



**Racial Justice Task Force Kickoff Meeting Minutes**  
**Racial Justice Task Force Members**  
**4.4.18**

<b>Member</b>	<b>In Attendance</b>
1. Todd Billeci, Chief Probation Officer	Present
2. Debra Mason, Mount Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD)	Not present
3. Robin Lipetzky, Public Defender	Not present
4. Dennisha Marsh, First Five CCC, City of Pittsburg Community Advisory Council	Present
5. Venus Johnson, Assistant District Attorney	Present
6. Magda Lopez, Director of Court Programs and Services	Present
7. Harlan Grossman, Government Alliance of Race & Equity (GARE)	Present
8. John Lowden, Contra Costa County Sherriff’s Office	Present
9. Dr. Christine Gerchow, Psychologist at Juvenile Hall Martinez	Present
10. Stephanie Medley, RYSE & AB109 CAB	Present
11. Marcus Walton, Director of Communications West Contra Costa Unified School District	Not Present
12. Bisa French, Assistant Chief at Richmond Police Department	Not present
13. Dr. Cardenas Shackelford, Coordinator Student Intervention and Support, Antioch Unified School District	Present
14. Tamisha Walker, Founder & Director Safe Return Project	Present
15. Pastor Donnell Jones, Richmond Ceasefire	Not present
16. Reverend Leslie Takahashi, Mt. Diablo Universalist Church	Present
17. Dr. William Walker, Health Services Director	Present

**Resource Development Associates**

- Mikaela Rabinowitz
- David Muhammad
- Lupe Garcia

**Public Attendees**

- Donte Blue
- Lara Delaney
- Jill Ray
- Judith Tannenbaum
- Doug Leich





## Meeting Notes

- I. Introductions
- II. Meeting Objectives
  - RDA shared that today's objective is to continue the discussion of set recommendations that the Racial Justice Task Force will put forth to the Board of Supervisors in June. Prior to this meeting, RDA took the array of recommendations developed through the meetings, looked for commonalities and synthesized the recommendations into a framework of processes. Today's focus will be about the recommended set of prioritized recommendations that will be taken to the community forums.
  - RDA reviewed the timeline of recommendations. Based on the feedback heard throughout the community forums, RJTF members will vote for the set of prioritized recommendations during the June meeting and think about the steps needed to move the recommendations forward and actualize them.
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
  - **March meeting minutes were approved.**
- IV. Public Comment (items not on the agenda)
  - A public attendee asked if this was the time to respond to the set of recommendations. RDA shared the public will have the opportunity to respond after members discuss.
  - No other public comments.
- V. Community Forums
  - Tamisha reported the locations of the community forums are confirmed: Walnut Creek, Antioch, and Richmond. Flyers are available in English and Spanish for each location. There are also Facebook events for each community forum. The next step is for RJTF to share and disseminate the information to increase community participation.
  - Lara shared she has invited Board of Supervisors whose locations will be hosting a community forum. She shared a press release has been approved.
  - RDA shared there needs to be a good representation of RJTF in the forums. It is a good space for Task Force members to talk to the community and hear directly from the public about their concerns. They shared it is very important the Task Force does outreach to ensure community attendance. RDA also shared the community forum workgroup will be working on a preliminary agenda that will be later shared to the larger group via email communication since the Task Force will not be meeting until after the community forums.
- VI. Prioritization Criteria
  - RDA presented the criteria the recommendations were framed with: cost, impact, and jurisdiction. RDA shared the criteria is not intended to be measureable but rather a way to start thinking about the recommendations.
    - i. Cost: High, medium, and low



- ii. Impact: Potential number effected and impact on disparities at the point
  - iii. Jurisdiction: City, County, State, Community
- RDA asked the group how they want to arrive to the number of recommendations delivered to the Board of Supervisors.
  - i. A Task Force member shared that the task force should review all the recommendations regardless of cost.
  - ii. A Task Force member responded that from a community standpoint, they should be looking at the impact on people lives and if they cost more, they can make a case for it.
  - iii. A Task Force member agreed and suggested looking at the population most hurt and disfranchised and start from there.
  - iv. Public attendee stated that one of the fundamental reasons the task force was funded was to focus on racial disparities. While costs needs to be considered and other impacts, the underlying inherited purpose for this task force is reducing racial disparities.
  - v. **Based on this conversation, the group agreed to not use cost as a criteria for prioritizing or removing recommendations. Impact on disparities is the key priority.**
- RDA explained how some recommendations could reduce the population impacted but not reduce disparities. They explained it is important to assess numeric versus rate.
  - i. A Task Force member shared this is what is happening at schools with suspension rates. While suspension rates have decreased, the number of non-white students who are suspended is still disproportionate and disparities persist.
  - ii. Another Task Force member raised the question of the absence of a recommendation that is specific to school districts and suspension practices.
  - iii. A Task Force member suggested leveraging the Task Force’s influence to the Board of Supervisors and Office of Education to make impact at the local school level. She said it is important to address discipline practices in school districts especially since they were mentioned in the first round of community forums.
    - 1. **The recommendations were revised to more clearly articulate that the County should use its leverage via LCAP funding to push for certain school actions. In addition, the TF will include recommendations directly to school districts as a preliminary recommendation (still needs to be voted on for formal approval).**
- Several task force members stated that it is very important that all current preliminary recommendations plus those added today go to the community forums for additional input and go up for a vote.



