

Appendices

San Francisco Close Juvenile Hall Work Group



November 2021

Appendices

A. Learning Communities	3
B. Listening Sessions	4
C. Data Challenges, Process and Sources	5
D. Questions Answered in 2019 Administrative Data Analysis by American Institute for Research.	7
E. Guiding Questions to Consider for Case File Review of “Special Populations”	9
F. Capacity Analysis: Estimating Impact of Policy Changes	13
G. Close Juvenile Hall Work Group (CJHWG) Ordinance	18
H. NCCD: California Leadership Academy Partnership Campaign	26

A. Learning Communities

Date	Title	Resources
September 9, 2020	<u>Avoiding the Front Door of Juvenile Hall:</u> National Center for Youth Law	Joint Sub-committee Meeting Video Presentation
September 29, 2020	Rising Ground	New Parent Handbook , Scholar Handbook , Agenda & Question and Answer Video Tour
November 4, 2020	Alternative Rehabilitative Communities, Harrisburg, PA	
November 9, 2020	1055 Pine Street - Potential Site.	Video Links Listed Below Facility Schematic Outdoor Area Basketball and Mechanical 1st Floor Street Level/Intake and Entry 1st Floor Street/Ground Floor - Offices 5th Floor - Residential Description 2nd Floor & 4th Floor
February 9, 2021	Youth Diversion and Development in Los Angeles County: Department of Health Services, Division of Youth Diversion and Development	Video Link , Youth Justice Reimagined , LACO Youth Diversion and Development
February 16, 2021	Oakland Youth Diversion Program - National Institute of Criminal Justice Reform	Video Link , Oakland Neighborhood Opportunity and Accountability Board
June 30, 2021	American Institute for Research Review of San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department Case Files	Video Link

B. Listening Sessions

Date	Listening Session
September 9, 2020	San Francisco District Attorney's Office
November 16, 2020	Community Work's – Make it Right Program
December 11, 2020	Youth Listening Session 1
December 12, 2020	Youth Listening Session 2
December 12, 2020	Youth Listening Session 3
December 12, 2020	Parent Listening Session 1
December 15, 2020	Parent Listening Session 2
January 11, 2020	Youth Listening Session 4
January 21, 2021	San Francisco Judges
January 25, 2020	Youth Listening Session 5
January 30, 2021	Youth Guidance Center Counselors
February 3, 202	Listening Session with Individual Service Providers
January 3, 2020	JJPDA Service Providers Listening Session
February 4, 2021	Juvenile Probation Officers
February 4, 2021	San Francisco Bar Association
February 6, 2021	Youth Listening Session 6
February 6, 2021	Youth Listening Session 7
February 13, 2021	Youth Listening Session 8
July 22, 2021	My Brother's and Sister's Keeper program

C. Data Challenges, Process and Sources

Ordinance Requirement

The ordinance required the Working Group to establish a subcommittee to conduct a confidential review of juvenile delinquency case files, as authorized by the court. The “Data and Needs Ad Hoc Committee” was established to identify the circumstances leading to juvenile hall confinement and develop recommendations on how to meet youth's needs within the current community-based service delivery system.

Data Challenges

Lack of ready access to relevant data impeded the work of the Data and Needs Ad Hoc Committee. Not unlike jurisdictions throughout California, existing information systems from numerous agency databases were unable to extract data nimbly to answer key questions regarding why and for how long juvenile hall is used, and the extent to which youth detained in juvenile hall are or have been referred to or served by other agencies. Workarounds and other sources of quantitative and qualitative data were developed and utilized throughout the process.

Workarounds and Data Capacity Improvements

Originally, the Burns Institute worked with San Francisco Juvenile Probation to request court authorization to provide juvenile case file data and administrative data from the Department’s case management system for youth under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Juvenile Court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 827.12(a)(2). For a number of reasons, accessing data directly from JPD was not possible. Instead, JPD reached out to Department of Children and Family Services (DCYF) to see if American Institute for Research (AIR), an evaluator currently under contract with DCYF with access to relevant data under an approved data use agreement, would be willing to assist with data analysis.

American Institute for Research (AIR) Analyses

American Institute for Research (AIR), graciously agreed to assist with two components of the data and needs assessment area of work: (1) to conduct analyses of administrative data in order to answer key questions regarding the use of juvenile hall (see Appendix B for a summary of questions answered by the administrative data review); and (2) to conduct a case file review intended to focus on better understanding the context, contributing factors, and needs of “special populations” of youth who continue to be admitted to detention with relative frequency. These special populations included youth who are admitted for: robbery, placement related issues, home detention violations, and warrants. Additionally, the case file review examined information on unaccompanied immigrant youth, youth with mental health issues, and youth who reside outside of San Francisco. To assist in the case file review, the Data and Ad Hoc Committee developing guiding questions to assist the researchers.

Haywood Burns Institute (BI) Analyses

In addition to data analyses made available by AIR, BI received and analyzed data from the Community Assessment Referral Center (CARC). These data included all youth arrested in 2020, including referrals that were made to CARC, referrals that were handled with a notice to appear and referral to JPD or CARC.

San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) Analyses

JPD provided a variety of monthly and annual reports throughout the process, as well as analyses on special topics (see list below). While data from JPD could not initially be used to answer the basic questions posed about the use of juvenile hall,

the department improved its data collection and reporting capacity over the last year. Moving forward, increased efforts around the collection, analysis and reporting of accurate data by all relevant parties, including JPD, must continue.

Reports and presentations referenced throughout the process are listed below:

1. [Data and Needs Subcommittee San Francisco Juvenile Hall Population Profile Report and Presentation \(May 2020\).](#)
2. [Department of Public Health Justice-Involved Youth: Demographics and Other Data Stories for those engaged in behavioral health services \(October 2020\).](#)
3. *2020 Case Level Arrest Data from Community Assessment Referral Center (CARC)* (February 19, 2021).
4. *Through Their Eyes: Stories of Reflection, Resistance, and Resilience on Juvenile incarceration from San Francisco Cis and Trans Young Women & Girls, Trans Young Men & Boys and Gender Expansive Youth, Expansive Youth.* Young Women’s Freedom Center and Freedom Research Institute (February 2021).
5. *Blue Ribbon Panel Juvenile Justice Reform Plan* (March 2021).
6. [Data and Needs Assessment Subcommittee Policy Brief: Reforming Detention for Juvenile Warrants in San Francisco \(April 2021\).](#)
7. [Expanding CARC \(May 2021\).](#)
8. Findings from the American Institute for Research (AIR) *2019 Administrative Data Analysis* (Excel file provided AIR on May 19, 2021; Update to data provided September 28, 2021).
9. [Juvenile Hall Population Analysis](#), Juvenile Probation Department (May 2021)
10. [Data Deep Dive: Time to Detention Hearings](#), Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) (2021).
11. [Out-of-Home Placement in the San Francisco Juvenile Justice System](#), A Study Conducted for the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department by Reyna McKinnon (May 2021).
12. Findings from AIR’s *2020 Case File Review* (June 17, 2021).
13. [San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department Annual Reports](#) (1999-2020).
14. *An Independent Evaluation of the Detention Diversion Advocacy Program (DDAP)*, Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ) (July 28, 2021).
15. [JPD Monthly Statistics, Prepared for the Juvenile Probation Commission \(October 2020-September 2021, monthly\).](#)
16. [Data Deep Dive: Probation Program Referrals to CBOs, Juvenile Probation Department \(JPD\). \(September 8, 2021\).](#)
17. Findings from the American Institute for Research (AIR) *2020 Administrative Data Analysis* (Excel file provided AIR on October 1, 2021).
18. *Data and Needs Assessment Subcommittee Policy Brief: Reforming Youth Diversion in San Francisco* (October, 2021).

