Consistent with state and local orders addressing the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting of the Safety and Justice Challenge Subcommittee will be held remotely via videoconference. The meetings held through videoconferencing will allow remote public comment via the videoconference or through the number noted above. Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely by submitting written comments electronically to josie.halpern-finnerty@sfgov.org. These comments will be made part of the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Subcommittee. Explanatory and/or Supporting Documents, if any, will be posted at: https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sentencing-commission-relevant-documents

1. Call to Order; Roll Call.

2. Public Comment.
   a. General Public Comment.
   b. Public Comment on All Agenda Items.

3. Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e). (Discussion and Action)
   a. The Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup will consider adoption of a resolution making findings that newly-enacted Government Code Section 54953(e) requires in order to allow the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup to hold meetings remotely, as currently required under local law, without complying with infeasible Brown Act requirements.


6. Strategy Updates. (Discussion and Possible Action).

7. Request for Future Agenda Items. (Discussion and Possible Action).

8. Adjournment.
SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SAN FRANCISCO SAFETY AND JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE
Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the San Francisco Safety and Justice Challenge Subcommittee, 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 Subcommittee. Written comments should be submitted to: Josie Halpern-Finnerty, San Francisco District Attorney’s Office, via email: josie.halpern-finnerty@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 emailing josie.halpern-finnerty@sfgov.org. 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 Josie Halpern-Finnerty at josie.halpern-finnerty@sfgov.org 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 Josie Halpern-Finnerty at josie.halpern-finnerty@sfgov.org 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/
RESOLUTION MAKING FINDINGS TO ALLOW TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e)

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 54953(e) empowers local policy bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology during a proclaimed state of emergency under the State Emergency Services Act so long as certain conditions are met; and

WHEREAS, In March, 2020, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a state of emergency in California in connection with the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (“COVID-19”) pandemic, and that state of emergency remains in effect; and

WHEREAS, In February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”) declared a local emergency, and on March 6, 2020 the City’s Health Officer declared a local health emergency, and both those declarations also remain in effect; and

WHEREAS, On March 11 and March 23, 2020, the Mayor issued emergency orders suspending select provisions of local law, including sections of the City Charter, that restrict teleconferencing by members of policy bodies; those orders remain in effect, so City law currently allows policy bodies to meet remotely if they comply with restrictions in State law regarding teleconference meetings; and

WHEREAS, On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that amends the Brown Act to allow local policy bodies to continue to meet by teleconferencing during a state of emergency without complying with restrictions in State law that would otherwise apply, provided that the policy bodies make certain findings at least once every 30 days; and

WHEREAS, While federal, State, and local health officials emphasize the critical importance of vaccination and consistent mask-wearing to prevent the spread of COVID-19, the City’s Health Officer has issued at least one order (Health Officer Order No. C19-07y, available online at www.sfdph.org/healthorders) and one directive (Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33i, available online at www.sfdph.org/directives) that continue to recommend measures to promote
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physical distancing and other social distancing measures, such as masking, in certain contexts; and

WHEREAS, The California Department of Industrial Relations Division of Occupational Safety and Health (“Cal/OSHA”) has promulgated Section 3205 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, which requires most employers in California, including in the City, to train and instruct employees about measures that can decrease the spread of COVID-19, including physical distancing and other social distancing measures; and

WHEREAS, Without limiting any requirements under applicable federal, state, or local pandemic-related rules, orders, or directives, the City’s Department of Public Health, in coordination with the City’s Health Officer, has advised that for group gatherings indoors, such as meetings of boards and commissions, people can increase safety and greatly reduce risks to the health and safety of attendees from COVID-19 by maximizing ventilation, wearing well-fitting masks (as required by Health Officer Order No. C19-07), using physical distancing where the vaccination status of attendees is not known, and considering holding the meeting remotely if feasible, especially for long meetings, with any attendees with unknown vaccination status and where ventilation may not be optimal; and

WHEREAS, On July 31, 2020, the Mayor issued an emergency order that, with limited exceptions, prohibited policy bodies other than the Board of Supervisors and its committees from meeting in person under any circumstances, so as to ensure the safety of policy body members, City staff, and the public; and

WHEREAS, the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup of the San Francisco Sentencing Commission has met remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic and can continue to do so in a manner that allows public participation and transparency while minimizing health risks to members, staff, and the public that would be present with in-person meetings while this emergency continues; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup finds as follows:
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1. As described above, the State of California and the City remain in a state of emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At this meeting, the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup has considered the circumstances of the state of emergency.

2. As described above, State and City officials continue to recommend measures to promote physical distancing and other social distancing measures, in some settings.

