City and County of San Francisco
YOUTH COMMISSION

MINUTES

Monday, April 3, 2023
5:00 p.m.

IN-PERSON MEETING with REMOTE ACCESS

Members: Emily Nguyen (Chair, D11), Ewan Barker Plummer (Vice Chair, Mayoral), Steven Hum (Legislative Affairs Officer, Mayoral), Raven Shaw (Legislative Affairs Officer, Mayoral), Gabrielle Listana (Communications & Outreach Officer, D6), Astrid Utting (Communications & Outreach Officer, D8), Chloe Wong (D1), Allister Adair (D2), Reese Terrell (D3), Maureen Loftus (D4), Hayden Miller (D5), Ann Anish (D7), Yoselin Colin (D9), Vanessa Pimentel (D10), Yena Im (Mayoral), Tyrone S. Hillman III (Mayoral).

Present: Emily Nguyen, Ewan Barker Plummer, Raven Shaw, Gabrielle Listana, Astrid Utting, Chloe Wong, Allister Adair, Reese Terrell, Maureen Loftus, Hayden Miller, Ann Anish, Yoselin Colin, Vanessa Pimentel, Yena Im, Tyrone S. Hillman III.

Absent: Steven Hum (excused).

Tardy:

The San Francisco Youth Commission met in-person with remote access, and provided public comment through teleconferencing, on April 3, 2023, with Chair Nguyen presiding.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call for Attendance

   Chair Nguyen called the meeting to order at 5:03pm.

   On the call of the roll:

   Roll Call Attendance: __ present, __ absent.

   Chloe Wong  present
   Allister Adair  present
   Reese Terrell
Maureen Loftus present
Hayden Miller present
Gabrielle Listana present
Ann Anish present
Astrid Utting present
Yoselin Colin present
Vanessa Pimentel present
Ewan Barker Plummer present
Steven Hum absent
Raven Shaw present
Yena Im present
Tyrone S. Hillman III present
Emily Nguyen present

A quorum of the Commission was present.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer, seconded by Officer Utting, motioned to excuse Officer Hum. The motion was carried by the following voice vote:

Voice Vote: 15 ayes, 1 absent.

Chloe Wong aye
Allister Adair aye
Reese Terrell aye
Maureen Loftus aye
Hayden Miller aye
Gabrielle Listana aye
Ann Anish aye
Astrid Utting aye
Yoselin Colin aye
Vanessa Pimentel aye
Ewan Barker Plummer aye
Steven Hum absent
Raven Shaw aye
Yena Im aye
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye
Emily Nguyen aye

Action: Officer Hum’s absence excused.

2. Communications
Alondra Esquivel Garcia, Director of the SFYC, shared communications and meeting announcements with Commissioners.

3. **Approval of Agenda** (Action Item)

No discussion, and no public comment.

Commissioner Colin, seconded by Commissioner Loftus, motioned to approve the April 3, 2023 full Youth Commission meeting agenda, with the amendment to table agenda Item 11C. The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Voice Vote: 15 ayes, 1 absent.

Chloe Wong aye
Allister Adair aye
Reese Terrell aye
Maureen Loftus aye
Hayden Miller aye
Gabrielle Listana aye
Ann Anish aye
Astrid Utting aye
Yoselin Colin aye
Vanessa Pimentel aye
Ewan Barker Plummer aye
Steven Hum absent
Raven Shaw aye
Yena Im aye
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye
Emily Nguyen aye

Action: Agenda Approved.

4. **Approval of Minutes** (Action Item)
   a. March 20, 2023 (Packet Materials)

No discussion. No public comment.

Officer Utting, seconded by Commissioner Colin, motioned to approve the March 20, 2023 full Youth Commission meeting minutes. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:
Voice Vote: 15 ayes, 1 absent.

Chloe Wong  aye
Allister Adair  aye
Reese Terrell  aye
Maureen Loftus  aye
Hayden Miller  aye
Gabrielle Listana  aye
Ann Anish  aye
Astrid Utting  aye
Yoselin Colin  aye
Vanessa Pimentel  aye
Ewan Barker Plummer  aye
Steven Hum  absent
Raven Shaw  aye
Yena Im  aye
Tyrone S. Hillman III  aye
Emily Nguyen  aye

Action: Minutes Approved.

5. Public Comment on matters not on Today's Agenda (2 minutes per comment)

No public comment.