D. Questions Answered in 2019 Administrative Data Analysis by American Institute for Research.

Questions listed below represent a refined version of questions originally developed by the Data and Needs Ad Hoc Work Group. Questions were revised based on the availability of data and the feasibility of the analysis.

1. Questions regarding youth referrals to JPD:

- a. Of the youth in JPD records between January 1, 2019 and Dec 31 2019, how many of them have ever been detained, including demographic characteristics? From what zip codes are youth detained in 2019? In what schools are youth detained in 2019 enrolled at time of detention?

Parameters: All youth in JPD records (2019). Data at the youth level.

- b. Of all youth in JPD records between January 1, 2019 and Dec 31 2019, how do the characteristics of youth who have been detained in 2019 compare with those who have not been detained in 2019? What proportion of youth are detained or not in 2019 by race/ethnicity and gender? What proportion of youth are detained/not detained by gender and primary language? What proportion of youth are detained or not in 2019 by race/ethnicity and gender? What proportion of youth are detained or not in 2019 by race/ethnicity and primary language?

Parameters: All youth in JPD records (2019). Data at the youth level.

2. Questions around the number of time youth are detained and for what reasons:

- a. Of the youth who were detained between January 1, 2019 and Dec 31 2019, how many times were they detained across this period? What is the distribution of duration of detention? How many times are youth detained in 2019 by race/ethnicity? What is the average and median length of time youth spend in detention in 2019 and most serious offense? By most serious offense (MSO)/detention reason, how often are youth released within 1-3 days (noting: this could be proxy for detention hearing)?

Parameters: All detained youth (2019). Data at the youth level.

3. Questions around how policy(ies) guide or mandate probation intake decision making?

- a. Of the youth physically referred/booked at juvenile hall in 2019, how many were released, released to HS or detained by race/ethnicity and DRI risk score? Of youth detained with a low, medium, or high score, what was the "Override Reason"? How many youth physically referred to juvenile hall had a low or medium score and were detained because of a state or local policy by DRI risk level? How many youth physically referred to juvenile hall had Non 707b Felonies and were 14 and over?

Parameters: All youth detained (2019). Data at the detention episode level.

4. Questions around youth releases from juvenile hall:

- a. Where/to who are detained youth released to? By length of time served in juvenile hall, where were youth released to?

Parameters: All youth detained (2019). Data at the detention episode level.

5. Questions around reasons for admission to juvenile hall:

- a. What are most serious reasons for detention admission? (2019) What were top 20 most serious offenses/detention reasons that youth were admitted to Juvenile Hall? What were the offenses/detention reasons that were 707b offenses that youth were admitted to Juvenile Hall? What are the offenses/detention reasons for youth that had warrant as their secondary override reason? What are the top 10 most serious

offenses for youth that are not 707b offenses and do not have secondary override reasons for warrants or court orders?

Parameters: All youth detained (2019). Data at the detention episode level.

E. Guiding Questions to Consider for Case File Review of “Special Populations¹”

Special Pop.	Questions
<p>Robbery</p>	<p>Brief Description of incident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was it an Estes robbery? (Ex: In store committing a theft but confront a security guard). • What was youth’s role? • What was taken? Was it returned? • Was force used? What type? Did the youth personally use force? Was the victim injured? What were the injuries? • Was a weapon used? What type? Did the youth personally possess it? • How did charges change from arrest to filed to sustained? [If robbery ended in grand theft (or other lesser), review police report.] Or to a diversion or WIC 654 Informal Probation?
<p>Placement Related Detention</p>	<p>Brief Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize all prior placements and current placement , length of time spent in placement, length of time spent in AWOL status (if applicable), length of time spent in detention between placements. <p>Note: these questions “flow” from the reason(s) for the placement failure (and thus the use of detention), starting from what happened at placement and working backwards to what preventative measures were tried, or might have been tried, to prevent placement or place youth in a more suitable placement including with family members. We are trying to learn what services were needed (and provided or not provided) at each step to determine what types of solutions and interventions must be put in place to prevent placement, ensure suitable placements and services when needed, and serve youth successfully while in placement in the future.</p> <p>Information related to reasons for placement failure or what went wrong in placement that led to this detention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the youth indicate that there were problems at the placement? (I.e. harassment from staff or other issues that made the placement untenable?) • Is there a record of compliance by probation of the case plan while the youth was in placement such as visits w/ youth or contacts w/ family? • Is there any indication of use of graduated sanctions in the placements for youth? • What were the reason(s) that placement was not successful, including JPD reports and youth/defender statements or briefs? • For youth who ran-away or “AWOL’d” from placement: • Is there any indication that when a youth awol’d from program he/she was allowed to return w/o a warrant for detention? • How long was the youth “awol” or out of touch after he/she left the placement? • Was a child-family team convened? Was a new case plan developed following the placement disruption? <p>Information related to court disposition and choice of placement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the expected duration of the placement? • If the order was to a STRTP, did JPD identify a treatment need that the STRTP would address? What was the treatment need? Was this treatment need based on an assessment? Who conducted the assessment? • How many placements were contacted? Were they contacted simultaneously or one by one? How many placements interviewed the youth? How many placements accepted the youth? How many placements did not accept the youth? • Is there any indication that JPD or the court considered a less restrictive placement as an alternative? • Were incidents reported by youth that were considered in the placement decision (ie prior altercation)?

¹ “Special Population” data questions were shared with the CJHWG via web link on numerous occasions for workgroup members and members of the public to add questions and comments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following the court’s dispositional order, how long did it take for the youth to be transferred to placement? <p>Information related to attempts to prevent removal from home, place youth with family, and gain input from family or other supportive people in the youth’s life to develop an effective case plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did JPD conduct a “family find”? At what point in the case? Did JPD identify any family for possible placement? • Did JPD document its reasonable efforts to prevent removal from home? At what point in the case? What were JPD’s “reasonable efforts”? • Were family-based placements attempted at any point in the case? Where and with who? What was the outcome? How long did the family placement last? If the placement terminated, what were the reasons? • Was a child and family team convened? When? Who was included in the child-family team? How often did the team meet? Were all members present for meetings? Were youth selected supports engaged? • Did JPD create a case plan and submit it to court prior to disposition? Did the case plan include input from the child-family team? • Was the case submitted to a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) for review prior to disposition? Who participated in the MDT meeting? What information did the MDT consider as part of its process? What was JPD’s recommendation to the MDT? What was the MDT’s recommendation? What was the basis for their recommendation? • What plans did JPD make for reunifying the youth with his/her family? <p>Information related to court response following placement failure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did JPD recommend the court should do following the placement failure? What did the DA recommend? What did the youth request? • Did JPD conduct a child-family team meeting prior to submitting its recommendation to the court? • Did JPD submit a new case plan with its recommendation to the court? • Were any less-restrictive or family-based settings considered? • What did the court order? • When was the youth released and to where?
<p>Home Detention</p>	<p>Brief Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was home detention requested by defense or probation? If by defense, is there a record that probation objected to home detention request? • If by probation, why was home detention recommended by Probation? • What conditions of Probation were youth subject to? • Was Electronic Monitoring part of the HD? If so, how long was youth on EM prior to detention? If EM, why recommended? What were the EM requirements? • How long was youth on HD prior to detention? • What was the violation? • What underlying issues, if any, did the youth identify as the reason for the violation? Were these issues addressed by JPD or the court? How? • Was youth in compliance with other parts of the home detention requirements? Which ones? • Did youth have parent/guardian/family support for complying with home detention requirements? What support, if any, was offered to the family to promote compliance with home detention requirements? • What agency did the youth have to engage with (for things like curfew check)? • Prior Interventions while on HD? • How many meetings with probation prior to detention? • How many meetings with CBO prior to detention?

