



Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e)

San Francisco Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council's
DJJ Realignment Subcommittee
10.12.21
Agenda Item 4

Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e)

- 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....provided that the policy bodies make certain findings at least once every 30 days
- Most recent emergency order by the Mayor requires all bodies, except BOS and disciplinary hearings, to continue meeting virtually
- Subcommittee must make two findings (and vote) today on whether to continue remote meetings

Teleconferencing Meetings Continued

Must make two findings:

1) That the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee has considered the circumstances of the state of emergency and 2) that one of the following circumstances exist:

(a) The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of members to meet safely in person

OR

(b) State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing



DJJ Realignment Updates

San Francisco Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council's
DJJ Realignment Subcommittee

11.9.21

Agenda Item 5

Information & Materials

- All planning templates will be posted to website today:
 - [DJJ Realignment Resources | Juvenile Probation Department \(sfgov.org\)](#)
- All learning sessions are currently posted to website:
 - [Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council \(JJCC\) | Juvenile Probation Department \(sfgov.org\)](#)
- Sections 1 – 3 of draft plan to your inbox at the end of this meeting
 - **Please review for:**
 - Correct name, title, and email address
 - Current investments for topic areas accurately reflected (as discussed here)
 - **Feedback on these sections by November 15th @ 5pm**

Close Juvenile Hall Workgroup Update

- Final report to be submitted by 11/15
- BOS to schedule hearings following receipt of report
- Dates of hearings TBD

Proposed November/December Schedule

- **November 16th, 4pm – 6pm**
- November 23rd, 4-pm-6pm
- **November 30th, 4pm – 6pm**
- December Meeting Dates, if any, TBD

NOVEMBER - DECEMBER DJJ REALIGNMENT PLAN SCHEDULE

TASKS

MEETINGS

FEEDBACK DEADLINES



Final topic area discussions

November 9

Sections 1 - 3 feedback due by **November 15**



Discuss and determine interim SYTF site and identify spending priorities

November 16

Section 4 - 8 feedback due by **November 22**



Approve state plan submission

November 23

Any final feedback due by **November 29th**

November 30



Plan to BOS

BOS December meeting (TBD)

Attendance not required for DJJ Realignment Subcommittee members



Planning Template for DJJ Realignment Subcommittee Topic Areas

Topic Area: Settings

Young people in San Francisco who have petitions sustained for 707(b) offensesⁱ are most frequently ordered by the court to three distinct dispositions:

- 1) **formal probation in the community:** under the supervision of the court and Juvenile Probation; must abide by certain conditions imposed by the court; living at home with parent or guardian if under 18
- 2) **out of home placement:** ordered by the court to reside in a foster care placement (could be with a resource family or in a group home); must abide by certain conditions imposed by the court and is ordered not to leave this placement to live anywhere else
- 3) **secure youth treatment facility:** a locked residential facility where the young person is not free to leave

To aid in the creation of SF's DJJ Realignment Planⁱⁱ, please fill out the following table that asks what currently exists, what doesn't, and what needs to in this particular topic area across the continuum of possible dispositions for these young people. **When filling out the table please keep the following in mind:**

- The DJJ realignment adopted the following as its guiding values. How are these values reflected in this topic area?
 - Healing-Centered Models
 - Family- Centered Models
 - Community Involvement
 - Culturally Responsive Models
- Have the voices of young people and directly impacted people been included in these ideas?
- At each stage of the continuum, what is needed to prevent deeper system involvement?
- What does integration of services, programs, or resources look like for this topic area across continuum and/or as a young person is stepped down from a more restrictive setting?
- What does this topic area look like for young people under 18 vs. over 18?

Topic:	Formal Probation in the Community	Out of Home Placement	Secure Youth Treatment Facility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What resources and services currently exist in San Francisco and are working well for this group of young people? 	<p>Youth placed on formal probation in the community receive their intervention, support and services in the following settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the <u>home</u> of their parent/guardian (or, if young adult, living independently) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This could include in a home where they live with their own children Broad array of <u>community-based service agencies</u> across the City or in their home counties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private (CBOs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justice related Non-justice related: workforce development, education support, recreation, wellness, arts, cultural programming Public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools – K-12, higher ed Health clinics Court/JPD/services located at 375 Woodside <p><u>Relevant regulations/structural constraints:</u></p>	<p>Youth ordered by the Court to <u>nonsecure</u> out of home placement (OOHP) receive their intervention, support and services across a <u>continuum of OOHP settings</u>. <u>Some of these settings are in San Francisco; others are not, but serve San Francisco youth:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Resource Family (RFA):</u> a caregiver who provides out-of-home care for youth in foster care. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be a relative or a non-relative Youth attends school and receives services in the community Youth may be placed near home or around the Bay Area Some RFAs are independent. Others are part of Foster Family Agencies (FFAs); these caregivers typically receive extensive training and support, including respite care. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In September 2021, JPD and DCYF launched a pilot with Alternative Family Services, a FFA, to 	<p>Currently, the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee has identified San Francisco Juvenile Hall as our SYTF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently operating as a secure detention center that meets all state and Federal regulations (see more details below). Education is provided by San Francisco Unified School District; youth who have completed their diploma or GED/HiSET may take online courses at City College. Programming includes services provided on-site by a broad range of community-based organizations including: Art of Yoga, the Beat Within, City Youth Now, Fresh Lifelines for Youth, OTTP, Omega Boys Club, New Door Ventures, Next Step Project, Ripple Effect 22 Block to Block, Comunidad San Dimas, Success Centers SF (visual art, playwriting, job readiness, coding), Sunset Youth Services (digital arts & technology, case management), Youth Narrative, and Young Women’s Freedom Center, as well as on-site services by the Department of Public