- i. **Based on this conversation, the forums will include all current preliminary recommendations and allow community members to weigh in. Then all recommendations will come to the Task Force for a vote.**
  1. A public attendee suggested proposing a multi-year plan.
  2. A Task Force member stated the task force needs to consider how the recommendations will impact the entities responsible for implementing them.

VII. Review of recommendations

- Rec 1:
  - i. A Task Force member shared some community members have come across fraudulent community courts and fees therefore, the county should provide a legitimate list of diversion programs.
- Rec 5:
  - i. A Task Force member shared the county is entertaining the idea of diversion programs. The county has consulted with current programs and they were told that parents are more willing to enroll their youth and have increased buy-in if there is a fee. There is a perception of legitimacy with a fee. However, John shared that a fee should not be required as a condition to participate in the programs. Fee waivers are provided for those who cannot afford the fee.
- Rec 6:
  - i. A public attendee shared that the behavioral health department currently has a juvenile crisis team that they are expanding. They are also creating a mobile crisis team for adults and MET (Mental Health Evaluation Team) program.
- Rec 8:
  - i. A Task Force member shared the Probation Department is re-processing DRAI, and re-evaluating Post-Disposition Risk assessment. They also shared they are doing a graduated response grid for the AB 109 population.
- Rec 17:
  - i. Task Force members discussed the challenges of implementing Restorative Justice practices and maintaining fidelity to such best practices. Members suggested that this recommendation should include continuous training and evaluation.
  - ii. Task Force members discussed the issues of recommendations and practices that focus on youth discipline rather than on how adults react and interact with youth, specifically in school and with suspension practices. Such practices can exacerbate racial disparities.
  - iii. A public attendee suggested that the Behavioral Health department reach out to school districts and offer behavioral health assistance to youth who may be struggling with behaviors that lead to delinquency.



1. A Task Force member agreed it would be a great partnership as many youth receive services from health centers located in school sites.
    - iv. **A Task Force member suggested adding a recommendation around Local Control Funding to support these recommendations and push schools to follow best practices.**
      - Rec 19: Task force members discussed the idea of an independent body for oversight and monitoring and the challenges it may present regarding data sharing.
        - i. To limit the number of new committees, the Task Force agreed to the following change: **Assess current county commissions / committees that can effectively take on recommendations.**
      - Rec 24: A Task Force member asked if the Task Force would be providing recommendations for the District Attorney aside from charges and sentencing. They expressed a concern regarding attaching the recommendation to Proposition 57 as it is currently being scrutinized.
        - i. **The recommendation will exclude the wording Prop 57. Instead the recommendation will describe Prop 57**
      - Rec 25: A Task Force member suggested the recommendation should **include partnering with those that do the same assessments in order to reduce duplications.**
      - Rec 29: A Task Force member shared that the idea of this recommendation is ensure detainees have their rights. This specific recommendation came out the community due to the current conditions of facilities and the disparity of treatment for individuals who are undocumented and Black.
      - Rec 30: A Task Force member suggested defining “independent body” as an exclusion of employees that are involved.
- VIII. Discussion of Final Set of Recommendations
- RDA asked the Task Force if seventeen recommendations was too high of a number and most members said yes.
  - Task Force members discussed Recommendations 20 and 21. A Task Force member shared the 50% attached to the recommendation seems arbitrary and that currently 23% of current funds are going to community-based organizations for community programs and public agencies.
    - i. **Task Force members agreed to take this recommendation off the priority list however, the Task Force would like to investigate what information is needed to come to a feasible number that allows increased funding.**
  - Task Force members discussed the lack of data to analyze to focus on specific disparities throughout the system. Specifically, Task Force members discussed Recommendation 2 and how it is not based on analyzed data due to unavailability. They discussed the importance of agencies collection and analyzing data in order to put forth the recommendations.



## Contra Costa County

### Racial Justice Task Force—Meeting #13 Notes

---

- A Task Force member shared change does not automatically happen without the participation and voice of the community. They shared by bringing these issues and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, it can bring attention to certain agencies.
- A public attendee shared the **Task Force needs to look back at the input provided during the first round of community forums and integrate it when finalizing the priorities.**
- Two Task Force members shared they are not comfortable supporting Recommendations 29 and 30 because it they do not think they are aligned with the purpose of the Task Force.
  - i. Another Task Force member responded that this recommendation rose from the community and that is what happens when a space is open to the community. Community voice brings a perspective to the table that otherwise would be absent.
- A Task Force member agreed, stating that the issue with the Sherriff's Office and ICE has been a long-standing issue for the faith-based community.

#### IX. Next Steps

- The community forum workgroup will think about how the recommendations are presented to the community and ensure sufficient context is provided.
  - i. **RDA will send the materials to the full Task Force for review prior to the community forums.**