<p>Other 707(b)</p>	<p>Brief Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the youth was initially brought in on a 707b alleged by police but the petition charged a non-707b offense, did JPD change their recommendation from detention to release?
<p>Warrants</p>	<p>Brief Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there proof of use of graduated sanctions prior to a request for warrant on violations of home detention or probation conditions? • How many warrant cases were handled out of custody to recall the warrants? • What was the status of the case when the warrant was issued? (I.e. pre-adjudication, post-adjudication, or post-dispo). • How much time passed between the time the warrant was issued and the detention on the warrant? • What were the circumstances of the youth’s arrest on the warrant? (I.e. where was the youth arrested, by what agency, how did the agency come into contact with the youth, was there a new law violation?) • For warrants due to a failure to appear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What was the youth supposed to appear in court for? (I.e. what type of hearing was missed?) ○ Had the youth previously attended court? Were there any factors that led to the successful appearance? ○ Did the youth have support of parent/guardian/family to make it to court hearings? ○ How many hearings were missed before the warrant issued? ○ What efforts were made to contact the youth before the warrant issued? By JPD? By their defense attorney? ○ How long was the youth in custody before being released? Where was the youth released to? Was the youth released to the same home as before or to a new placement? Were any additional interventions ordered? If so, what? • For warrants due to a home detention violation (see HD questions above) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What efforts were made to contact the youth before the warrant issued? By JPD? By their defense attorney? ○ How long was the youth in custody before being released? Where was the youth released to? Was the youth released to the same home as before or to a new placement? Were any additional interventions ordered? If so, what? • For warrants due to leaving a placement (I.e. AWOL) (see placement questions above) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What efforts were made to contact the youth before the warrant issued? By JPD? By their defense attorney? ○ How long was the youth in custody before being released? Where was the youth released to? Was the youth released to the same home as before or to a new placement? Were any additional interventions ordered? If so, what? • For warrants due to a probation violation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How long had the youth been on probation when the warrant was issued? ○ What were the probation conditions? ○ What was the alleged violation? Did JPD file a WIC 777 petition alleging a probation violation? ○ What underlying issues, if any, did the youth identify as the reason for the violation? Were these issues addressed by JPD or the court? How? ○ Was youth in compliance with other parts of probation requirements? Which ones? ○ Did youth have parent/guardian/family support for complying with probation requirements? What support, if any, was offered to the family to promote compliance with probation requirements?
<p>Un-accompanied Immigrant Youth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is youth’s country of origin? • Does youth speak English? • Was youth already connected to the child welfare/dependency system at the time of detention? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If so, what was his/her dependency status? Was a 241.1 hearing held? What was the agencies’ recommendation at that hearing? What ruling did the court make? ○ If not, was a referral made to child welfare/dependency?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If so, who made the referral? Did child welfare conduct an investigation? What was the outcome of that investigation? ▪ Was a 241.1. hearing held? What was the agencies' recommendation at that hearing? What ruling did the court make? • What were the reasons for the detention of the youth? Did the youth lack a stable place and/or guardian who could take custody of the youth? What, if any, efforts were made to identify a temporary placement while the dependency and/or delinquency proceedings were pending? • Did the youth have representation from an immigration lawyer? • Was a challenge made to the age of the youth? Did the youth remain in detention while his/her age was investigated? What was the process for determining the youth's age?
<p>Youth Residing Outside of San Francisco</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What connections does the youth (or his/her family) have to San Francisco? (I.e. does the youth attend school here? Does the parent work here? Did the family live in SF previously? Does the youth have family members who reside in SF?) • Was the youth's case transferred to his or her county of residence? At what stage? • Did youth participate in any part of the SF juvenile justice system? If so, what providers were involved and what services were offered or required? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CARC? ○ Home detention? ○ Electronic monitoring? ○ Informal probation? • Was the youth connected to services in their county of residence? • Was the youth/family connected to other systems in SF or county of residence?

F. Capacity Analysis: Estimating Impact of Policy Changes

Applying lessons learned from the data reviewed in this report along with policy recommendations proposed by members of the CJHWG and community participants, BI developed its analysis for the capacity needs of a non-institutional place of detention. This analysis estimates that once recommended policy changes are implemented and take effect, a capacity of 5-10 beds may be adequate to serve as the non-institutional placement. The following steps were taken to make the estimation:

- ✓ **Step 1:** Using 2019 and 2020 annual data provided by AIR, calculate average monthly admissions for each admission reason.
- ✓ **Step 2:** Using the policy recommendations included in this report, estimate reductions in the number admitted per month for each admission reason.
- ✓ **Step 3:** Using the average number of hours youth stay in detention (included in the 2019 and 2020 data provided by AIR), translate average length of stay into days and months.
- ✓ **Step 4:** Calculated the average daily population/ capacity needs of a non-institutional place of detention, using the estimated reduction and multiplying the estimated number of youth admitted monthly for each admission reason by the time youth spend in detention monthly for each admission reason.

Using these steps, BI estimated the reduction in the capacity needs of a non-institutional place of detention as follows:

Step 1: Calculate Monthly Admissions by Admission Reason				
	2019 Admissions		2020 Admissions	
	2019 Annual Admissions	2019 Estimated Monthly	2020 Annual Admissions	2020 Estimated Monthly
Total	486	41	298	25
707(b)	184	15	108	9
<i>Robbery</i>	147	12	78	7
<i>Assault with Deadly Weapon (ADW)</i>	24	2.0	10	0.8
<i>Murder</i>	5	0.4	6	0.5
<i>All Other 707(b)</i>	8	0.7	14	1.2
Technical / Warrants	179	15	92	8
<i>Warrants</i>	109	9	66	6
<i>Home Detention (HD) Violation</i>	29	2.4	3	0.3
<i>Fail to Obey</i>	22	1.8	6	0.5
<i>Placement Related</i>	10	0.8	11	0.9
<i>Court Order 602</i>	5	0.4	2	0.2
<i>Court Order Wknd</i>	2	0.2	0	0
<i>Courtesy Hold</i>	2	0.2	2	0.2
<i>Other Warrant (Back Door/Ramey)</i>			2	0.2
All Other Felony/Misd	123	10	98	8