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State & Federal law (ex: Education Code, W&I Code, Medi-Cal) • Funder requirements (ex: DCYF grant agreement) <p><u>Additional features/qualities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Usage:</u> These settings can be the primary intervention <u>or</u> the step down from more intensive interventions (secure settings, out-of-home placement) • <u>Program structure:</u> Some settings co-locate justice-focused supports with mainstream services; others do not • <u>Age:</u> Some settings are limited to youth <18; others will serve youth 18+ • <u>Location:</u> Our youth and families live across the Bay Area, which means that their homes, schools and services may be located outside SF. • <u>Electronic monitoring:</u> Some youth are placed on electronic monitoring as a component of being on probation in the community (noting as an existing component; efficacy is debated) <p><u>“Human infrastructure”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents/guardians & the youth’s household(s) 	<p>operate 7 RFAs specifically for SF probation youth. Through this pilot, AFS is recruiting and supporting resource families to provide highly responsive, short-term emergency and long-term placement options in culturally-responsive RFA settings. The resource families receive robust training and support by AFS, as well as funding by the City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As of November 1, SF has 4 youth placed in RFAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Short-Term Residential Treatment Program (STRTP):</u> formerly referred to as a Group Home - a residential facility operated by a public agency or private organization that provides an integrated program of specialized and intensive care and supervision, services and supports, treatment, and short-term 24-hour care and supervision to youth and nonminor dependents. 	<p>Health Special Programs for Youth (Girls’ Circle, Boys’ Council, Aggression Replacement Therapy, and Experiential Groups)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family visits are both virtual and in-person • Facility is based on a unit/pod setting, in which youth and young adults are assigned to units based on gender, age/development and behavior. Additional spaces include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education Center ○ Multipurpose Room ○ Merit Center ○ Gymnasium ○ Health Clinic ○ Outdoor recreation and garden space ○ Intake/admissions • “Human infrastructure” includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sworn staff (Counselors, Counselor IIs, Senior Counselors) ○ SFUSD educators and academic support ○ DPH/Special Programs for Youth medical and mental health staff ○ Community-based service providers who come on site ○ SFPL librarian
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educators/school staff • Community-based service providers: case managers, but also a variety of direct service providers and adult allies who may/may not be connected to the justice system • Mental & medical health providers • Probation officers, defense counsel, Court 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some STRTPs are located in a community and <u>leverage external programs and services</u>; youth attend school and receive services in the community. Examples in SF include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Catholic Charities’ Boys Home (“33rd Avenue”) ▪ Edgewood - doesn’t generally take JPD youth ○ Other STRTPs <u>are self-contained campuses</u> - all services, including education, are provided on the campus. They are often in remote locations. Examples used by San Francisco include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aaron Boys’ Home (Atascadero/San Luis Obispo) ▪ Boys Republic (Chino Hills/San Bernadino) ▪ Courage to Change (Exeter/Tulare) ▪ Rites of Passage (San Andreas/Calaveras) ▪ Teen Valley Ranch (Madera/Madera) ○ As of November 1, SF has 7 youth placed in STRTPs (1 pre-adjudicated/6 post-adjudicated). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ombudsman ○ Visitors for individual youth (including attorneys) • COVID practices include: intake/quarantine unit with COVID testing at days 1, 7, 14; on-site testing for all visitors and weekly testing for all staff/regular service providers; masking and other social distancing strategies <p><u>Relevant regulations/structural constraints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>California Code of Regulations Titles 15 and 24</u> provide the regulatory landscape for SYTFs until the state develops new standards for these settings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Title 15 regulates operations</u>, including: County inspection & evaluation; appointment & qualifications; staffing; youth supervision staff orientation & training; fire & life safety; fire safety plan; emergency procedures; safety checks; suicide prevention plan; juvenile facility capacity; screening for sexual abuse, Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA); classification, transgender & intersex youth; orientation;
--	---	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “STRTP of one” – new model being rolled out by CDSS ○ Limited access to out-of-state STRTPs through new law. ● <u>Transitional Housing Placement Plus Foster Care (THP+FC)</u>: also referred to as AB 12, allows eligible foster youth to extend foster care beyond age 18 and up to age 21. The eligible foster youth are designated Non-Minor Dependents (NMDs) and are entitled to various foster placement options including Supervised Independent Living Settings (SILPS). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Examples currently used include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mary’s Help (Vallejo) ▪ Unity Care (Daly City, South San Francisco) ▪ Uplift Family Services (Concord) ○ As of November 1, SF has 5 young adults placed in THP+FCs. ● <u>Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP)</u>: a community care licensed placement opportunity for youth ages 16-18 in foster care; the goal is to help participants emancipate 	<p>separation; room confinement; institutional assessment & plan; counseling & casework services; use of force; use of physical restraints (including for movement within the facility); safety room procedures; searches; grievances; education program; programs, recreation & exercise; religious program; work program; visiting; correspondence; access to legal services; discipline/discipline process; responsibility for health care; patient treatment decisions; scope of health care; health education; reproductive services & sexual health; mental health; food/serving & supervision; clothing; standard bedding & linen issue/exchange; mattresses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Title 24, regulates the physical structure</u>, including: Reception/intake admission; locked holding room; natural light; corridors; living unit; locked sleeping rooms; single/double occupancy
--	--	---	---

