-arraignment, and reconviction.
- Severity of charges at each subsequent criminal justice contact point.
- Demographic information, including gender and race/ethnicity.
- Disaggregation by criminal history to account for underlying differences.

The RWG will also analyze larger justice-system outcomes for those who were arrested, but not necessarily charged and convicted, in 2013. Research questions generated by the RWG to date include:

- Analyze subsequent criminal justice contact in cases where charges were not filed.
- Compare dispositions for street citations to custodial arrests.

---

\(^1\) Excludes: 1385 PC - Guilty Plea to Other Charge (72); Sentence Stayed Purs. 654PC (86); 1210,1(D)(1)PC-Dismissed Prop 36 (91); and all State Prison Dispositions (193, 194, 195, and 196).
The Cycle of Violence: The Impact of Early Childhood Trauma on Risk Taking and Chronic Victimization and Criminal Behavior

Dr. Gena Castro Rodriguez, Psy.D., LMFT
Chief of
SFDA Victim Services and Parallel Justice Programs
AGENDA

- The Cycle of Violence
- Trajectory of Risk
- Coping Skills
What is Trauma?

1. Serious Injury, Life Threatening (Death), Imminent Threat, or Violation of Personal Physical Integrity

2. Produce terror, horror or helplessness
   – Real or Perceived
   – Direct or Indirect
   – Chronic or Complex
Developmental Cycle of Trauma

- Early Childhood
  - ACES
- Childhood
  - Complex and Chronic Trauma
- Adolescence
  - Risk Taking Survival Behaviors Delinquency
- Adulthood
  - Criminal Behavior/Chronic Victimization
Chronic & Complex Trauma

Complex → Chronic

Chronic → Complex
HPA Axis
Psychological Impact of Trauma

View of others

View of world

View of self

Cognitive schemas/core assumptions

Janoff and Bullman, 2010
Trajectory of Risk Behavior

- Alcohol
- Drugs
- Delinquency
- Chronic System Involvement
- Homeless
- Risky/Survival Sex
- Running Away
- Negative Peers
- Alcohol
- Drugs
Repeat Victimization

One of the best predictors of future victimization is past victimization.
Mental Health Effects of Victimization

Depression
SA 50% +

PTSD
Homicide
25% +

Substance Abuse
DV 4X

From The National Center for Victims of Crime Mental Health Consequences of Crime
Coping: Safer Together Rubric

- In Crisis
- Thriving
- Building Capacity
- Stable
- Vulnerable
- In Survival Mode
Contact Information

San Francisco District Attorney’s Office
Victim Services Division
850 Bryant Street, Room 320
San Francisco, CA 94103
Tel: 415-553-9044    Fax: 415-553-1034
Email: gena.castrorodriguez@sfgov.org
Website: http://www.sfdistrictattorney.org/
Blueprint for Shared Safety: 
Survivor-Centered and Trauma-Informed 

San Francisco Sentencing Commission 
June 7, 2017
Agenda

1. Blueprint for Shared Safety – Introduction and Background
2. Safety – The Need for a New Framework
3. Blueprint for Shared Safety – How is Shared Safety Different?
4. Survivors at the Center
5. The 5 Principles of the Blueprint for Shared Safety

Marisa Arrona  
Director, Local Safety Solutions Project

Anna Cho Fenley  
Director, Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice
WHAT IS THE
Blueprint for Shared Safety?
WHY DO WE NEED

A New Framework?
What is the current justice system response to crime?

“I learned that we have to fight the temptation to just punish out of a sense of vengeance – and instead think about what actually prevents people from committing crimes. That means more effective forms of accountability that better serve victims – and tax payers.”

– Dionne
ONLY 41% of crime is reported to the police
Least Protected – Most Harmed

Three out of four
crime victims had a friend who had been victimized in the last five years.

Two in three
had a family member who had also been a victim of crime.

Eight in 10 who were NOT crime victims also did NOT have friends or family who had been victimized
FOUR OUT OF FIVE SERVICES available to crime victims tested – including assistance with accessing victims’ compensation and navigating the criminal justice process – were unknown to the majority of victims.

Source: California Crime Victim’s Voices, findings from the First-Ever Survey of California Crime Victims and Survivors
The criminal justice system does **not** deliver justice for the majority of survivors.
FROM Safety for Some TO Safety for All
HOW IS THE

Shared Safety Approach different?
TRADITIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE APPROACH

Siloed

Uses a criminal justice lens:
responds after a crime occurs

Relies on incarceration as the primary tool

Fails to protect most vulnerable communities
(Safety for some)

Responds based on severity of offense

Assumes victims needs = punishment

Narrowly measured by crime rates
(only 50% of crimes reported)

SHARED SAFETY APPROACH

Collaborative

Uses a public health lens:
prioritizes prevention, intervention, and
treatment to eliminate the “disease” of crime

Increases investments in diversion

Recognizes that low-income communities of
color are at highest risk for repeat and violent
crime (Safety for all) and community corrections

Graduated responses based on risk to public
safety and severity of harm caused

Recognizes victims need = healing

Measured by impact on community safety
and well-being
5 Blueprint Principles for Shared Safety