Step 2: Estimate Monthly Admissions with Reductions		
	Estimated Monthly	
	2019 Monthly Admissions (with reductions)	2020 Monthly Admissions (with reductions)
Total Admissions	14.4	7
707(b) <i>(with reductions below)</i>	7.3	3.6
<i>Robbery Reduced by 60%</i>	4.9	2.8
<i>ADW Reduced by 25%</i>	1.5	0.6
<i>Murder - no reduction</i>	0.4	0.5
<i>All other 707(b) Reduced by 25%</i>	0.5	0.9
Technical/ Warrants <i>(with reductions below)</i>	6.9	3.7
<i>Warrants Reduced by 50%</i>	4.5	3
<i>HD Violation Reduced by 50%</i>	1.2	0.2
<i>Fail to Obey Reduced by 50%</i>	0.9	0.3
<i>Placement Related Reduced by 100%</i>	0	0
<i>Court Order 602 Reduced by 50%</i>	0.2	0.1
<i>Court Order Wknd Reduced by 100%</i>	0	0
<i>Courtesy Hold Reduced by 50%</i>	0.1	0.1
<i>Other Warrant Reduced by 50%</i>		0.1
All Other Felony/Misd <i>(Reduced by 100%)</i>	0	0

Step 3: Average Length of Stay in Detention

	2019	2020

	Days	Month	Days	Month
Total	23.3	0.76	15	0.50
707(b)	22.9	0.75	21.2	0.70
<i>Robbery</i>	22.3	0.73	8.4	0.28
<i>Assault with Deadly Weapon</i>	18.4	0.60	7.7	0.25
<i>Murder</i>	76.8	2.53	39.5	1.30
<i>All Other 707(b)</i>	11.0	0.36	21.2	0.70
Technical / Warrants	21.1	0.69	19	0.62
<i>Warrants</i>	18.6	0.61	18	0.59
<i>Home Detention Violation</i>	33.3	1.09	6	0.20
<i>Fail to Obey</i>	15.8	0.52	20	0.66
<i>Placement Related</i>	26.2	0.86	24	0.79
<i>Court Order 602</i>	26.2	0.86	24	0.79
<i>Court Order Weekend</i>	26.2	0.86	24	0.79
<i>Courtesy Hold</i>	26.2	0.86	24	0.79
<i>Other Warrant ("Back Door"/Ramey)</i>		0.00	24	0.79
All Other Felony/Misd²	23.3	0.76	15	0.49

Step 4: Estimated Capacity Needs by Offense (With Reductions)

	Estimated Capacity	
	Capacity Needs Using 2019 Data (with reductions)	Capacity Needs Using 2020 Data (with reductions)
Total Capacity Needs (With Reductions)	10.4	4.4
All 707(b) (with reductions below)	5.6	2.2
<i>Robbery Reduced by 60%</i>	3.5	.8
<i>Assault with Deadly Weapon Reduced by 25%</i>	.9	.3
<i>Murder no reduction</i>	1	.6
<i>All other 707(b) Reduced by 25%</i>	.2	.6
All Technical/ Warrants (with reductions below)	4.8	2.2
<i>Warrants Reduced by 50%</i>	2.8	1.8
<i>Home Detention Violation Reduced by 50%</i>	1.3	0.0
<i>Fail to Obey Reduced by 50%</i>	0.5	0.2
<i>Placement Related Reduced by 100%</i>	0.0	0.0
<i>Court Order 602 Reduced by 50%</i>	0.2	0.1
<i>Court Order Weekend Reduced by 100%</i>	0.0	0.0
<i>Courtesy Hold Reduced by 50%</i>	0.1	0.1
All Other Felony/Misdemeanors Reduced by 100%	0.0	0.1

² See below for length of stay by specific offenses. According to the AIR Administrative data for 2019, 122 youth were admitted for an average of 653 hours (27.2 days) for "All other" misdemeanor and felony offenses. In calculating length of stay for this category BI weighted offenses, meaning the 13 youth detained for an average of 410 days for burglary was weighted with the 1 youth detained for 58 days for resisting arrest There was one additional admission with no length of stay recorded; the length of stay for this youth was counted as the average of the remaining 122 youth.

Average Length of Stay in Detention

The 2019 and 2020 Administrative Data from AIR included average length of stay³. Burns Institute categorized these data by three categories: (1) 707(b); (2) Warrants and Technical Violations; and (3) All other felony and misdemeanor offenses. Below, average length of stay by each category was calculated by adding the total number of days in juvenile hall for each admission reason category and dividing by the total number of detention episodes for each admission category.

2019 Average Length of Stay in Detention

Admission Reason Description (with hierarchy code)	Number of Admissions	ALOS Days	Total Days in Juvenile Hall
8900 -- Robbery	113	21.0	2373.00
14400 -- Robbery 2nd Degree	34	26.8	911.20
Robbery combined	147	22.3	3284.20
22400 -- Assault with a Deadly Weapon	24	18.4	440.9
1300 -- Murder	5	76.8	384.1
2020 -- Kidnap/Carjack	1	8.5	8.5
2495 -- Human Trafficking	1	2.4	2.4
5400 -- Rape	1	26.2	26.2
6200 -- Penetration	1	9.6	9.6
6850 - Carjacking	*		
7200 -- Arson Inhabited Structure	1	2.8	2.83
7500 -- Shooting Inhabited Dwelling	1	26.2	26.21
16000 -- Assault with a Chemical	1	1.6	1.63
Total W.I.C. 707(b)	183	23	4187
141899 -- Warrant	109	18.6	2029.6
999999 (All "other" Technical violations, including home detention violations (10); Placement Related (10); Court Order 602 (5); Court Ordered Weekend (2); and Courtesy Hold (2).	29	26.2	760.8
177400 -- Fail to Obey Orders	22	15.8	348.2
"Missing" (identified as Home Detention Violation)	19	33.3	632.5
Total Warrants and Technical	179	21.1	3771.0
42700 -- Burglary 2nd Degree	13	17.1	222.01
46200 -- Grand Theft Auto	11	15.2	167.44
10000 -- Possession of Cocaine	9	23.3	210.15
9800 -- Transporting, Selling Narcotics	7	17.8	124.42
12900 -- Burglary	6	59.7	358.44
32600 -- Concealed Weapon	6	13.6	81.77
77300 -- Conspiracy to Commit Crime	4	23.4	93.79
89500 -- Threaten, Obstruct Officer	4	26.1	104.56
102700 -- Sexual Battery	4	16.2	64.97
14500 -- Firearm at School	3	22.6	67.74
17300 - Possession of Narcotic	3	35.8	107.30
28018 -- Possession of Stolen Vehicle	3	52.6	157.89
42500 - Retail Theft	3	55.7	167.16
46300 -- Intimidating a Witness	3	26.0	78.13

³ Length of Stay answered the questions: What is the average and median length of time youth spend in detention in 2019 by most serious offense? The parameters included all 486 admissions to detention and were calculated at the episode level. The data were provided by AIR using hours in detention and were converted to days in detention by dividing by 24 (hours). The spreadsheet also included median length of stay, minimum number of days in detention by admission reason, maximum days in detention by admission reason, and standard deviation.