		<p>successfully by providing a safe environment for youth while learning skills that can make them self-sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As of November 1, SF has 0 youth placed in THPPs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Community Treatment Facility:</u> A locked facility that provides intensive clinical services to the highest needs youth experiencing mental health challenges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As of November 1, SF has 0 youth placed in Community Treatment Facilities. <p><u>Relevant regulations/structural constraints:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● OOHP is heavily governed by law: CA statutes and Federal law, most recently by FFPSA. These laws increasingly favor the use of RFAs (foster and relative placements) over STRTPs. ● California Department of Social Services (CDSS) oversees the certification of all OOHPs used for California youth. ● JPD is required to approve any relative RFAs pursuant to these regulations. 	<p>sleeping rooms; dormitories; dayrooms; physical activity/rec areas; academic classrooms; safety rooms; medical examination rooms; pharmaceutical storage; dining areas; visiting space; storage; audio monitoring system; emergency power; confidential interview room; programs and activity areas; toilet/urinals; wash basins; drinking fountains; showers; beds; lighting; padding (safety room); seating; weapons lockers; security glazing (glass); mirrors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At the Federal level, statutory definitions of “secure” and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) also apply. <p><u>Additional SYTF options available/undergoing implementation at this time:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sonoma SYTF - open to No Cal counties ● San Luis Obispo SYTF - open to counties statewide; focus on younger youth ● Fresno Sex Offender SYTF - most likely will limit to Central Valley region
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>Additional features/qualities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Placement/JCRU support:</u> All youth in OOHP are visited monthly by either their Probation Officer (for youth on probation) or their Social Worker (for AB12 non-minor dependents). Youth returning from placement are part of the JCRU - a model reentry court with a dedicated judge, probation officers, community organizations, public defender and other partners. • <u>Usage:</u> OOHP may be used as the initial intervention, as a step up for youth who are not doing well on probation in the community or cannot be placed at home, and as a step down from more intensive interventions. <p><u>“Human infrastructure” includes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Families of placed youth • CBO staff who support placed youth • Resource families - both relative and non-relative • Staff at STRTPs • Justice partners - JPD, Court, Defense, DA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Grove Fire Camp - transitioning from CDCR oversight; Anti-Recidivism Coalition will be one of the new partners
--	--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the service & resource gaps? • What program elements are missing? 	<p><u>Youth on probation in the community may face multiple access barriers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility restrictions • Transit • Safe passage and safe locations • Hours of operation • Stay away orders that restrict service access • Competing demands on their time across these settings (for example: leaving school to attend court) <p><u>Out-of-county youth face additional barriers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They may lack the broad array of community-based interventions and supports that we have in SF • SF juvenile justice system partners are less familiar with the services in their communities • They may have limited access to SF-based services (both eligibility and getting there) <p><u>Human Infrastructure gaps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole family support • Shared vision, training and practices across community-based settings • Collaboration and coordination across community-based settings • Adequate pay and resources 	<p><u>Limited local RFA options:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of living in SF and the Bay Area makes it difficult to operate RFAs - particularly culturally responsive ones. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Youth placed in RFAs outside SF have to change schools and have reduced access to positive local connections (family, peers, community resources & relationships) • Many existing RFAs do not serve justice involved youth and particularly youth with sustained 707(b) petitions. • Youth’s relatives who are willing to care for them in an RFA capacity may not be able to meet state regulations. <p><u>Limited STRTP options, SF and beyond:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State congregate care reform and recent Federal legislation have sought to improve the quality of group homes while restricting their use in favor of foster care placements. These reforms have also led to a reduction in available OOHPs - particularly smaller “mom & pop” group homes that were more culturally responsive to system-involved youth. 	<p>Juvenile Hall, in its current form, is <u>a traditional secure detention setting, not designed for long-term living or programming.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carceral setting • Short-term programming <p>Juvenile Hall, in its current form, is slated to close per BOS legislation, and the <u>future secure setting is unknown at this time.</u></p> <p><u>Log Cabin Ranch</u> is not operational - and not secure in its current format. SF anticipates a <u>very small number of youth</u> who will require long term programming and other design shifts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does effective programming look like without a “critical mass”? • Especially for youth populations detained in the lowest numbers (e.g. girls, gender expansive youth)? <p>We do not have long-term secure programming designed for <u>specialized populations</u> of young people/young adults, such as sex offenders.</p> <p>We have not had <u>meaningful community education and engagement</u> about DJJ realignment -</p>
---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In December 2020, CDSS decertified all out-of-state STRTPs, which means that probation can no longer send our youth to those placements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is significant because <u>San Francisco often relied on out-of-state placements for youth who otherwise would have been committed to DJJ.</u> • As a result of legislative reform and the decertification of out-of-state placements, there are extremely limited STRTP options for the youth most affected by DJJ realignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are older ○ Have completed their high school diploma/GED ○ Have sustained petitions for serious offenses - particularly gun-involved offenses ○ Cannot safely be placed locally • Declining placements also led STRTP providers to close. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Catholic Charities Girls Shelter (SF's only girl-specific STRTP) closed in May 2021 	<p>and SF's juvenile justice transformation work.</p> <p><u>Human infrastructure gaps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared vision, training and practices for all adults working with youth in the SYTF • Collaboration and coordination in daily operations and programs • Equitable pay and resources
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited local STRTP options require us to look beyond SF for youth that could otherwise be placed locally.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ With only one SF program serving our youth (Catholic Charities Boys Home), we cannot locally accommodate boys who are in conflict with each other.○ The Catholic Charities Boys Home program model is best suited for boys who attend K-12 school locally (off site); it is not a fully contained STRTP• STRTPs that do continue to exist face high staff turnover due to low pay, difficult work and legislative changes. <p><u>No operating SF ranch/camp:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SF's Log Cabin Ranch temporarily closed in 2018 but did not reopen.• At this point, the facility requires significant investment, time and construction to become operational and meet all necessary requirements.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Most significantly, water is offline on the campus. PUC estimates that bringing (partial) water systems back	
--	--	--	--

online will cost between \$2-7M and take 3-5 years to complete.

Limited options for older youth/nonminor dependents (NMDs):

- Many STRTPs cannot accommodate older youth (see above).
- There are insufficient THP+FC options, particularly in and near SF.
 - Many NMDs express that they would prefer different types of settings - for example, apartments rather than homes
- Without a change in law, youth who were committed to SYTF or who turn 18 while their cases are in process will not qualify for AB12 as they step down - which means they will lack critical income and supports as they transition into adulthood.

Limited options for behavioral health treatment:

- Intensive psychiatric treatment
- Residential substance abuse treatment
- Secure restoration program

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we fill these gaps? • What ideas or models should be implemented? • Are there experts or models, including those outside of SF, that can help us? 	<p><u>Flexible funding; funding that “follows the youth/family”</u></p> <p><u>Barrier busting/access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes, this will be co-location of orgs, for ease • Sometimes, this will be single-org sites, for privacy and safety • Sometimes, youth/family will want services near home; near school; near work • Funding for transit/safe passage, for program costs, for any financial barrier to participation <p>Increased array of/knowledge of community-based services – and connection/coordination – for kids who live <u>out of county</u></p> <p><u>Meaningful choice</u></p> <p><u>“Do-able” goals/plans</u></p> <p><u>Connection & coordination</u> across these spaces and services, from the point of system entry</p> <p><u>“Human infrastructure” support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate pay and financial investment for all involved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Model for flexible funding: Youth Advocacy Programs (YAP) 	<p><u>Incorporate the <i>best</i> aspects of community life into placement, for those youth who cannot be with their parent/guardian:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships/connection • Opportunity • Continuity • Healing • Agency • Youth development <p><u>Build in meaningful <i>choice</i>:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Many youth do not want to be placed in placements away from their families and community. AWOL rates are high - particularly for girls and gender expansive youth. ○ On the flip side, some youth specifically do want to be placed outside of San Francisco or other communities, for a variety of reasons. ○ For some youth/young adults, distance adds value and IS a privilege (colleges/boarding schools were noted) • Diversity of placements • Gender specific • Age appropriate 	<p><u>Incorporate the <i>best</i> aspects of community life into placement, for those youth who must spend time in a secure setting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships/connection • Opportunity • Continuity • Healing • Agency • Youth development <p><u>What we need - physical infrastructure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options for individuals - what can choice look like in a SYTF? Or across SYTFs? • At a minimum, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Secure beds ○ Space for all components, including programming identified by the subcommittee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Living space ▪ Sleeping & solitude space - may not be homelike, but could emulate college dorm ▪ Social ▪ Educational <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-12, AA, BA • Virtual & in person • Classroom settings, carrells ▪ Vocational
---	--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training, mentoring, supervision and trauma mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Model training: ROCA Rewire • Collaboration 	<p><u>Develop more, varied placement options for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth ages 18+, including communal homes, apartments, and varying levels of on- and off-site support • Youth who have completed high school diploma/GED • Youth with serious sustained petitions • Youth who need intensive SA/MH treatment • Girls & gender expansive youth <p><u>Identify, approve and support more local, relative, and culturally responsive RFAs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create funding mechanism and flexible funding so that relatives have the same or more supports/resources/funding as “professional” RFAs do • Partner with community organizations, CASAs and mentors to support youth (and relatives) in placements • Racial equity commitment • Community strengthening investment <p><u>“Human infrastructure” support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFS as a model for relative support: AFS’s robust structure of training and support for its 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recreational ▪ Health & wellness ▪ Hygiene ▪ Outdoor/access to nature - space, distance ▪ Visiting space for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family - may look different for different youth/young adults <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bio family ○ Chosen family ○ Children • Off-site service providers • Counsel ▪ Group & 1:1 space for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration/credible messengers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dining ▪ Technology ▪ Court access ○ Design that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maximizes freedom of movement ▪ Is trauma informed and responsive ▪ Promotes agency ▪ Promotes relationships and connection at all levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between youth
--	--	---	--