6. LYRIC Certificate of Honor
   a. Presenter: Vice Chair Barker Plummer and Commissioner Utting

      The presenters made positive remarks for LYRIC. LYRIC was incredibly thankful for the support and allyship with the Youth Commission, especially because of the ongoing attacks that they’ve received in their support queer and trans youth.

      No public comment.

7. Presentations (discussion and possible action)
   a. Department of Environment
      i. Presenter: Joseph Piasecki, Policy and Public Affairs Coordinator

      Piasecki gave their presentation to the Commission. Vice Chair Barker Plummer asked how the housing target has been adjusted due to the recently passed
housing element, with Piasecki saying that they are still analyzing that process, in addition to addressing the recent BOS policy to restrict new housing to only use electric appliances. Vice Chair Barker Plummer asked if they’re prepared to still move forward with their goals considering the dire budget situation the City is in, to which Piasecki said that they will still move forward, but that not getting the funding will jeopardize parts of the Climate Action Plan, but they’ll still remain optimistic. Commissioner Miller thanked the department for their work, and said that it’s one of the most important departments, especially for young people. Commissioner Miller asked how the department is pushing people to use more sustainable methods of transportation, in which Piasecki said that they’re trying to ensure residents have easy access to public transportation and walkable neighborhoods to prohibit the use of cars and polluting transit methods. Commissioner Miller asked if the department has considered e-bike subsidies as a way to get people out of their cars, in which Piasecki said they are doing so, in addition to exploring an upcoming e-bike food delivery program in Downtown SF. Commissioner Miller asked if there’s a rationale behind the ride to home program that the department provides for only those 18 and older, to which Piasecki said that he isn’t sure why that is at the moment but would love to work with him to address it. Chair Nguyen asked what their exact roles are in implementing the Climate Action Plan, to which Piasecki said that they collaborate with other city departments to create unified goals to reduce the infighting on funding, and can help provide greater information as they proceed. Chair Nguyen asked if those collaborative efforts will result in a positive outcome since there’s some goals that haven’t been met yet, to which Piasecki said that they are very optimistic that it will succeed and that there’s not many other cities with ambitious plans like the City has currently.

b. **Office of Financial Empowerment K2C** (discussion and possible action)

   i. Presenter: Mohan Kanungo, Program Manager

Kanungo presented to the Commission. Commissioner Utting asked what K2C’s outreach plan is towards students, in which Kanungo said that they send newly enrolled Kindergarteners and their families a packet via mail and text to help them enroll into the program; they also have school ambassadors to help refer students and families to the program, even more so than the initial outreach. Commissioner Utting asked if they target high school students at any point, to which Kanungo said that they’re just now seeing their first set of students from the Kindergarten level who are graduating high school as well as them exploring alternatives for high school students to join into the program as well. Commissioner Colin asked what the rate is of students who forget to take out their funds or what happens with the funds if they don’t use it, to which Kanungo said that they are
about to initiate their first payment disbursements and said that if they do not take out any of the funds that the funding then recycles back into the program, or they can transition that funding to another special account for them to hold onto. Vice Chair Barker Plummer asked what challenges there have been and how the YC can support the program and its outreach, to which Kanungo said that they’ve rebranded last year and would love for the YC to push out on social media and into their networks to let other youth know about the program. Commissioner Loftus asked where their budget comes from originally, to which Kanungo said the main staff salary comes from the City’s General Fund and they have other funding sources to incentivize families to join. Commissioner Adair asked what they think the Youth Commission can do to support this program, to which Kanungo said that outreach and external support can help create a strong message to all youth that they should start an account. Commissioner Miller asked if youth who graduate can still get the funding if they don’t go to college, to which Kanungo said that they can always get the money back that they put in or earned incentives for, but the remaining incentives are supplemented are reserved specifically for youth who are planning on going to any institution of secondary education. Officer Utting asked if the school ambassadors can be youth themselves, to which Kanungo said that they’re exploring that as an option in the near future.

c. **Larkin Street Youth Services** (discussion and possible action)
   i. Presenter: Kelsey Pimentel, Program Manager of Youth Leadership

Pimentel and Reagan presented to the Commission. Commissioner Loftus asked for language clarification. Commissioner Wong asked what barriers exist for immigrant youth, to which LSYS said there are low barriers to achieving the resources available. Officer Listana asked what programs and services they provide for queer youth specifically, to which they created specialized housing programs and always collaborate with other organizations with the same mission and goal as they have.

d. **Climate Presentation** (discussion and possible action)
   i. Presenter: Hector Mondragon, District 9 Intern

Mondragon presented to the Commission. Commissioner Miller asked what the specific ask was, to which Mondragon said that he hopes that the YC can help spread important information to youth widely across the City so that they can have more motivation and incentives to get involved in these opportunities. Commissioner Adair asked for an elaboration on what jobs and opportunities are available, to which Mondragon listed the many roles that are within the orgs that
he pointed out in his presentation. Mondragon also went into the resolution that he's working on to condemn President Biden's action and going back on his word by approving the Willow Project.