- Shifting to a Public Health Frame
- Crime Survivors At the Center
- Breaking the Cycle of Harm
- Wellbeing Is Safety
- Making the System Work
CRIME SURVIVORS AT THE CENTER

1. ENVISION
   Recognize Who is Most Vulnerable to Crime

2. PLAN
   Create a Healing Agenda for Crime Survivors

3. INVEST
   Ensure Access to Restorative Justice and Trauma Recovery

4. EVALUATE
   Engage Crime Survivors to Improve Outcomes

5. STRENGTHEN
   Shed Stigma & Foster Awareness
Who are California Crime Survivors?

1 in every 5 acknowledged having been a victim of crime

Nearly all had been victims of property crimes

Half also acknowledge having been a victim of violent crime

People of every race, class, gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic status experience crime

Source: Californians Crime Victims’ Voices, Findings from the First-Ever Survey of California Crime Victims and Survivors
CRIME SURVIVORS AT THE CENTER

1. ENVISION
   Recognize Who is Most Vulnerable to Crime

2. PLAN
   Create a Healing Agenda for Crime Survivors

3. INVEST
   Ensure Access to Restorative Justice and Trauma Recovery

4. EVALUATE
   Engage Crime Survivors to Improve Outcomes

5. STRENGTHEN
   Shed Stigma & Foster Awareness
We could better **protect** all crime survivors and build **safer** communities.
5 Blueprint Principles for Shared Safety

- Shifting to a Public Health Frame
- Wellbeing is Safety
- Crime Survivors at the Center
- Breaking the Cycle of Harm
- Making the System Work
SHIFTING TO A PUBLIC HEALTH FRAME

1. ENVISION  Adopt Safety as a Public Health Issue

2. PLAN  Align Health & Safety Delivery Systems

3. INVEST  Prioritize Preventive Health

4. EVALUATE  Generate Shared Health & Safety Data Systems

5. STRENGTHEN  Harness Media to Promote a Public Health Frame
WELL-BEING IS SAFETY

1. ENVISION
   Define Well-Being for Your Community

2. PLAN
   Identify Gaps in Community Well-Being

3. INVEST
   Scale Up to Meet the Greatest Needs

4. EVALUATE
   Measure Safety through Well-Being Indicators

5. STRENGTHEN
   Cultivate Sanctuary Spaces for All
MAKING THE SYSTEM WORK

1. ENVISION
   Build Community Trust & System Legitimacy

2. PLAN
   Establish Collaborative Partnerships

3. INVEST
   Leverage Diverse Funding Streams

4. EVALUATE
   Commit to Transparency & Continuous Improvement

5. STRENGTHEN
   Support Community Organizing to Improve Accountability
BREAKING THE CYCLE OF HARM

1. **ENVISION**
   - Embrace Risk+Harm+Need Decision-Making

2. **PLAN**
   - Develop Problem-Solving Models to Deter Crime

3. **INVEST**
   - Maximize Diversion & Community Corrections

4. **EVALUATE**
   - Abandon Harmful Practices, Reduce Recidivism

5. **STRENGTHEN**
   - Eliminate Barriers to Second Chances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIFTING TO A PUBLIC HEALTH FRAME</th>
<th>WELL-BEING IS SAFETY</th>
<th>CRIME SURVIVORS AT THE CENTER</th>
<th>BREAKING THE CYCLE OF HARM</th>
<th>MAKING THE SYSTEM WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adopt Safety as a Public Health Issue</td>
<td>Define Well-Being for Your Community</td>
<td>Recognize Who is Most Vulnerable to Crime</td>
<td>Embrace Risk + Harm + Need Decision-Making</td>
<td>Build Community Trust &amp; System Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Align Health &amp; Safety Delivery Systems</td>
<td>Identify Gaps in Community Well-Being</td>
<td>Create a Healing Agenda for Crime Survivors</td>
<td>Develop Problem-Solving Models to Deter Crime</td>
<td>Establish Collaborative Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prioritize Preventive Health</td>
<td>Scale Up to Meet the Greatest Needs</td>
<td>Ensure Access to Restorative Justice and Trauma Recovery</td>
<td>Maximize Diversion &amp; Community Corrections</td>
<td>Leverage Diverse Funding Streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Generate Shared Health &amp; Safety Data Systems</td>
<td>Measure Safety through Well-Being Indicators</td>
<td>Engage Crime Survivors to Improve Outcomes</td>
<td>Abandon Harmful Practices, Reduce Recidivism</td>
<td>Commit to Transparency &amp; Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Harness Media to Promote a Public Health Frame</td>
<td>Cultivate Sanctuary Spaces for All</td>
<td>Shed Stigma &amp; Foster Awareness</td>
<td>Eliminate Barriers to Second Chances</td>
<td>Support Community Organizing to Improve Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BLUEPRINT FOR
SHARED SAFETY

Working Together to Build Safety for All
Contact Information

Marisa Arrona
Director, Local Safety Solutions Project
marisa@safeandjust.org

Anna Cho Fenley
Director, Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice
anna@safeandjust.org

www.sharedsafety.us
#SharedSafety