		<p>resource families, described above, is a model that can be adapted to support relatives and other community members who are interested in housing JPD youth who have been ordered to placement - both increasing the odds that youth will be able to live with relatives/community members who are known to them, and also investing directly in San Francisco's communities most impacted by our juvenile justice system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better "whole family" support for families with youth in OOHP. • Better training and pay for STRTP staff to address high turnover rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between youth and staff/service providers • Between all adults who work with the youth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promotes positive youth development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression • Growth • Rest • Increasing autonomy • Choice (ex: sleeping arrangement, room décor, door on room) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with Titles 15 & 24; or waivers for specific regulations <p><u>What we need - human infrastructure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All have a role to play in healing and wellness - including youth and families, not just as impacted parties • Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sworn staff ○ Educators - academic, vocational, life skills ○ Health & wellness providers ○ Credible messengers/ "sober companions"
--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Running groups ▪ By a youth's side throughout the day ▪ Interactive meals ○ Positive youth development providers: arts, recreation etc ○ Youth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Peer support ▪ Leadership/governance ○ Peer parents ○ Advisors and supports/coaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "College navigator" ○ Circles of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identified by youth ▪ Involved throughout stay, during transition out, throughout Court supervision ▪ Take a lead role at 6-month review hearings? ○ Faith community ○ Food service ○ Facility maintenance ○ Volunteers ● Some folks should be "in the facility but not of it" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarity on their role - confidentiality? Involvement in discipline/rewards? <p><u>What can meaningful choice look like at this highest level?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Which SYTF:
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Presumption is the local one, but what if youth want to go to others?● Within a given SYTF:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Which programming○ Who is in their circle of support○ Which housing type○ Other? <p><u>Need for public education & engagement, wherever the new SYTF is built</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● While not a service directly for youth with a 707(b) sustained petition, launching new programming for this population should incorporate community education about the rationale for and approaches to our new continuum of responses. Messaging and engagement should include both:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Voices of individuals harmed by juvenile delinquency - safety concerns; desires for “punishment”<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How can we incorporate healing and education?○ Community voice<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Those in communities most impacted by violence and the reach of the system
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Those from communities that support the traditional system/historical approaches
--	--	--	--

ⁱ **WIC 707(b)** This subdivision is applicable to any case in which a minor is alleged to be a person described in Section 602 by reason of the violation of one of the following offenses:

- (1) Murder.
- (2) Arson, as provided in subdivision (a) or (b) of Section 451 of the Penal Code
- (3) Robbery.
- (4) Rape with force, violence, or threat of great bodily harm.
- (5) Sodomy by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm.
- (6) A lewd or lascivious act as provided in subdivision (b) of Section 288 of the Penal Code.
- (7) Oral copulation by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm.
- (8) An offense specified in subdivision (a) of Section 289 of the Penal Code.
- (9) Kidnapping for ransom.
- (10) Kidnapping for purposes of robbery.
- (11) Kidnapping with bodily harm.
- (12) Attempted murder.
- (13) Assault with a firearm or destructive device.
- (14) Assault by any means of force likely to produce great bodily injury.
- (15) Discharge of a firearm into an inhabited or occupied building.
- (16) An offense described in Section 1203.09 of the Penal Code.
- (17) An offense described in Section 12022.5 or 12022.53 of the Penal Code.
- (18) A felony offense in which the minor personally used a weapon described in any provision listed in Section 16590 of the Penal Code.
- (19) A felony offense described in Section 136.1 or 137 of the Penal Code.
- (20) Manufacturing, compounding, or selling one-half ounce or more of a salt or solution of a controlled substance specified in subdivision (e) of Section 11055 of the Health and Safety Code.

-
- (21) A violent felony, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 667.5 of the Penal Code, which also would constitute a felony violation of subdivision (b) of Section 186.22 of the Penal Code.
 - (22) Escape, by the use of force or violence, from a county juvenile hall, home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp in violation of subdivision (b) of Section 871 if great bodily injury is intentionally inflicted upon an employee of the juvenile facility during the commission of the escape.
 - (23) Torture as described in Sections 206 and 206.1 of the Penal Code.
 - (24) Aggravated mayhem, as described in Section 205 of the Penal Code.
 - (25) Carjacking, as described in Section 215 of the Penal Code, while armed with a dangerous or deadly weapon.
 - (26) Kidnapping for purposes of sexual assault, as punishable in subdivision (b) of Section 209 of the Penal Code.
 - (27) Kidnapping as punishable in Section 209.5 of the Penal Code.
 - (28) The offense described in subdivision (c) of Section 26100 of the Penal Code.
 - (29) The offense described in Section 18745 of the Penal Code.
 - (30) Voluntary manslaughter, as described in subdivision (a) of Section 192 of the Penal Code.

ii **1995.** (a) To be eligible for funding described in Section 1991, a county shall create a subcommittee of the multiagency juvenile justice coordinating council, as described in Section 749.22, to develop a plan describing the facilities, programs, placements, services, supervision and reentry strategies that are needed to provide appropriate rehabilitation and supervision services for the population described in subdivision (b) of Section 1990.

(b) The subcommittee shall be composed of the chief probation officer, as chair, and one representative each from the district attorney's office, the public defender's office, the department of social services, the department of mental health, the county office of education or a school district, and a representative from the court. The subcommittee shall also include no fewer than three community members who shall be defined as individuals who have experience providing community-based youth services, youth justice advocates with expertise and knowledge of the juvenile justice system, or have been directly involved in the juvenile justice system.

(c) The plan described in subdivision (a) shall include all of the following elements:

(1) A description of the realignment target population in the county that is to be supported or served by allocations from the block grant program, including the numbers of youth served, disaggregated by factors including their ages, offense and offense histories, gender, race or ethnicity, and other characteristics, and by the programs, placements, or facilities to which they are referred.

(2) A description of the facilities, programs, placements, services and service providers, supervision, and other responses that will be provided to the target population.

(3) A description of how grant funds will be applied to address each of the following areas of need or development for realigned youth:

(A) Mental health, sex offender treatment, or related behavioral or trauma-based needs.

(B) Support programs or services that promote the healthy adolescent development.

(C) Family engagement in programs.

(D) Reentry, including planning and linkages to support employment, housing, and continuing education.

(E) Evidence-based, promising, trauma-informed, and culturally responsive.

(F) Whether and how the plan will include services or programs for realigned youth that are provided by nongovernmental or community-based providers.

(4) A detailed facility plan indicating which facilities will be used to house or confine realigned youth at varying levels of offense severity and treatment need, and improvements to accommodate long-term commitments. This element of the plan shall also include information on how the facilities will ensure the safety and protection of youth having different ages, genders, special needs, and other relevant characteristics.