Appendices: Close Juvenile Hall Work Group (CJHWG)

46415 -- Vehicle Theft	3	27.5	82.37
91700 -- Theft	3	21.0	63.10
17900 -- Possession of a Controlled Substance and Firearm	2	10.0	20.08
21800 -- Injury to Spouse/Date	2	19.9	39.71
21900 -- Elder Abuse	2	18.5	36.96
22500 -- Battery with Serious Injury	2	43.4	86.90
37300 -- Resisting an Executive Officer	2	62.6	125.27
48400 -- Possession of Native American Art	2	3.4	6.86
61500 -- Carry Concealed Weapon	2	13.2	26.31
63300 -- Evading Officer	2	13.3	26.55
64520 - Carry Loaded Firearm	2	37.4	74.76
68600 -- Minor Conceal Weapon	2	27.4	54.82
22395 -- Armed with a firearm	1	215.1	215.07
22505 -- Resisting Officer	1	2.4	2.40
30400 -- False Imprisonment	1	1.2	1.17
30500 -- Possession of Marijuana	1	51.0	50.98
30800 -- Possession of Controlled Substance for Sale	1	74.6	74.57
46600 -- Grand Theft	1	107.9	107.94
62200 -- MFG/Etc.	1	3.1	3.05
66000 -- Minor Conceal Weapon	1	17.2	17.17
77800 -- Vandalism	1	16.2	16.19
89800 -- Battery	1	1.9	1.94
91900 -- Receive Stolen Property	1	3.2	3.25
91950 -- Vehicle Without Consent	1	47.9	47.90
92600 -- Conspiracy	1	0.6	0.56
95000 -- Minor Escape	1	90.8	90.80
104400 -- Theft	1	7.6	7.62
104700 -- Petty Theft	1	0.7	0.69
135500 -- Trespassing	1	27.1	27.12
All Other Misdemeanor and Felony	122	27.2	3317.8
Total	484	23.3	11275.4

2020 Average Length of Stay in Detention

Hierarchy Code	Admission Reason Description	Number of Admissions	ALOS (Days)	Total Days
1200	Murder: First Degree	1	45.6	45.6
1300	Murder	5	38.3	191.4
2435	Oral: Victim under 10	1	3.7	3.7
4500	MFG/Sell Assault Weapon	1	28.0	28.0
4800	Assault Semi Automatic Firearm	1	20.8	20.8
6850	Carjacking	8	15.8	126.2
8900	Robbery	56	7.1	395.4
9200	ADW NOT F/ARM:PO/FIRE:GBI	2	7.5	15.0
14400	Robbery 2nd Degree	22	11.9	261.9
22300	Assault with a Firearm	1	103.1	103.1
22400	Assault with a Deadly Weapon	10	7.7	77.3
	All Murder	6	39.5	237
	All Robbery	78	8.4	657.3

Appendices: Close Juvenile Hall Work Group (CJHWG)

	All "other" 707b	14	21.2	297
	All 707b	108	11.7	1268
141899	Warrant	66	17.8	1176.8
177900	Fail to Obey Orders	6	20.0	119.8
999999	Unknown	17	24.4	414.3
Missing	Violation of HD	3	5.6	16.9
	All Technical/Warrant	92	18.8	1728
9800	Transporting, Selling Narcotics	14	6.3	88.6
10000	Possession of Cocaine	3	5.4	16.2
12900	Burglary	1	1.2	1.2
14500	Firearm at school	2	13.8	27.6
17300	Possession of Narcotic	2		0.0
21800	Injury to Spouse/Date	2	0.8	1.6
22500	Battery with Serious Injury	1	19.1	19.1
28018	Possession of Stolen Vehicle	2	114.3	228.7
30400	Possession of Narcotic Controlled Substance	1	25.0	25.0
31900	Felon/ETCPoss	4	2.7	11.0
32600	Concealed Weapon	7	26.8	187.6
39300	Assault with a Stungun/Taser	1	20.6	20.6
39690	Illegal Firearm	1	55.3	55.3
40600	Threatening Crime	1	3.3	3.3
42700	Burglary 2nd Degree	10	5.0	50.4
43000	Forge/Altervehreg	1	27.8	27.8
46200	Grand Theft Auto	6	12.3	74.1
46300	Intimidating a Witness	3	29.5	88.6
46415	Vehicle Theft	4	13.9	55.7
46600	Grand Theft	2	25.3	50.6
48400	Stolen Property	3	26.2	78.5
61090	Convprsnposs Firearm	3	21.2	63.7
61500	Carry Concealed Weapon	1	2.7	2.7
62200	MFG/Etc.	1	5.9	5.9
63300	Evading Officer	4	18.7	74.7
64520	Carry Loaded Firearm	1	6.5	6.5
77300	Conspiracy to Commit Crime	3	18.1	54.3
77800	Vandalism	1	6.8	6.8
89500	Threaten, Obstruct Officer	4	21.4	85.4
90700	ADW/FORCE:POSSIBLEGBI	1	17.1	17.1
91200	Possesion of Narcotics	3	5.0	15.0
91700	Theft	1	2.7	2.7
102700	Sexual Battery	1	19.9	19.9
104350	Shoplifting	1	19.9	19.9
104400	Theft	1	11.8	11.8
104700	Petty Theft	1	10.5	10.5
	ALL Other Felony/Misdemeanor	98	15	1509
	TOTAL ALOS	298	15	4505

G. Close Juvenile Hall Work Group (CJHWG) Ordinance

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the City to close Juvenile Hall by December 31, 2021, expand community-based alternatives to detention, and provide a rehabilitative, non-institutional place of detention, in a location approved by the Court, to establish a working group for the development of a Juvenile Hall closure plan, and to establish the Youth Justice Reinvestment Fund to support community-based alternatives to detention and also support the working group; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.

Deletions to Codes are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.

Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.

Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.

Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Environmental and Land Use Findings.

(a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ___ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

(b) On _____, the Planning Department determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts this determination as its own. A copy of said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Chapter 119, consisting of Sections 119.1 through 119.3, to read as follows:

CHAPTER 119: CLOSURE OF JUVENILE HALL

SEC. 119.1. DEFINITIONS.

"City" means the City and County of San Francisco.

"Court" means the San Francisco Superior Court Juvenile Division.

"Juvenile Hall" means the locked detention facility at 375 Woodside Avenue in the City.

SEC. 119.2. FINDINGS.

(a) For nearly two decades, since roughly the advent of the 21st Century, youth crime has steadily declined across the country, including in the City. During this time the City has emerged as a leader in juvenile justice reform - shifting the focus from punishment and incarceration to support and care for young people. The City's reform-minded approach and the decrease in youth crime have contributed to a dramatic decline in the number of youth detained in custody. The City's focus increasingly has been on new and innovative interventions that invest in young people, rather than punishment.