Chair Nguyen calls for a 10-minute recess at 6:37pm. Chair Nguyen called the meeting back to order at 6:48pm.

8. Letters of Support (discussion and possible action)
   a. Human Rights Commission Budget Ask
      i. Presenter: Commissioner Colin and Commissioner Shaw

Commissioner Colin believes they should support the $15 million ask by the HRC because they have many programs and resources that they offer.

Commissioner Colin, seconded by Officer Shaw, motioned to approve the letter of support for the HRC budget ask, with grammatical amendments. No public comment. The motion carried by the following voice vote:

Voice Vote: 15 ayes, 1 absent.

Chloe Wong aye
Allister Adair aye
Reese Terrell aye
Maureen Loftus aye
Hayden Miller aye
Gabrielle Listana aye
Ann Anish aye
Astrid Utting aye
Yoselin Colin aye
Vanessa Pimentel aye
Ewan Barker Plummer aye
Steven Hum absent
Raven Shaw aye
Yena Im aye
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye
Emily Nguyen aye

Action: letter approved.

b. Latino Task Force Budget Ask
   i. Presenter: Commissioner Colin and Commissioner Shaw
Commissioner Colin believes they should support the $6 million ask that goes to the many resources, services, and programs that LTF has been doing and continue advocating for their ongoing efforts. Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on the budgetary ask. Director Garcia clarified that they have lost funding on COVID-based grants due to the state and federal government shifting to a post-pandemic focus. Vice Chair Barker Plummer asked if this would be a reduction based on their current funding, to which Director Garcia said yes.

c.  **SB 472** (Subject: Pupil health; opioid overdose reversal medication)
   i.  Presenter: Commissioner Colin

   Commissioner Colin mentioned the details of the legislation. Commissioner Miller asked if the state would be providing the funding to purchase the medication, to which Vice Chair Barker Plummer said the state would reimburse the school districts across California.

d.  **AB 912** (Subject: Strategic Anti-Violence Funding Efforts Act)
   i.  Presenter: Commissioner Colin, Commissioner Barker Plummer, and Commissioner Pimentel

   Commissioner Colin explained the legislation. Vice Chair Barker Plummer said this legislation is critical to addressing gun violence and is a good investment. Commissioner Colin also mentioned that this funding would be broken down into several budgets.

Commissioner Colin, seconded by Chair Nguyen, motioned to approve all of the letters of support for the Latino Task Force budget ask, SB 472, and AB 912. No public comment. The motion carried by the following voice vote:

   Voice Vote: 15 ayes, 1 absent.

   Chloe Wong  aye
   Allister Adair  aye
   Reese Terrell  aye
   Maureen Loftus  aye
   Hayden Miller  aye
   Gabrielle Listana  aye
   Ann Anish  aye
   Astrid Utting  aye
   Yoselin Colin  aye
9. Trainings
   a. Public Comment
      i. Presenter: Joy Zhan, Youth Development Specialist

Specialist Zhan went into a training to assist Commissioners with the ability to do public comment. Commissioners Anish, Im, Pimentel, Terrell, and Wong gave practice public comment. No public comment.

10. Resolutions and Motions (discussion and possible action)
   a. [Gun Violence Restraining Orders - Public Awareness] - Resolution urging the City and County of San Francisco to improve and expand public awareness of Gun Violence Restraining Orders, particularly to middle school students, high school students, higher education students, educators, school administrators, and other school staff (First Reading and Possible Action item).
      i. Presenter: Commissioner Barker Plummer, Commissioner Colin, and Commissioner Shaw