(5) A description of how the plan will incentivize or facilitate the retention of realigned youth within the jurisdiction and rehabilitative foundation of the juvenile justice system in lieu of transfers of realigned youth into the adult criminal justice system.

(6) A description of any regional agreements or arrangements to be supported by the block grant allocation pursuant to this chapter.

(7) A description of how data will be collected on the youth served and outcomes for youth served by the block grant program, including a description the outcome measures that will be utilized to measure or determine the results of programs and interventions supported by block grant funds.

(e) In order to receive 2022-2023 funding pursuant to Section 1991, a plan shall be filed with the Office of Youth and Community Restoration by January 1, 2022. In order to continue receiving funding, the subcommittee shall convene to consider the plan every third year, but at a minimum submit the most recent plan regardless of changes. The plan shall be submitted to the Office of Youth and Community Restoration by May 1 of each year.

(f) The Office of Youth and Community Restoration shall review the plan to ensure that the plan contains the all elements described in this section and may return the plan to the county for revision as necessary prior to final acceptance of the plan.

(g) The Office of Youth and Community Restoration shall prepare and make available to the public on its internet website a summary and a copy of the annual county plans submitted pursuant to this section.

Stakeholders Input on Settings

November 9, 2021

Across all settings, we need to value and embed choice, voice, basic needs, procedural justice, culturally and gender-specific resources and supports.

“As we try things out – including designing a SYTF – we need flexibility on the back end to make adjustments.”

Design Philosophy

Physical infrastructure “guiding principles:

- *The facility is physically designed to foster relationship and connection;*
- *The Facility is designed not to strip away individuality but to foster positive self-worth;*
- *Every vestige of the traditional prison model that can be eliminated is eliminated.”*

“Following state law, how far can you push a model building?”

- Need to transform from a prison-type setting - look to settings in other countries enable people to “leave whole”
 - “Buildings that are more creative & inspiring - like a sculpture”
- What a youth first sees should give a sense of rehabilitation
- “Space that acknowledges I’m doing great work and I have resources at my disposal”
- “Am I seen as a threat? Or is this an environment where I can grow?”
- “Build some healing and opportunity” into a locked institution
- Use existing space in a way that is restorative and rehabilitative
- Concept of “user wellness”
- Activated spaces - every component is about well being
- Loss acknowledgment
- Architecture supporting continuum of care
- Need spaces and services designed to meet root cause
 - Safety is “the most important piece... remember some kids are also coming from families/homes that are unsafe. I’m grown now...I would never have said that before.”
- Safety is not just physical
- Home like setting with multiple buildings or sites for varied experiences and activities; something like a small high school or college campus
- What regulations do we comply with vs. what do we try to waive?
- The old layout of juvenile hall [cottages] “sounds better than the new one that I was in”
 - Opportunities to teach youth to care for their cottage
- The layout and design of Log Cabin Ranch could be a good model: outdoor space and activities; vocational training spaces, etc.
- Secure doesn’t need to be isolative or carceral
- Incorporate trusted JH staff in the design and restorative plan
- Architecture philosophy of controlling groups of people - these methods proving harmful
 - “It doesn’t matter if you call yourself a counselor, we still know you are a guard. It doesn’t matter if you call it a room, we still know it’s a cell”

- “How easily institutional trappings seep in” - there are safety concerns, but using the same carceral language when the whole goal is to reimaging what a secure facility might be seems counterintuitive.
- As much as possible, remove (or make less visible) the “fittings and practices that remind kids of the places they’ve been held before or heard about”

Design Details

- Representation is really important
 - People seeing selves celebrated – artwork, photos, and other ways.
- Vibe/energy matters
 - In Missouri, the perimeter was a fence with barb wire – but inside, there were bean bags, a meditation room, and other softening features
 - Real plants
- Indigenous practices that free up energy/”heal the juju”
 - Sage, restorative circles – helps even as symbolism
- Murals can be a reminder of what’s possible - and a motivation
 - Examples: mural of Black youth graduating from college, young Black man coding, holding stethoscope - helps youth realize there is a larger world out there
- Divide up spaces to give structure to the activities
- Use colors - “gray sends me into dull mode”
- Ergonomic furniture
- Acoustics need to be addressed - they are often awful in secure settings so it seems noisy, and voices carry, which makes it difficult for youth to discuss sensitive or private matters.
- Natural light needs to be emphasized - internal, intense bright white lights can feel like a hospital.
- Ventilation is important - youth in some facilities talk about how badly it smells.
- Turn Intake into a “Welcoming Center” - signs on the wall should list what “We do do”, not what “You don’t do”
- Be careful about:
 - Militaristic affectations
 - Too much metal, not enough fabric
- One facility “flips the locks” so community can use the education spaces in the evenings

Program Orientation

“The central problem with incarceration is that it disconnects the kids who are in greatest need of connection. I think that SF is in a great place to do something genuinely new on that front: to turn these secure facilities in[to] centers of connection”

- “Not just the lesser evil but actually a community hub that floods kids and families with connections and resources” from the minute a young person walks in the door in crisis, and continues after they leave.
 - Support kids in their existing relationships
 - Family therapy
 - Bring in pastor/community figure in the kid’s life

- “intake’ with the entire family, connect them with nonprofit service providers as well as city resources so the kid doesn’t return to the same set of problems that brought them there in the first place
- At CYA, youth were put in isolation when that was the opposite of what they needed – make sure there is a space/spaces for communal connection
 - We need to lean in instead of pushing youth away in difficult moments - and need spaces that support this
 - For some youth, indoors may be best; for others, outdoors is what they need (one example was playing 1:1 basketball with a counselor - it “meant so much”).
 - We need to incorporate choice into our space design
- In the old hall, counselors had to come physically unlock a youth’s door – this facilitated contact & connection. In the new hall, they can open the door with a push of the button, and this opportunity for connection is lost.
- Easier to encourage good behavior than to discourage bad ones. “Catching your child doing something right”
 - Where are we putting energy/paying attention?
 - The importance of positive acknowledgement by adults you know and respect
- With very small number of youth in SYTF/secure setting, opportunities for personalization
- Walls are meant not just to keep us in, they also keep the people who see our humanity out.
 - Could our youth join with larger groups – like big high school graduations?
 - Could we invite folks in for big events and promote healing for others as well?
 - Good use of space – and also contributes to energy
 - But there will be concerns about contraband
- Some detained youth reported that point systems are problematic because they are punitive & demoralizing - “earning things you should just have”
 - However, one youth who spent time in multiple halls preferred point system in Santa Clara hall because “it was clear what you had to do to earn things - [in SF] it’s more confusing”
- Could long-term kids be on their own unit? Have more privileges than short-term kids?