3. As described above, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, conducting meetings of this body and its committees in person would present imminent risks to the safety of attendees, and the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of members to meet safely in person; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That for at least the next 30 days meetings of the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup and its committees will continue to occur exclusively by teleconferencing technology (and not by any in-person meetings or any other meetings with public access to the places where any policy body member is present for the meeting). Such meetings of the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup and its committees that occur by teleconferencing technology will provide an opportunity for members of the public to address this body and its committees and will otherwise occur in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of parties and the members of the public attending the meeting via teleconferencing; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the staff of the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup is directed to place a resolution substantially similar to this resolution on the agenda of a future meeting of the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup within the next 30 days. If the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup does not meet within the next 30 days, the staff is directed to place a such resolution on the agenda of the next meeting of the Safety and Justice Challenge Workgroup.
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Background

Collaborative Courts

Restorative Justice

Traditional Prosecution
Inquiry: Expanding Access to Restorative Justice

- Respect
- Accountability
- Healing
- Empathy
Research Questions

- What does an impactful and effective RJ program that incorporates a holistic and healing centered model of care look like for San Francisco?
- What makes up the ecosystem of partners, initiatives, and programs currently engaged with the SFDA in restorative practices? Where are there gaps and opportunities in program supports?
- How can the SFDA’s Office engage a wider range of stakeholders in restorative justice programs and practices? What misperceptions, beliefs, and narratives exist and what messages work to disrupt these narratives?
Methodology

- 24-Key Informant Interviews (60 mins)
- 1-Focus Group with Survivors of Crime (90 mins)
- 1-Focus Group with Formerly Incarcerated (90 mins)
- Focus Group w/ Systems Actors* (60 mins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivor of Crime</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Actor</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leader</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ Facilitator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly Incarcerated</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stakeholders</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Process

Define
- Analysis of problem
- Prioritization of options
- Research questions

Design
- Select research methods
- Develop research protocols

Data Collection
- Focus Groups, Key Informant Interviews, Convenings
- Data and Policy Review

Analysis & Reporting
- Sense making
- Reporting
- Dissemination to SFDA, Community and Stakeholders
Findings
The Case for Restorative Justice

Traditional System
- Disparate harm to Black communities
- Not rehabilitative
- Disempowering for Survivors

Restorative Justice
- Rigorous
- Humanizing
- Healing
Stakeholders agreed that San Francisco currently lacks the capacity to realize the vision of accessible, widely available, community-driven, restorative justice models.
Expanding RJ as an Alternative to Traditional Prosecution

The District Attorney’s Office is committed to expanding off ramps through the development of a post charge model of Restorative Justice, but interviews revealed that the office is in the developmental stages of building a common vision about the role of RJ as an alternative to traditional prosecution.
Stakeholders agree that the District Attorney’s Office has a critical role to play in advancing commitment to restorative justice as an alternative but diverge in their visions of how the Office should use its power and resources.
Stakeholders agree that a prominent narrative exists in San Francisco that positions alternatives to traditional prosecution such as restorative justice as soft on crime and a threat to public safety.
Summary of Findings

- The Case for RJ as a Community Driven Model
- Need to Build an Ecosystem
- Expanding RJ as an Alternative
- Role of the DA as Ally and CJ Reform Leader
- Strategic Narrative Change
Considerations

Art by Miami Culture Maven
System Accountability

We recommend:

• On-going acknowledgement of past and current harms
• Continuous advocacy for community centered restorative justice
• Investment in the community-led restorative justice
• Financial divestment from punitive systems
Allyship

The current national conversations about reinventing justice represent an opportunity for the DA’s Office to act as a powerful ally to impacted communities through modeling the transfer of power and resources from the system to community-based prevention and interventions.
Building a post charge model of restorative justice presents an opportunity for the DA’s Office to collaborate with community leaders, restorative justice practitioners, survivors, and formerly incarcerated individuals.
Advocacy

The DA’s Office could play a powerful role in advancing the expansion of restorative justice through regular and transparent release of information about current criminal justice system outcomes and through investments in research and evaluation that continues to make the case for alternatives to traditional prosecution.
## SF SJC 2021 Overarching Goals:

1. Reduce racial disparities in the jail
2. Maintain overall jail population reductions or make further reductions if needed amidst the ongoing pandemic
3. Develop mechanisms to sustain efforts and changes

### Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead with Race</th>
<th>Sustain Shared Focus</th>
<th>Improve Case Processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jan-March</strong></td>
<td><strong>April-June</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center all strategies around racial disparities reduction. Engage community members with lived experience in to inform strategies and activities. Develop new programs/activities focused on disparities reduction.</td>
<td>• Launch inaugural SJC Fellowship • Refine activities and metrics to ensure racial disparities reduction focus across strategies • Plan community engagement activities with SJC Fellows focused on expanding diversion options • Criminal Justice Racial Equity Work Group (CJREWG) and SJC Fellows develop goals for Racial Justice Act training series • Finalize and implement Office of Racial Equity Phase I Action Plans¹</td>
<td>• SJC Fellows begin participatory action research on expanding diversion options • Hold Racial Justice Act training series in partnership with CJREWG, SJC Fellows, Bright Research Group • Fellows develop recommendations to expand community engagement and diversion options • Participate in Office of Racial Equity Phase II planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain and enhance a vigorous jail population review (JPR) process. Use the lessons from case review to drive policy change.</td>
<td>• Hold bimonthly JPR meetings with focus on charges where black people are overrepresented • Develop plan to track impact and share lessons learned from JPR • Host more intensive case review as needed during COVID</td>
<td>• Continue JPR meetings, revisiting case criteria quarterly to ensure focus on racial equity • Bring policy recommendations to SJC Workgroup quarterly • Host more intensive case review as needed during COVID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improve Case Processing