Vice Chair Barker Plummer introduced the resolution and explained the story of why it's being introduced, based on the recent shooting and hate crime in the Richmond District in a Jewish synagogue. The authors of the resolution read the language aloud. Chair Nguyen asked if San Francisco would be able to look for grant funding to support the initiatives listed in the resolution at the local level. Officer Utting agreed with Chair Nguyen but asked if there were other city models to look at, to which Vice Chair Barker Plummer said San Diego would likely be the best model since they were the first to do so and are also in California. Officer Utting said it might be a good idea to list some of the other cities in the resolution to amplify its impact. Chair Nguyen asked if there was a greater pool of data to pull from to strengthen the information in the resolution on its success.
b. [Motion Declaring Solidarity and Support for LGBTQ+ Student Walkout] -
Motion declaring solidarity and support for San Francisco students walking out against anti-LGBTQ+ legislation nationwide.
   i. Presenter: Commissioner Barker Plummer

Vice Chair Barker Plummer discussed the student walkout that took place on Friday, March 31st, and the Youth Liberation March on Saturday, March 25th. The authors read the resolution aloud.

No public comment.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer, seconded by Officer Utting, motioned to declare solidarity and support for the LGBTQ+ student walkout. The motion carried by the following voice vote:

   Voice Vote: 15 ayes, 1 absent.

   Chloe Wong  aye
   Allister Adair  aye
   Reese Terrell  aye
   Maureen Loftus  aye
   Hayden Miller  aye
   Gabrielle Listana  aye
   Ann Anish  aye
   Astrid Utting  aye
   Yoselin Colin  aye
   Vanessa Pimentel  aye
   Ewan Barker Plummer  aye
   Steven Hum  absent
   Raven Shaw  aye
   Yena Im  aye
   Tyrone S. Hillman III  aye
   Emily Nguyen  aye

   Action: motion approved.

11. Legislation Referred (discussion and possible action)
   a. BOS File No. 230326 - Resolution urging elected representatives, schools, and youth-serving institutions in San Francisco and other jurisdictions to protect transgender and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ+) youth and adults'
lives and gender expression from hate and violence amid national legislative efforts to roll back transgender and LGBTQ+ protections.

i. Presenter: Youth Commission staff

Director Garcia explained the core of the legislation, and that it was a first step to address and support LGBTQ+ youth.

b. BOS File No. 230328 - Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 912, The SAFE Act, authored by Assemblymember Reggie Jones-Sawyer, to reinvest prison closure savings into community crime reduction programs.

i. Presenter: Youth Commission staff

Director Garcia summarized the legislation, and how it’s separate from the letter of support that was voted on earlier in the meeting.

Commissioner Colin, seconded by Officer Shaw, motioned to support both BOS File No. 230326 and BOS File No. 230328. No public comment. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Voice Vote: 14 ayes, 2 absent.

Chloe Wong  aye
Allister Adair  aye
Reese Terrell  aye
Maureen Loftus  aye
Hayden Miller  absent
Gabrielle Listana  aye
Ann Anish  aye
Astrid Utting  aye
Yoselin Colin  aye
Vanessa Pimentel  aye
Ewan Barker Plummer  aye
Steven Hum  absent
Raven Shaw  aye
Yena Im  aye
Tyrone S. Hillman III  aye
Emily Nguyen  aye

Action: motion approved.
e. BOS File No. 230158—Ordinance appropriating $25,371,063 of General Fund General Reserves, $587,029 of other revenues, and $834,204 of special revenue fund balance to the Police Department; de-appropriating $31,999,402 from permanent salaries, mandating fringe benefits, equipment, budgeted debt service, budgeted project expenditures, and overtime for increased overtime budget in the Police Department in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023 as required per Administrative Code, Section 3.17, required biweekly reporting to the Board of Supervisors on overtime by neighborhood, and releasing $7,430,008 from expenditure reserve:

This item was removed from the agenda during the approval of the agenda, due to no response from the Board of Supervisors’ legislative aides.

12. Committee Reports (discussion item)
   a. Executive Committee
      i. Legislative Affairs Officers

      Officer Shaw said the Board of Supervisors were on break last week, so there’s been no new legislation referred to the Youth Commission. She also mentioned it’s good to see the YC passing resolutions and motions this meeting and in previous meetings. Chair Nguyen asked if there was any movement on the resolutions that they delivered to the Board of Supervisors, or with Commissioners continuing to do further advocacy to the BOS, and Officer Shaw said she’d work on that and bring it to the forefront with Officer Hum.

      ii. Communication and Outreach Officers

      Officer Listana said that they’ve reached out to SFUSD teachers for classroom presentations, they’ve done social media outreach to promote local events, and have sent out the flyers for both the Youth Budget Town Hall and 2023/2024 Recruitment. Officer Utting said that Commissioner Loftus will be doing the takeover this week, as well as some additional posts that will be coming out regarding the BOS Budget & Policy Priorities presentation.