Sleep Space/Bedrooms

“Solitude without solitary confinement”

- How much agency can folks have over their space?
 - Make room for folks who are going to be there a while to make the space their own
- Don’t have window through which you can’t see anything – feels like intentional torture
- Once the door [to the bedroom/cell] closes, “it’s like solitary confinement”
- Fill their room with décor - or have youth create their own works - that make them consider what they have to do to succeed in the program, ground them in their purposes and goals
- Incorporate a blackboard wall or dry erase wall for drawing and writing
- Bring in own belongings
- Pencils and more books in rooms
- New mirrors in sleeping rooms: important for the youth to have one in their space, but a mirror etched with gang signs “means gangs never die”
- Bigger windows and windows you can see through
- No lights on for 24 hours (disrupts sleep) or cold air on all day AND night (not enough layers of clothes to stay warm)

- Better beds; mattress (opposed to thin pad/mat on concrete) and adequate bedding (blankets/pillows/sheets), etc.
- Ask youth for their perspective on choice - some prefer a single room “like a small college dorm room;” others want roommates or dorm style living.
 - Youth in CJHWG listening sessions suggested that if ample recreation/program time is available for youth to engage, individual rooms for youth are preferred, because there may be interpersonal issues and it allows for a safe space to reflect on actions and transition. However, if programming access and open recreation time is not consistent, youth prefer to have the option to select their sleeping arrangements, between an individual room or shared room with one other youth, of similar age range; depending on their safety risks.
 - Dorms - “everyone is on the same page” - but no privacy for normal private behaviors e.g. masturbation
 - Some youth want separate spaces: “Living family style, but we’re not a family”
- How can rooms be able to lock for safety (some youth want this) but not feel confined/in seclusion

Living Space

- Communal spaces that feel more like living rooms (furniture not bolted)
- Would prefer couches, like the Merit Center, “to chill”
- Real, comfortable furniture, no molded plastic chairs, less metal/more fabric
- Smaller spaces for 1:1 that “don’t resemble therapist offices (no bad art)”
- Avoid physical structure where staff podium is like “the throne”
- Loss of access to living (or other) space should not be used as punishment – it’s a need
- Have some space that’s truly for enjoyment; youth could earn time there as an incentive

Positive Youth Development/Program Space

- Build in capacity-building programming/spaces - how do we use space to make this happen?
 - How to feed self
 - How to care for self
 - How to establish relationships
- Merit Center: “I like the murals on the outside space - youth see those designs as representing them”
 - Like the colors, furniture, real plants
- Space for horseshoes & circles - message: “this is your space”
- Smaller spaces for 1:1 that “don’t resemble therapist offices (no bad art)”
- Spaces for sensitive conversations (vs. youth being asked to divulge info in line)
- Gym/fitness
- Library: do we have current law books?
- Access to art supplies & recording studio
- No limit to a variation of experiences and exposure to explore interests and career pathways; via choice in art, sports, technology, construction, coding, internships, etc.
- Need spaces for coaching and mentorship

School/Learning Space

- Integration of the latest technology and multimedia programs should be implemented and enhanced to improve approaches to distance learning education, training, literacy, programming, recreation/entertainment, and communication.
- “The [current] classrooms look good... just need to have good classes”
- Young adult with lived experience liked the idea of study carrels for the college students - not just to give them space, but to give them structure, responsibility and routine (turning on laptop, opening up books etc).
- Virtual reality capacity could make a difference; CTE classes online are not very immersive
- Need: VR, laptops, charging station; furniture that’s nice and a more adult experience
- Refurbish education center; reconfigure one of the classrooms for the college students; replace desks/tables with study carrels (they bought ones for Ida B. Wells Continuation School with mesh sides - would work well for the hall because the both offer privacy and supervision capacity)
- Keep the larger tables (bought for COVID) instead of traditional desks for the younger students; they offer better spaces for them to work.
- Movement is important. Noted a site where the teachers moved through classrooms but the kids stayed put - not a good plan for them

Vocational Space

- Tech/coding opportunities seem like a great fit for custodial setting - youth can do actual jobs from within the walls (or from home) - there is so much fear re: people with a history. Help them develop skills they can do from anywhere without being judged
- Opportunities to earn money while in SYTF
 - For restitution, saving and spending
 - Canteen as a short-term strategy/access to more things?
- Could we have a barbershop that the kids run?
- Could we have spaces outfitted for: exposure to union trades for young adults? Course certification for things like OSHA/machinery, i.e. forklift and crane? For silk roll training?
 - Can’t do restorative work alone; need mentorship and coaching, “sit with me”
 - Maybe decorate with pictures of and saying by coaches?
- Celebration spaces to highlight youth achievements and cultural events
- Can we have space on-site for institutions to come support our youth? Both for youth in SYTF and those on probation.
 - Banking
 - Social Security
 - City Hall liaison for services provided there

Decompressing/Meditative Space

- Space/time “to decompress” after court:
 - For both youth and parents
 - Time/space to say goodbye
 - “Don’t want to return to unit or school from court crying”
 - Can’t rely on other kids for support (sometimes kids do, but sometimes kids are mean, and no one wants to look weak); should have a third party who can be there for them

Dining Experience

“Family dinner’ can be magic, and especially with a mentor figure at each table, real conversation might happen in this setting.”

- Better food; larger portions or extra food, healthier, special dietary accommodations, etc.
- Importance of how meals are served
- “Decent food, not served on plastic trays - small tables (maybe four kids and a staff member or mentor/ally) with either plated meals or, even better, family style bowls passed around and shared.”
- Kids being fed but still hungry
- Youth to interview food services folks and advise on menus

Clothing

- Better clothing; new under clothes (new socks/boxers), proper size clothes that fit
- Jogger fit/track suit, “nothing wrong with pajamas”, different outfits for different activities, suggests each unit wears different colors
- Street clothes, not uniforms (which “impose an image of generic authority when it comes to the staff as well as erasing individuality when it comes to the kids.”)
- Clothing - likes the idea of more options/clothes tied to activities

Showers, Toilets & Hygiene

- Private or individual restroom (no windows to see youth using bathroom) and multiple showers, and preferably non metal toilets/sinks
- Privacy when doing bodily business or no windows in door of restrooms
- Would prefer the toilet not be in the sleeping room
- Girls need privacy when using the bathroom or showering while at JJC. “I feel like they should warn you. Especially when there’s male staff”
- Better hygiene products, soap, etc.

Outdoor Access & Space

- “Kids talk all the time about the importance of sunlight; what it means to see the sky.”
 - Backyard/courtyard/garden
 - Skylights
- Recreation time should include outdoor activities such as gardening, basketball, flag football, kickball, physical fitness, health & wellness, etc.
- Nature in the outdoor space within secure environment
- Have a formal garden shed/green house, hold visits outside
- Outdoor kitchen? Could get umbrella tables for outdoor visits
- Separately, can we develop ways that SYTF youth can participate in sports off-site?