(b) The budget for Juvenile Hall does not reflect today's low numbers of detained youth. In fiscal year 2017-2018, the City budgeted \$13,322,254 for Juvenile Hall despite the significantly reduced number of detained youth as compared to earlier years. From 2009 to January 2019, the average annual cost per year for each youth detained in Juvenile Hall has risen 127%, from \$123,400 to \$279,500.

(c) The detention of young people is not rehabilitative, nor does it effectively address public safety. Detention increases the likelihood of recidivism, future incarceration, and homelessness, and results in lower high school completion rates.

(d) The majority of youth detained in Juvenile Hall are not charged with serious offenses. In December 2018, 40 youth were detained at Juvenile Hall - filling only 27% of its beds. Of those 40 youth, 30% were detained for a misdemeanor offense, and 50% were detained while waiting for a court-ordered placement.

(e) Multiple studies have shown that putting youth behind bars fails to enhance public safety, drives low-level delinquent youth deeper into criminality, and increases the likelihood that they will wind up behind bars again. The Arkansas Division of Youth Services studied youth recidivism and identified detention as the strongest predictor of youth recidivism - more so than family difficulties or gang membership. One recent longitudinal study of 35,000 young offenders found that those who were detained as juveniles were twice as likely to be incarcerated as adults than juveniles who committed similar offenses and came from similar backgrounds but were given an alternative sanction or simply not arrested. Another recent study, from Brown University and MIT, found that detaining young people increases by 23% the likelihood that they will be jailed as adults. The study also found that juvenile detention is the single biggest predictor of future incarceration.

(f) The majority of youth in the juvenile justice system nationwide have experienced abuse, neglect, trauma, mental health problems, and family crisis. Youth in the juvenile justice system suffer from serious mental health issues at a rate far greater than the general youth population: 70% as compared to 10-20% of the general youth population. Nearly 90% of youth in the juvenile justice population nationwide have suffered a prior traumatic experience, and 30% of that population meet the criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder. The needs of youth impacted by these issues are better met outside of the punitive framework of the delinquency system.

(g) Detention adds more trauma to the lives of already traumatized youth. Detained youth become more isolated and disconnected from their families and their support networks and, when detained while awaiting their disposition hearings, fare far worse at every stage of their case.

(h) The detention of youth negatively impacts their cognitive development at what are critical development stages. Healthy psychological development requires: 1) the presence of a parent or parent-like adult who is involved with and concerned about the young person's development; 2) a peer group that values positive behavior and academic success; and 3) opportunities and activities that foster independent decision-making and critical thinking. These core adolescent development requirements cannot be achieved when young people are detained because those detained are: 1) separated from their support networks; 2) grouped together with other youth who have been charged with offenses; and 3) stripped of their autonomy and self-determination.

(i) Most youth will age out of crime and should be supported in a positive developmental process. This requires creating strong relationships with caring adults, inclusion in pro-social peer groups and activities, and encouragement to develop their own interests and potential. By expanding our investment in services that are community-based, culturally-relevant, trauma-informed, and developmentally-appropriate, the City will enable youth to make a positive transition into adulthood.

(j) For those youth who must be detained, small, non-institutional settings are most effective at rehabilitating and supporting youth. Services provided to youth should be built on strengths and needs identified by their families, should be

delivered by community programs, and whenever possible should avoid institutional placements and their attendant costs and harms.

SEC. 119.3. CLOSURE OF JUVENILE HALL.

By no later than December 31, 2021, the City shall close Juvenile Hall, expand community-based alternatives to detention, and provide a rehabilitative, non-institutional place of detention, in a location approved by the Presiding Judge of the Court, that will be available for wards of the Court and persons alleged to come within the jurisdiction of the Court. The place of detention shall be a safe and supportive homelike environment, which shall not be deemed to be, nor treated as, a penal institution, and which shall conform to all applicable State and federal regulations.

Section 3. Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Article XL, consisting of Sections 5.40-1 through 5.40-7, to read as follows:

ARTICLE XL: CLOSE JUVENILE HALL WORKING GROUP

SEC. 5.40-1. CLOSE JUVENILE HALL WORKING GROUP.

The City hereby establishes the Close Juvenile Hall Working Group.

SEC. 5.40-2. DEFINITIONS.

“CARC” means the Huckleberry Community Assessment and Resource Center.

“City” means the City and County of San Francisco.

“Court” means the San Francisco Superior Court Juvenile Division.

“DCYF” means the Department of Children Youth and Families.

“Juvenile Hall” means the locked detention facility at 375 Woodside Avenue in the City.

“Working Group” means the Close Juvenile Hall Working Group.

SEC. 5.40-3. PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES.

(a) The purpose of the Working Group is to create a plan to:

(1) close Juvenile Hall by no later than December 31, 2021;

(2) strengthen and expand community-based alternatives to detention;

(3) provide a rehabilitative, non-institutional place of detention, in a location approved by the Court, which is available for all wards of the Court and persons alleged to come within the jurisdiction of the Court; and

(4) reinvest any monies saved by the closure of Juvenile Hall in high-quality, effective, community-based alternatives to detention; an alternative, rehabilitative, non-institutional center for youth who are detained; and mental health and educational support for detained youth.

(b) In carrying out this purpose, the Working Group shall be guided by the following principles:

(1) A juvenile justice system should balance public safety, positive youth development, family and community health, and victim restoration.

(2) Detention has a devastating impact on youth, their families, and their neighborhoods, and undermines the safety and health of both detained youth and their communities.

(3) The rehabilitative goals of the juvenile justice system can best be accomplished in family-based settings in the communities where youth live.

(4) The vast majority of young people in detention should be diverted from that system and given access to developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed programs and services that address racial and ethnic disparities.

(5) Youth in the juvenile justice system and their families should have a role in identifying what kind of support would be most helpful to them.

(6) Resources invested in Juvenile Hall should instead be invested in youth, their families, and community-based programs, including mental health and educational support.

(7) Community-based programs that serve juvenile justice-involved young people should be supported, strengthened, and where appropriate, expanded.

(8) Youth in the juvenile justice system should be referred to programs and court-ordered placements in the City whenever possible.

(9) Juvenile Hall staff should be given the opportunity, consistent with civil service rules, to transfer to other jobs with the City or the San Francisco Unified School District once Juvenile Hall is closed.

SEC. 5.40-4. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) Members. The Working Group shall consist of 13 members as set forth below.

(1) Seats 1 and 2 shall be held by representatives of community-based non-profits that serve juvenile justice-involved youth and are members of the Juvenile Justice Providers Association.

(2) Seats 3 and 4 shall be held by persons under the age of 29 who were previously detained or incarcerated.

(3) Seat 5 shall be held by a parent or guardian of a person who is or was detained as a youth in the juvenile justice system.

(4) Seat 6 shall be held by an expert in the design of small, rehabilitative, and education-focused centers that meet the needs of young people who, following their arrest or detention, cannot return to their home or community.

(5) Seat 7 shall be held by an expert in youth mental illness, with experience serving the juvenile justice population, and expertise in best practices for serving youth with mental illness.

(6) Seat 8 shall be held by an expert in juvenile justice reform with experience in data analysis and the development of alternatives to detention.

(7) Seat 9 shall be held by a member of the labor community.

(8) Seat 10 shall be held by the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer or the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer's designee.