      iii. General Committee Updates

      Vice Chair Barker Plummer couldn't meet last week because of the lack of quorum, but had a working meeting instead. He said they worked on
planning for the Youth Budget Town Hall and further outreach for 2023/24 recruitment.

b. Housing, Recreation, and Transit Committee

Commissioner Anish said there’s nothing to report since they canceled their last scheduled meeting on March 27th due to time conflicts.

c. Civic Engagement and Education Committee

Commissioner Loftus said they were able to meet with California Association of Student Councils (CASC) and talked about future collaboration with the Youth Commission. Chair Nguyen added that CASC is very excited to work with the Youth Commission, especially on the Vote16 initiative.

d. Transformative Justice Committee

Commissioner Colin said that last week they went through all of the four letters of support that they passed earlier in this meeting. The committee met with Vice Chair Barker Plummer on his resolution, went over the Juvenile Hall hearing flyer, and they talked about several pieces of referred legislation.

e. LGBTQ+ Task Force

Officer Listana said they haven’t met since the last meeting, but will be meeting on Thursday, April 20th at 5pm.

No public comment.

13. Roll Call and Introductions

Roll call for introduction of resolutions, requests for hearings, letters of inquiry, and Commissioners’ reports on their Commission related activities.

a. Presenters: Commissioner Anish, Commissioner Utting, Commissioner Miller, Commissioner Hum, Commissioner Adair, Commissioner Shaw, Commissioner Nguyen, Commissioner Loftus

Commissioner Anish said they’ve been working on a resolution and changed her focus after meeting with the Human Rights Commission, to try and accommodate language regarding the recent violence between youth at youth-centered spaces like Stonestown Galleria. She might write a letter regarding that violence to help youth try and feel safer in those spaces.
Commissioner Utting has started the research process to write a resolution on paying Youth Commissioners, and she has created a survey to see how being paid or not being paid has impacted their ability to do their advocacy and work. She’s also working on making the preregistration BPP into a resolution, but will wait to bring that to the full Commission for a vote until the Department of Elections presents to the Commission in May. She’s collaborating with both Commissioners Im and Wong to create an easier process for students to apply to the City College of San Francisco (CCSF), to which Vice Chair Barker Plummer said he can connect them with a CCSF professor who can help. She will be turning the results of the CEEC survey into a report that they can then share externally to community organizations. Lastly, there will be updates coming soon in regards to the school safety hearing.

Commissioner Miller said he has been on spring break so he hasn’t been doing much, but wants to do something regarding expanding bike access and possibly a resolution to allow bikes on Muni trains. He also wants to get a presentation on fare enforcement from SFMTA, especially since the fare agents have failed to accurately enforce their policies and targeting youth and specific neighborhoods.

Commissioner Hum is absent.

Commissioner Adair said he is continuing to do work on the 78 Haight resolution, but he is doing more research since the situation with Silicon Valley Bank has jeopardized some of the funding for the nonprofit that is supporting this housing project.

Commissioner Shaw said she has been working alongside Commissioners Colin and Barker Plummer on the letters of support that they passed today. She also has been working with Commissioner Hillman on a resolution.

Commissioner Nguyen said she has been working to support the Youth Budget Town Hall, as well as a bike resolution recently, but she’s doing more research in the next month. She’s also been connecting with different organizations on the issue of Vote16, and how the YC can set a solid foundation on pushing it forward to become a charter amendment in 2024. She’d also like to look into doing a letter of support with the Environment Department to support their budget ask.

Commissioner Loftus said that she’s working with Commissioner Pimentel on a resolution stemming from the BPP on life skills, and has narrowed it down to
focus on financial literacy based on everyone’s feedback from last month. She is planning a lot of fun activities as well for her IG takeover.

b. Other Legislative Introductions

No other legislation has been introduced.

14. Staff Report (discussion item)

Director Esquivel Garcia will email her report later this week. Specialist Zhan asked Commissioners to let her know their availability to schedule meetings with their appointing officers for continued BPP advocacy. Specialist Ochoa said to make sure to share the Youth Budget Town Hall flyers, to share the 2023/2024 SFYC Recruitment flyers, and that staff will be doing 1:1’s to help support Commissioners on the conversation if they’re planning on reapplying to serve on the Youth Commission next year.