Family/Support Contact

- Expanded phone call access to a small list of people in support circle (not just parent).

- Better treatment to parents/caregivers, no judgment when visiting/advocating, no mistreatment at facility in court and culturally responsive
- Transportation and expenses for visiting adults
- Entrance that is welcoming for families and other visitors
- Visitation used to be on the units. Parents would get very upset seeing the environment that their kids were living in - it would take a mental toll for some; for others it was too hard to even visit.
- Phones on the current units are “like prison” because of the cords and being stuck to the pole - can there be cordless phones?]
- Need variety of spaces for visits with children: softened spaces, outdoors, library
 - So a parent is not just associating one space with their child
 - Especially if that space is identified/associated with something else
 - Library: bring in staff, kids’ books from local library
 - Ability to see, touch is critical (and part of the SFCIPP bill of rights)

Facility Location & Type

- “Start the programming in the [current] SYFT and fill the void caused by closure of LCR and out-of-state placements.”
 - Short-term additions more individual; mid-range additions to include robust, longer-term curricula/programs
 - AND need a less restrictive alternative for the most serious cases
 - Geographically secure or actually secure, for kids who are both a high flight risk and high public safety risk
- We need the capacity to serve especially small groups of young people that need specific programming, such as girls - through agreements with other counties? Regional approach?
- If committed to keeping kids close, how do we design a space to benefit all populations there at the same time?
 - What are the opportunities for mixing?
 - How to convey short-term and long-term messages?
- “The plan that makes the most sense is to modify the hall” with services for long-term stays, better programming, spaces look more like college dorms - “less industrial, more comfortable”
- “We want to keep our kids in SF and we don’t at this time have an alternative that conflicts with Titles 15 & 24”
- Can we bring in modular buildings on the open space at the current site?
- “Onsite is the best possible outcome”
- Build a new, small home on the YGC property - maybe engage Designing Justice/Designing Spaces - and transform the old building inside and out to become a “monument to change”
 - “Bring in formerly-incarcerated artists to cover the building in murals, inside and out, so anyone driving by would see visual evidence of a transformation in attitudes”
 - Keep school portion; add law library? Theater? Tutoring center staffed by volunteers? Vocational classes beyond barbering & culinary arts?
 - Much of the space would go to CBOs - “if you’re going to take a kid out of the community, bring the community to the kids”
 - Satellite offices to promote access for kids either in and/or exiting the secure setting (and coming from court/probation)
 - Ideally, kids could walk back and forth from the secure setting?
 - “connect instantly” once released

- Place for family supports during young person's incarceration
 - Peer support groups
 - Other resources
 - Childcare
- Why can't the youth move from place to place?
 - Sleep in a homelike setting in SF, and come to the facility for everything else
 - How can this space be used for more than the small number of kids in secure detention/commitment
 - Education, recreation, therapeutically
 - Maybe young adults who haven't done well in community setting?
 - Like "outpatient day treatment"
- One possibility for extremely serious crime or mental illness issues:
 - Start in "Alpha" home (on campus)
 - Then transition to "Beta" home, etc. (in community)
 - For cases where the judge wants the time (till 25)
 - "Timed stages"
- Facility with very few youth will be lonely, expensive
 - Could be available to any commits, not just secure commits.
- "Critical mass is a real concept" - need enough youth in one place to make programming meaningful. It's tricky to have programming for so few youth
- Need to have many options [at each stage of the continuum] - case-by-case - "put it on the menu"
 - Need more than one secure setting - but this exacerbates the challenge of critical mass
- Maybe come up with a plan for when out-of-county SYTF will be approved in individual cases
 - Everyone signs on?
 - Give youth choices re: SYTFs? Agency & empowerment for the youth
- Design like a college campus - buildings for different purposes - "so don't lose executive function"
- "Don't want to walk away with people thinking we're making it OK to stay in the current hall - align with CJHWG".
 - Have a Plan A - e.g. for now we are using campus spaces this way....
 - Plan B for if campus closes.....
 - "Transferrable" plan for when it goes away
 - "Staged plan, with timeline"
- Need to have a "deep conversation" - "what's wrong with making this a campus for our youth?"
 - Location - "I think it's good", "mind changing", "leave your village where you've had trauma."
 - Find bridges between campus and community - ways to give back to the community. "My mother has these needs...I'm going to help", with the intention to return there, but get trained for a job in the meantime.
 - Acknowledge timing/gentrification/outmigration in youth's community
 - Invest in CBOs that are there
- "Makes sense" to move out of (step down from) secure housing but still do program on-site
- On current site, use existing pods for services and CBO presence - and space for SFUSD too"
- Replace current hall building with Alpine Village type architecture that fits better in community "like Log Cabin Ranch but up here"
- If secure setting is outside SF, lose easy access to: family, SF-based service providers, community correction, court

- Negative consequences of sending a youth to a SYTF or OOHP in a more conservative jurisdiction - if they commit a delinquent act in that facility (e.g. assault facility staff), they are at the mercy of that court, prosecutor, local/community norms

Human Infrastructure

- “Everything I’ve seen and heard from young people tells me that the way the staff view and interact with them is more important than the structure or condition of the building.”
- Regardless of which setting/program type, the secret = the people
- Who youth and parents believe should work with youth in a non-institutional rehabilitative location:
 - Staff that has similar experiences as the youth and were able to transform their lives as living examples of success
 - Staff that could maintain a safe space and not take advantage of the power dynamics that naturally will exist among staff and youth
 - Staff that have a deep understanding of their role and purpose when interacting with youth
 - Staff that were free of paternalistic values and punitive practices
 - Staff that have a background in adolescent and youth development
 - Staff that have non-violence communication skills
- Staff need to understand the purpose of detention - if there is a need for youth to be in a secure setting this means that a youth’s life has reached a level of diverse needs.
- Interactions with staff should not reinforce negative and harmful stereotypes
- Girls expressed extreme discomfort interacting with male counselors in the hall
- “They need classes just how they give us classes while we are in there. I see them angry all the time.”
- Need counselors who care and want to do this work
- New, well-designed facilities - much lower turnover (increased staff stability)
- Need “people on site whose sole role is to connect with and support the kids”
 - Youth must understand that those service providers/mentors/allies are functioning independently of probation and have no formal power over them or their cases
 - “The community partners would not have correctional responsibilities, and they don’t get a say in when kids leave or whether they get some kind of disciplinary sanction or privilege....ideally...their relationship with the young people would be confidential - no joint staff meetings where the kid becomes a ‘case’”
 - Might deescalate or forestall situations
 - Credible messengers - equivalent of a “sober companion’ by their side”
 - “If someone has the keys to a building you can’t leave - and/or authority over things like whether you can see your family - there are going to be limits to any relationship you might build, however kind and well-intentioned that staffer might be.”
 - “No matter how good the therapist might be, if they were employed by either [the foster care or juvenile justice] system, the kids didn’t trust them - didn’t trust their sessions would be confidential and couldn’t see the therapist as ‘on their side.’”
 - Mentor/allies who are “at the site but not of it” and a “mechanism for relationships established at the facility to continue post-release.”
- Kids, even those who have a history of violence, should serve as peer support
- Family is an important part of the human infrastructure - but “family” might not look the same for everyone. Need to work with youth to identify their circles of support and have spaces for them to play a meaningful role on-site and during transition.