- Court signs contract with Justice Management Institute (JMI)
- Kick-off meeting with JMI and justice system partners
- Court develop dashboards for judges to monitor caseloads, track case management progress, and monitor metrics related to racial disparities
- JMI host training on case processing and sentencing best practices
- JMI conducts site visit and partner interviews, shares interim report, provides TA to Court on dashboards
- Identify case processing metrics relevant to racial disparities
- Explore processes/practices related to different types of “holds” in jail
- Draft case management plan reviewed by workgroup and leadership
- Finalize case plan and associated tools for case coordination
- Finalize Court dashboards

¹ See Office of Racial Equity website for more details: [https://www.racialequitysf.org/mandate](https://www.racialequitysf.org/mandate)
## GOALS & ACTIVITIES FOR 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Goal(s)</th>
<th>Jan-March</th>
<th>April-June</th>
<th>July-Sept</th>
<th>Oct-Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase &amp; Maintain Healthy Connections</td>
<td>Increase connections to community-based support for people with behavioral health and/or housing needs in jail. Improve coordination across local criminal justice, public health, and housing systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) launches racial disparities analysis and system mapping project with Reentry Council</td>
<td>• Continue work of DPH clinician and DA Sentencing Planner, with focus on overrepresented groups</td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly to at data trends and data sharing needs, with focus on racial disparities indicators</td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly to at data trends and data sharing needs, with focus on racial disparities indicators</td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly to at data trends and data sharing needs, with focus on racial disparities indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homebase provide TA series to help partner agencies navigate the housing system</td>
<td>• Training for Judges/DAs on serving people with BH needs</td>
<td>• Justice Dashboard transitions from CA Policy Lab to CCSF hosted platform</td>
<td>• Refine disparities reduction activities across strategies as needed based on indicators</td>
<td>• Refine disparities reduction activities across strategies as needed based on indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SJC and Reentry Council host joint meeting with Prop C Committee to inform funding allocations</td>
<td>• CA Policy Lab completes system high utilization descriptive analysis and presents to the SJC Workgroup</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DPH clinician works with people in jail who have BH needs, referring to JPR and community-based supports, with focus on individuals from overrepresented groups</td>
<td>• CSH shares interim findings from analysis with SJC Workgroup</td>
<td>• Continue development of internal and external facing data dashboards</td>
<td>• Continue development of internal and external facing data dashboards</td>
<td>• Continue development of internal and external facing data dashboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DA Sentencing Planner develops individualized plans for community-based care to support dispositions</td>
<td>• Share lessons learned from Tipping Point pilot bridge housing project with SJC Workgroup</td>
<td>• Finalize a cross-agency agreement to guide data-sharing through the JUSTIS hub</td>
<td>• Finalize a cross-agency agreement to guide data-sharing through the JUSTIS hub</td>
<td>• Finalize a cross-agency agreement to guide data-sharing through the JUSTIS hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue work of DPH clinician and DA Sentencing Planner, with focus on overrepresented groups</td>
<td>• Continue work of DPH clinician and DA Sentencing Planner, with focus on overrepresented groups</td>
<td>• Continue work of DPH clinician and DA Sentencing Planner, with focus on overrepresented groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive with Data</td>
<td>Build a more transparent, data-driven justice system in San Francisco. Develop tools and data-sharing agreements that enhance partners’ ability to sustain jail reductions.</td>
<td>• Continue sharing monthly Jail population presentation with SJC Workgroup, refining based on input</td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly, develops indicators to track decision-points critical to reducing disparities</td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly to at data trends and data sharing needs, with focus on racial disparities indicators</td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly to at data trends and data sharing needs, with focus on racial disparities indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Data team meets monthly, develops indicators to track decision-points critical to reducing disparities</td>
<td>• Present racial disparities indicators at SJC Workgroup; refine disparities reduction activities across strategies as needed</td>
<td>• Present racial disparities indicators at SJC Workgroup; refine disparities reduction activities across strategies as needed</td>
<td>• Present racial disparities indicators at SJC Workgroup; refine disparities reduction activities across strategies as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue development of internal and external facing data dashboards</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalize a cross-agency agreement to guide data-sharing through the JUSTIS hub</td>
<td>• Finalize a cross-agency agreement to guide data-sharing through the JUSTIS hub</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
<td>• Finalize key performance indicators for the criminal justice system developed by the JUSTIS partners; develop a plan to regularly share with City leadership and the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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