15. Announcements (this includes Community Events)

Specialist Ochoa said that there will be an Easter Egg Hunt at the Great Highway Park on Sunday, April 9th at 11am, in addition to an Ocean Beach Clean Up on the same day at 1pm.

No public comment.

16. Adjournment

There being no further business on the agenda, the full Youth Commission adjourned at 8:04pm.
San Francisco Youth Commission Hearing: Juvenile Hall

KATHERINE W. MILLER
CHIEF, JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT
APRIL 17, 2023
Juvenile Probation Department Goals

1. **Reimagine how the City addresses juvenile crime and delinquency** – from referral through reentry – in collaboration with community and government partners; emphasizing research, evidence-based practices, and innovation; and **sustainably addressing pervasive racial disparities** throughout the system.

2. **Prioritize diversion and connection** to appropriate services and responses at every stage of the youth’s contact with JPD. Ensure youth are returned home as quickly as possible, whenever appropriate, and that families are provided comprehensive support. **Maximize the utilization of community-based services** that provide high quality care for all youth and their families throughout a young person’s involvement in the juvenile justice system.

3. **Advance a whole family engagement strategy** that places racial equity at its center to ensure that all youth have full and equal access to opportunities, power, and resources; that advances youth- and family-centered case plans and goal development to help justice-involved youth and their families thrive; and, that minimizes unnecessary or further justice system involvement.
Juvenile Probation Department Goals

4. Create a non-institutional home-like secure setting for both detained and incarcerated youth and young adults that is healing-centered, developmentally appropriate, family-centered, community-connected, culturally responsive, and developmentally appropriate. Implement daily community presence of community partners; shared leadership with community and city agencies whenever possible; and meaningful opportunities for community input into policies and programming.

5. Continue to organize and right-size the JPD department and budget to reflect changes in caseloads, increased emphasis on community-based services, and changes in approach and responsibilities, including DJJ realignment duties. Bolster equitable leadership development opportunities for Black, Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander staff throughout the Department, implement change that meaningfully improves the workplace experience of BIPOC staff; enact our organizational belief of redemption and helping people to succeed. Develop a collaborative approach to policymaking and service provision to work effectively with community agencies and appropriate city agencies, including health, law enforcement and schools.

6. Advance the goals of the City and DJJ Realignment Subcommittee in our ongoing implementation of DJJ Realignment to effectively support the most impacted youth and young adults, both in the community and in the Secure Youth Treatment Facility located in Juvenile Hall.
Juvenile Justice Transformation

- Warrant Policy
- Violation Policy
- Detention Alternatives:
  - Alternative Family Services
  - San Francisco Boys’ Home
- JPD-CBO Partnership Workgroups (with Third Sector, Inc.)
- Joint Trainings
- Credible Messenger Life Coaches
- Whole Family Support
- Care Team Pilot
- CARC Expansion
- Detention Decisionmaking Tool
- Newcomer Youth/ Unaccompanied Minors
- Justice Reinvestment
- DJJ Realignment
Community Investments: $9.1M (FY 22-23) & $5.8M (FY 23-24) & $5.6M (FY 24-25)
Community Based Organizations funded by JPD through DCYF*

Behavior Change and Positive Youth Development
- Border Youth Tennis Exchange
- Sharp Circle, Inc.
- Success Stories

Case Management/ Referral
- Community Assessment and Resource Center (CARC)
- Instituto Familiar de la Raza
- Success Centers
- Westside Community Services

Educational Support
- Five Keys Schools and Programs
- Young Community Developers (YCD)

Life Coaches
- Bay Area Community Resources (BACR)
- Success Centers
- Us4Us (w/ Renaissance for Parents)

Life Skills
- Bay Area Community Resources (BACR)
- City of Dreams
- Occupational Therapy Training Program (OTTP)
- Sunset Youth Services
- Young Community Developers (YCD)

Justice Services
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ)
- Hunters Point Family
- Mission Neighborhood Centers
- The Art of Yoga
- Niroga Institute
- Young Women’s Freedom Center

Out of Home Placement/ Alternatives to Juvenile Hall
- Alternative Family Services (AFS)
- Catholic Charities—San Francisco Boys’ Home

Restorative Justice
- Community Works West—Make it Right
- Insight Prison Project—Victim Offender Education Group (w/ Five Keys)

Vocational Support
- Success Centers
- Sunset Youth Services

Whole Family Support
- City Youth Now
- San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project
- Young Community Developers (YCD)