(9) Seat 11 shall be held by the Public Defender or the Public Defender's designee.

(10) Seat 12 shall be held by the District Attorney or the District Attorney's designee.

(11) Seat 13 shall be held by a representative of the Court if the Court so chooses. While the Court is not required to provide a representative to hold this seat, it shall be invited to do so.

(b) Seats 1-9 shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors. The Board shall strive to appoint members to the Working Group from communities disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system and from the City's most marginalized communities.

SEC. 5.40-5. ORGANIZATION AND TERMS OF OFFICE.

(a) Members of the Working Group in Seats 1-9 shall serve at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors and may be removed by the Board at any time. Each member in Seats 1-9 may remain in the Working Group until the termination of the Working Group under Section 5.40-7, unless removed by the Board. Any vacancy in Seats 1-9 shall be filled by the Board.

(b) Service in the Working Group shall be voluntary. Members appointed to Seats 1 through 9 may receive a stipend in an amount determined by the Board.

(c) Any member in Seats 1-9 who, within a six-month period, misses three regular meetings of the Working Group without the express approval of the Working Group at or before the missed meeting shall be deemed to have resigned from the Working Group ten days after the third unapproved absence. The Working Group shall inform the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of any such resignation.

(d) Subject to the fiscal and budgetary provisions of the Charter, the City Administrator shall designate staff to provide administrative support to the Working Group.

(e) Subject to the fiscal, budgetary, and civil service provisions of the Charter, the City Administrator shall hire and make available to the Working Group an outside consultant with expertise in juvenile justice reform, program evaluation, data analysis, youth development, development of alternatives to detention, and juvenile justice systemic change. The outside consultant shall advise the Working Group, and, to the extent desired by the Working Group, may facilitate its meetings and compile required reports on behalf of the Working Group.

(f) Quorum. Seven members of the Working Group shall constitute a quorum.

(g) Officers. The Working Group shall elect a Chairperson from its members. The Chairperson shall designate a member to serve in the Chairperson's absence.

(h) Subcommittees. The Working Group may establish subcommittees to be convened as directed by the Working Group. The Working Group's Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee shall appoint members to the subcommittees. Subcommittees shall report findings and make recommendations to the full Working Group for its consideration.

(i) Meeting Frequency. The Working Group shall meet at least every two months until Juvenile Hall is closed and a substitute place or places of detention are available for youth placement.

(j) Roles of Members. In adopting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors recognizes that each member in Seats 10-13 retains their authority and duties under State law and that where conflicts may arise out of members' dual roles, State powers and duties shall supersede the duties that this Article XL imposes on members.

SEC. 5.40-6. POWERS AND DUTIES.

(a) The Working Group shall have the following powers and duties in the work focus areas described below:

WORK FOCUS AREA # 1: Based on available data, conduct a needs assessment for youth detained in Juvenile Hall. To conduct this assessment, the Working Group shall:

(1) Request that the City Attorney petition the Court for access to data contained in juvenile delinquency files and related juvenile records in the possession of the Juvenile Probation Department for the purpose of conducting the needs assessment.

(2) Track every child detained at Juvenile Hall who is not required by State law to be kept in a secure facility, including but not limited to: (A) children charged with probation violations or technical violations such as home detention violations, (B) children charged with a misdemeanor awaiting disposition, and (C) children awaiting an out-of-home placement post-disposition.

(3) Identify gaps in existing community-based programs and services.

(4) Evaluate the use of risk assessment tools, both quantitatively and qualitatively, to ensure that all young people who are eligible and safe to be released are in fact being released.

(5) Create plans to transition youth leaving Juvenile Hall to appropriate, local non-institutional settings.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 2: Plan and design a small, rehabilitative and education-focused center for the placement of detained youth ("Center"). In developing the plan and design, the Working Group shall:

(1) Analyze best practices for the administration and management of small rehabilitative non-institutional settings for youth, which may include consultation with designers, architects, experts in alternative models, and mental health and youth development experts. The analysis also may include examination of existing programs in other counties, states, or countries that have demonstrated rehabilitative success.

(2) Collaborate with the Real Estate Division, the Capital Planning Committee, and local community-based organizations to identify local land or existing buildings that may be used for this Center.

(3) Create an implementation plan for this Center.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 3: Determine the community-based residential or day-programs that need to be created, expanded, or reinstated to effectively serve wards of the Court and persons alleged to come within the jurisdiction of the Court who are not ordered detained by the Court. To make this determination, the Working Group shall:

(1) Promptly identify a housing option in the City for female youth who, following arrest or release from detention, cannot return to their homes, to replace the Catholic Charities San Francisco Girls Home Shelter closed in 2018.

(2) Identify existing community-based day programs and housing options that may be expanded.

(3) Identify new services or programs, including day services and housing options, which are needed to serve vulnerable youth populations.

(4) In consultation with DCYF, the Department of Public Health, the Juvenile Probation Department, and the Human Rights Commission, create funding plans to ensure both the expansion of existing programs with a demonstrated record of success and the creation of new programs. The programs should include mental health services, educational services, employment opportunities, and mentoring opportunities, which are culturally-relevant, trauma-informed, strengths-based, and rooted in the local community. Where possible, these services should be available to youths' family members.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 4: Collaborate with the Department of Human Resources and labor organizations that represent Juvenile Hall staff, to develop a plan to transition Juvenile Hall staff to jobs in other City departments or jobs with the San Francisco Unified School District or the alternative Center that this Working Group shall create.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 5: Develop trauma-informed, culturally relevant transition plans, specialized services, and housing options for vulnerable youth exiting detention, including young women, gender non-conforming and LGBT youth, African American youth, immigrant, youth, foster youth, homeless youth, and mentally ill youth.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 6: Develop a reinvestment plan that redirects funds historically allocated for Juvenile Hall to community-based alternatives to detention, the Center, and additional mental health and academic support programs for juvenile justice-involved youth.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 7: Develop policy recommendations for the Police Department, the Juvenile Probation Department, and CARC, which divert youth who have been arrested from the juvenile justice system to alternative, community-based programs and support systems.

WORK FOCUS AREA # 8: Develop policy recommendations for the Juvenile Probation Department that transform the department supervision model into a strengths-based framework so that young people are not sent to detention for probation violations, including technical violations or violations for low-level offenses.

(b) In carrying out its duties, the Working Group shall: 1) collaborate with the Mayor's Juvenile Justice Reform Blue Ribbon Panel; and 2) consult with the Capital Planning Committee, Real Estate Division, Child Welfare Division of the Human Services Agency, Child Crisis Division of the Department of Public Health, Youth Commission, the Police Department, and the San Francisco Unified School District. The Working Group shall invite a representative of each entity identified in this subsection (b) to all Working Group meetings.

(c) Subject to the fiscal, budgetary, and civil service provisions of the Charter, and to the extent consistent with open government laws, the Working Group shall investigate juvenile justice best practices by visiting other jurisdictions and retaining subject matter experts, as needed.