- Look to CBOs for reentry & credible messengers - invest in developing their capacity - also helps build racial equity
- Parent visiting: in the jail, CBO runs the program; admin staff/deputies in the jail are simply the “ushers”
- Many jails have Civilian Program Managers who are responsible for the programming of the facility

Transitioning Out/Stepping Down:

- If develop a good replacement for Log Cabin Ranch and out-of-state placement (a SYTF alternative), few kids will end up in secure track
 - Could start living in secure setting, and then move down to halfway house
- Can we use SF Victorians for community-based placement?
 - 3-4 stories
 - Dorm on top, kitchen middle, vocational/tech on the bottom
- How do you build connection with the person you’re going to call when you get out?
 - Like a CASA in the hall, but paid
 - Work with funded CBOs when they transition out
- Log Cabin Ranch is more compelling as a step down than a SYTF - as one of our options (if possible.)
 - If it is going to become a Conservation Corps site, could realignment funds be used to enhance Conservation Corps staff capacity to work with our youth?
- Step down planning for long (2-7 yr) commitments:
 - One way is to build in “RJ circles” that start in the SYTF, stay with the youth as they step down and through dismissal
 - Positive adult relationships
 - Circle could take the lead at the 6 month review hearings
 - Might open the door to victim engagement & forgiveness
- We need independent living opportunities for youth as they leave secure custody/placement, and guidance and support for youth seeking apartments, housing, or more structured transitional housing opportunities - inside and outside SF

Out of Home Placement

- Youth want to be part of the decision-making process for OOHP.
- Youth complained about not having enough food or other basic needs in group homes; staff were quick to call police to resolve issues; they did not feel safe in group homes (from youth or staff); they were not places to succeed
 - Youth who wanted to stay with her foster placement: “It should have been my option if I wanted to move back or not. I felt like I was forced to move back, and I really didn’t want to.”
 - Youth desired a more collaborative process around their placement - would have facilitated a more successful placement and less likelihood of feeling the need to run away.
 - “Don’t let me live in San Francisco because that’s where everything happens, good, bad.”
- Out-of-state OOHPs - not all were terrible; they play a role
- 6 months in OOHP is not long enough for youth needing intensive programming - secure track commitments may facilitate longer step-down placements (rather than staying in secure setting)
- Have seen older youth respond better to private school type setting than a family-type setting in the community
 - Those settings already haven’t worked for them

- As attorney, had clients that just weren't interested in another family
- Private school/campus-type settings have levels, steps etc that fo family homes don't offer
- "run-of-the-mill group homes gone; that's OK"
- Turn Edgewood buildings over to HSA to run?
- "Having more freedom and a better environment would prevent kids from wanting to run off"
- Include out of county options only in specific situations:
 - When they are needed to help youth be away from local threats
 - When it is requested or agreed to by the youth and family.
- Why do we have a 2-tiered foster care system?
 - "Professional foster parents" who get intensive training, support and resources
 - Relatives who receive much less of this
- Youth placed in SF may have safety concerns:
 - If their location is known to others
 - Being transported through neighborhoods to school and other sites
- Group home point system: "you're gonna have bad days...." Once you have one and you've lost points, you know you'll lose weekend visits, so it goes downhill

Probation in the Community

- Youth want part of probation to be focused on enacting self-determined goals, to reduce excessive monitoring, and to focus on economic stability
- What they want:
 - Focus on strengths and positive reinforcement
 - Adults who visibly demonstrate that they care for them and are interested in their wellbeing
 - Programs and services that address the root cause of their delinquency involvement related to poverty and trauma
 - To receive support and services from CBOs located in their communities, where they felt safe and trusted the adults they worked with
- Electronic monitoring difficult because they struggle to keep it charged
- Programs that come to the youth's house can be helpful

Other Places/Models of Note:

- Missouri: buildings nothing special; staff interacted with youth "in a caring, respectful non-power oriented way that was very different from what I'd seen elsewhere"
 - "virtually impossible to create a new culture - no matter how well-designed the facility - unless there's also a new mindset among the people who work there."
 - "Culture trumps everything" - Dan Edwards, Missouri
- New York: Commissioner of Dept. of Correction brought in Ikea catalog to Riker's Island, involved incarcerated people in picking out new furnishings
- In Yolo County Juvenile Hall, common areas are split by room dividers into areas for study/work, leisure/recreation and work on computers/have quiet time - the spaces gave structure to the activities
- Camp Kilpatrick, Los Angeles:
 - 6 beds each side, dorm style
 - Comfortable common space like living room
 - ½ door to bathroom

- Adjoining area private meetings
- But - it's a small space - when kids had to move to an old campus due to the Malibu fire, they actually preferred the larger old dorm space
- Visiting area redone to be less institutional
- Camp Kirby, Los Angeles:
 - Secure, mental health-oriented
 - Small "units" (e.g. cottages)
 - Services on site
 - Staffed by combo teams of counselors and mental health providers
 - Large, "beautiful" campus
 - Prom and other events
- El Dorado County: designing new hall to enhance homelike features and downplay security features
- Solano SP was noted as a proving ground for a lot of innovation, including CBO-run building

Contributing Stakeholders & Materials Reviewed

- Academy of Architecture for Justice webinar: “Applying Trauma-Informed Design Concepts in Correctional Facilities”
- Nell Bernstein, author, *Burning Down the House: The End of Juvenile Prison*
- Mollie Brown, Juvenile Justice Providers’ Association
- Rodney Bryant, Anti-Recidivism Coalition
- Alysse Castro, SFUSD/COE, DJJ Realignment Subcommittee
- Angel Ceja Jr., Juvenile Advisory Council, DJJ Realignment Subcommittee
- Hon. Roger Chan, SF Superior Court
- Close Juvenile Hall Work Group Youth Listening Sessions, as documented by Krea Gomez and Valentina Sedano
- Juvenile Probation Department members (5 internal input sessions)
- Dr. Monique Khumalo, listening session, “Trauma Responsive Practice in a Juvenile Justice Residential Setting”
- Lana Kreidie, Bar Association of San Francisco, DJJ Realignment Subcommittee
- Efrain Padilla, Anti-Recidivism Coalition
- Will Roy, Safe & Sound, DJJ Realignment Subcommittee
- Carlos Simpson, Anti-Recidivism Coalition
- Lisa Southwell, Board of State & Community Corrections
- Hon. Monica Wiley, SF Superior Court, DJJ Realignment Subcommittee
- Young Women’s Freedom Center, report, “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”