*Excludes Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) investments

JPD & DCYF have awarded nearly $1.9M in grants just since August 2022.
Juvenile Hall Admission & Reentry

1. Arrest
2. Call to CARC/OD
3. Detention Decisionmaking Tool
4. Admission Process
5. Special Programs for Youth Assessment
6. Unit Assignment

1. Connector Interview
2. Detention Hearing
3. Release on Home Detention
4. Care Team
Juvenile Hall Units

• Detention/ Pre-Adjudication Units
  • Median Length of Stay: 6 Days
    • Quarantine Unit
    • Living Units

• Secure Commitment Units
  • Median Length of Stay: 534 days
    • Secure Youth Treatment Facility
Plan for a Non-institutional Home-like Secure Setting
Why Does SF Need a Secure Juvenile Setting?

• The Superior Court, which will approve San Francisco’s non-institutional place of detention, has communicated to the CJHWG, that “under state and federal law, San Francisco will continue to need a secure detention facility for [...] young people, which complies with the minimum state statutory and regulatory standards for the operation and maintenance of juvenile halls for the confinement of minors.” (8/26/19 letter to Board of Supervisors)

• Pursuant to CA Welfare & Institutions Code (WIC) Section 625.3, under certain circumstances, youth must be securely detained until they can appear before a judge: “a minor who is 14 years of age or older and who is taken into custody by a peace officer for the personal use of a firearm in the commission or attempted commission of a felony or any offense listed in subdivision (b) of Section 707 shall not be released until that minor is brought before a judicial officer.”
Secure Setting: Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Definition

Federal definition of “secure” per 28 CFR Part 31 §31.304

• **Detain or confine** means to hold, keep, or restrain a person *such that he is not free to leave*, or such that a reasonable person would believe that he is not free to leave, except that a juvenile held by law enforcement solely for the purpose of returning him to his parent or guardian or pending his transfer to the custody of a child welfare or social service agency is not detained or confined within the meaning of this definition.

• **Secure** as used to define a detention or correctional facility this term includes residential facilities which include construction features designed to physically restrict the movements and activities of persons in custody such as locked rooms and buildings, fences, or other physical structures. It does not include facilities where physical restriction of movement or activity is provided solely through facility staff.
Background on Division of Juvenile Justice Realignment (SB 823 & SB 92)

• **SB 823 shifts responsibility to the counties** for the custody, care, and supervision of youth who would have otherwise been eligible for the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), California’s youth prisons.
  - SB 92 allows counties to establish local **Secure Youth Treatment Facilities** for youth who would have been otherwise eligible for DJJ commitment.

• **Adjusts the Age of Jurisdiction:** Extended to 21, 23, or 25, depending on offense

• **Intake at DJJ stopped July 1, 2021:** Seven young people committed in San Francisco to date.

Secure Youth Treatment Facility:
- Shall be a secure facility that is operated, utilized, or accessed by the county of commitment to provide appropriate programming, treatment, and education for eligible young people:
  - May be a **stand-alone facility or a unit/portion of an existing county juvenile facility**, including a juvenile hall or probation camp.
  - A county may **contract with another county** having a secure youth treatment facility in lieu of operating its own program.
  - A county may establish a secure youth treatment facility to serve as a **regional center** for commitment of young people from one or more counties on a contract basis.
- Facilities must comply with **Titles 15 & 24**, CA Code of Regulations
Close Juvenile Hall Work Group Proposals: Preliminary Analysis

- The 39 proposals in the CJHWG Report involve multiple city departments, as well as the Superior Court of California – a state agency – and youth, families, and community partners.

- Implementation requires us to assess which entities have primary decisionmaking/legal authority to consider each proposal – and where collaboration is required.

- JPD has mapped out the primary department/agency and the departments whose resources will be involved for each proposal.

- We have included our analysis in the following slides, with the primary department/agency noted in orange, and the departments involved noted in gold. We hope this can support City leadership, community stakeholders, and local and state agencies in developing the path forward.
# Proposals Regarding Diversion

## By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should aim to divert at least 80% of youth at the point of law enforcement contact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should implement a community-based intake and connection “Hub/Well-Being Center” that is available citywide, including to schools, parents, and service providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRC, DPH, HSA, DCYF, SFUSD/COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco’s community-based intake “Hub/Well-Being Center” should serve as the direct referral pathway for any youth who comes into contact with police, including youth who are unaccompanied minors and youth who reside outside San Francisco County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should eliminate the juvenile traffic court program; instead, citation cases should be processed through the “Hub/Well-Being Center.”</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRC, DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposals Regarding Charging Decisions