(d) Reports. The Working Group shall prepare and submit a report every six months that describes the Working Group's progress in fulfilling the duties set forth in this Section 5.40-6. The first report shall be due six months after the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No. _____, creating this Article XL. The Working Group shall submit each report to the Board of Supervisors, along with a proposed resolution to accept the report. The Working Group shall also submit each report to the Mayor, any City department or office responsible for a program identified in the report, and the City Administrator. Each report shall be available to the public, and the City Administrator shall post each report on the City Administrator's website.

(e) In carrying out its duties, the Working Group shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all City departments, offices, officers, and employees. All components of City government shall promptly produce all records and information requested by the Working Group, unless prohibited from doing so by state or federal law.

SEC. 5.40-7. SUNSET DATE.

This Article XL shall expire by operation of law, and the Working Group shall terminate, when the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer certifies in writing that Juvenile Hall is closed and there is a substitute place or places of detention, approved by the Court, that is available for wards of the Court and persons alleged to come within the jurisdiction of the Court. In that event, after the sunset date, the City Attorney shall cause this Article XL to be removed from the Administrative Code.

Section 4. Article XIII of Chapter 10 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.100-376, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.100-376. YOUTH JUSTICE REINVESTMENT FUND.

(a) Establishment of Fund. The Youth Justice Reinvestment Fund is established as a category eight fund to receive fee revenue dedicated to community-based alternatives to juvenile detention and other contributions to the fund.

(b) Use of Fund. The fund is to be used exclusively by the City Administrator, for the purpose of supporting community-based alternatives to juvenile detention and the work of the Close Juvenile Hall Working Group established in Article XL of Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code.

(c) Administration of Fund. The City Administrator, shall administer the fund and shall report annually to the Board of Supervisors on the current status of the fund, the amounts approved for disbursement, and the number and types of community-based alternatives to juvenile detention assisted. The City Administrator shall have the authority to prescribe rules and regulations governing the Fund.

Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: _____

JANA CLARK

Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2019\1900427\01351478.docx

H. NCCD: California Leadership Academy Partnership Campaign



California Leadership Academy Partnership Campaign

The Issue

Every year in California, thousands of young men age 18 to 25, including many juveniles charged as adults, are locked up in adult prisons (over 11,000 new admissions in 2010). National data indicates that not only are adult facilities ill-equipped to keep these young people safe, they offer inadequate opportunities for education, cognitive behavior therapy, skill building, or treatment for trauma. The shortage of targeted, evidence-based programming is particularly concerning and highlights the need for the programs designed for youth and young adults. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) reports that 67 percent of those released from prison 24 years old or younger are re-incarcerated within three years. This youth demographic has the highest recidivism percentage of any age group.

Prison overcrowding, youth exposure to adults who have committed harsher crimes, and the lack of appropriate programs and services lead to these extremely high rates of recidivism. The exorbitant cost of this ineffective and harmful incarceration costs taxpayers billions of dollars each year.

It is clear that the status quo is unacceptable. The California Leadership Academy Partnership seeks to achieve three goals to improve the outcomes of youth and young adults in the state: End or at least significantly reduce the number of children charged as adults; reduce the number of youth and young adults in California prisons and thereby reducing prison capacity; and open two Leadership Academy campuses that will provide education, treatment, and vocational training to 18-25 year olds who would otherwise be in deplorable state prisons.

Keeping Youth in the Juvenile System

In California, 6,500 individuals are incarcerated in an adult prison for a crime they committed while a juvenile. Nearly 1,000 children each year are charged as adult throughout the state.

Numerous studies have found that treating youthful offenders as adults is inappropriate, detrimental to their development, and ineffective as a deterrent to crime. Research shows that adolescents are more likely to act impulsively, more susceptible to peer influence, and are prone to risky experimentation as a part of their identity formation. Though the developing minds and identities of young people lead to risky and sometimes criminal behavior, their formative stage of development also makes them more responsive to positive influences and capable of change.

Recent state and federal court rulings have relied on research showing that adolescents are different than adults to strike down several criminal justice practices that treat children as adults. In the United States Supreme Court's 2012 decision in *Miller v. Alabama* (2012), Justice Kagan wrote, "[Children] are constitutionally different from adults for purposes of sentencing . . . Juveniles have diminished culpability and greater prospects for reform." The Court invalidated mandatory life without parole sentences for youth under the age of eighteen at the time of their crimes.

The practice of prosecuting youth in the adult system is not only ineffective, it is harmful – to the youth who need positive and age-appropriate programming and to society. In adult lock-ups, youth are often isolated from adults for their own protection. This puts them at danger of experiencing severe depression and other mental health issues, and

increases their risk for committing suicide. One study found that youth are 36 times more likely to commit suicide in an adult jail than in a juvenile facility. Youth are five times more likely to be sexually assaulted and two times more likely to be beaten by staff in adult facilities than in juvenile facilities.

With the overwhelming evidence that prosecuting and incarcerating children as adults is inhumane and ineffective, the California Leadership Academy Partnership will work with juvenile justice advocates and policy experts to end or at least significantly limit the practice.

The California Leadership Academy

The California Leadership Academy (CLA) is an alternative approach to incarceration that would relieve capacity in the adult system by diverting emerging young adult offenders into a model facility, surrounding them with pro-social peers sharing a desire to permanently change their lives, and providing the programming and services that will maximize their chances of reaching that goal. The Academy would lead the way for a “California Model” of juvenile justice reform for other states to follow.

The Academy would be operated by a non-profit organization in collaboration with the state government. Youth and young adults who would otherwise be in state prison will be transferred to CLA, which will focus primarily on education and rehabilitation programming, delivered in a therapeutic campus-like model. The proposed program is focused on 18-25 year olds who are serving 3-5 year sentences for serious and violent felonies. The Academy team and consultants, including experts in programming as well as facility design and construction, will develop the programming and physical plant using proven national models and evidence based programs.

The CLA Partnership has had initial discussion with CDCR and the Governor’s Office about opening two 300-bed campuses, one in Southern and one in Northern California. In 2015, the CLA Partnership will empanel an Advisory Committee of juvenile justice advocates and experts in youth treatment, rehabilitative facilities, and education.

Hallmarks of the California Leadership Academy

- Small living units, staffed by youth counselors and therapists.
- Individualized treatment plans, mentoring, case management, and referral to community services once released.
- Comprehensive, evidence-based mental health and substance abuse curriculum and support groups.
- Family integration into the treatment and reentry planning.
- Life skills curriculum to create a different aesthetic of the former offender re-entering the community.
- Establishment of numerous partnerships with CBOs and joint ventures with trade unions and potential employers.

Reducing Prison Capacity

In addition to joining a campaign to end the charging of youth as adults and opening an education and treatment based campus for youth and young adults who would otherwise be in state prison, the CLA Partnership will also reduce the capacity of California prisons. The CLA Partnership has received a pledge from the state that for every bed created by CLA, two prison beds would be taken off-line. Two CLA campuses of 300 beds each could lead to 1200 fewer prison beds available.

The California Leadership Academy Partnership Campaign of ending the charging of youth as adults, opening a non-profit run campus focused on education and treatment, and reducing prison capacity, is in its very early stages of development. The CLA Partnership welcomes feedback and input in order to achieve the very best outcomes for youth in the state.

NCCD promotes just and equitable social systems for individuals, families, and communities through research, public policy, and practice.