### By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should work with the SFPD to reform booking practices to incorporate adolescent development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should require the SFPD to issue a written statement of probable cause for any youth delivered to the custody of JPD.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco should implement policies to guide JPD’s immediate review of the statement of probable cause written by law enforcement to ensure the facts are sufficient to justify detention.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should implement a process for an accelerated review by prosecutors of charges that require youth to be transported to JPD custody.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposals to Reduce Reliance on Detention for Warrants & Limiting Time on Probation

By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should implement policies to avoid the issuance of warrants to the greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When a warrant cannot be avoided, San Francisco should implement warrant policies that preserve options to release youth pending their court hearing, sometimes referred to as a “two-tiered warrant.”</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco should create processes to allow outstanding warrants to be resolved and cleared without detention of the young person.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should consider implementing a local policy limiting the time youth spend on probation and thereby reduce warrants issued for violating terms of probation.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Proposals to Reduce Reliance on Detention for Out of Home Placement (OOHP)

By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should increase comprehensive support to families, thereby reducing the need for congregate care placements.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRC, DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should scrutinize existing STRTPs more closely and seek to decrease its reliance on congregate care.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When youth AWOL from OOHP, San Francisco should establish a process for locating them safely rather than issuing a warrant, arresting them and detaining them until placed again.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should continue to build alternatives to JH for youth awaiting OOHP</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposals related to Detention Hearings & Expanding Detention Alternatives

### By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should set up expedited or same day detention hearing system.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/PDR</td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should engage detention alternatives sooner and more often.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should further explore the use of “non-secure detention.”</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco should limit or eliminate the role of JPD in supervising youth on “home detention.”</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should connect youth with community-based systems of support, not electronic monitoring, when they are released from detention on “home detention.”</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For youth who are detained in juvenile hall, San Francisco must continue to utilize and fully fund programming that maximizes post-detention diversion options.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Defense/PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCYF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposals Regarding Unaccompanied Minors

By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should ensure that any unaccompanied minor who is in contact with the justice system has appropriate representation by specialized attorneys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should capitalize on the existing programs like Unaccompanied Children Assistance Program (UCAP) and further analyze the reasons why youth are involved in the justice system in lieu of UCAP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposals Regarding Non-Institutional Place of Detention

By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should review the capacity analyses to determine the number</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of secure beds that are needed and the most appropriate homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should ensure adequate staff to youth ratio during waking</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco should collaborate with the Real Estate Department to vet</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the following options: 1055 Pine Street; 1801 Vicente; identify 2-3 single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family homes in specific zip codes that meet other required criteria; have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED find available warehouse space, potentially in an industrial section of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should commit to shared leadership with community-based</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations (CBOs) and JPD in the design and operation of the non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFUSD/COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional place of detention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposals Regarding Community Alternatives

By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should implement structural change for: Early interventions to expand the use of non-legal options that impact pre-arrest diversion.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFPD, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should implement structural change for: Coordinating program utilization.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRC, DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco should implement structural change for: Program assessment.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should implement structural change for: behavioral health.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. San Francisco should implement structural change for: Program funding practices.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRC, DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. San Francisco should implement structural change for: Residential bed space.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSH, DPH, HAS, DCYF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
Proposals Regarding Re-Imagining Well-Being Alternatives to Detention
By Primary Department & Department Resources Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJHWG Proposal</th>
<th>JPD</th>
<th>Court (State)</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Defense/ PDR</th>
<th>SFPD</th>
<th>Other City Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Francisco should implement: Well-Being Advocate (WBA) at First Contact.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Francisco should implement: a Well-Being Assessment</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPH, HSA, DCYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. San Francisco should implement: a Well-Being Committee.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense/ PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCYF, DPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Francisco should implement: a system for flexible funding.</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. San Francisco should develop Centers for Well-Being and Youth Development</td>
<td>JPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Francisco should implement Centers for Well-Being and Youth Development for young people who do not need to be placed in a secure facility but who would benefit from a short respite.
Reimagining & Design Process

• Current JPD budget includes funds to enlist an architectural firm to work with stakeholders to develop high-level concepts for a reimagined non-institutional home-like secure setting.

• Goal is to produce concepts that advance San Francisco’s vision in alignment with state regulations.

• Process to identify architect is underway.

• At this time, there are no funds identified for construction.