

BY DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION



PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, April 22, 2024, 6:00 pm-7:00 pm

Meeting held in-person with public comment at:
City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 421
San Francisco, CA 94102

<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m7f35672c9d90084733102116ff9a2206>

Commissioners:

Johanna Lacoé, Chair
James Spingola
Manuel Rodriguez

Meeting Minutes

Hybrid meeting. Comments must be from the public sitting in the audience or using the meeting link listed above.

1. Roll Call:

- A. Meeting called to order at 6:02 pm.
- B. Members Absent: James Spingola.

2. Public Comment on items not on the agenda:

- A. Commissioner Rodriguez: In preparation for the October Commission meeting, he met with JPPD on March 6th. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce himself and understand the needs of the CBOs, what they need to work with to get people, and how to work with JPD staff.
- B. Commissioner Lacoé: Possibly present on probation practices in the field for July.
- C. No public comment.

3. Priorities for the Juvenile Hall:

- A. Short Term Priorities:
 - i. What can be done right now with physical improvements?
 - ii. What is the correct number of beds?
 - iii. What is the process we should undertake to determine alternatives?
- B. Chief Miller responds to questions regarding short-term priorities:
 - i. It would take \$180-200 million to build a partial new version of the Juvenile Hall.
 - ii. Short-term projects already completed/in progress:
 - 1. The walls in units 7 & 8 have been painted.
 - 2. Currently receiving bids to change the flooring and furniture.
 - 3. The young people have started selecting items to make their rooms more personalized and softer. Items such as bedding, towels, rugs, etc.

4. They have made purchases for the yard, such as outdoor furniture and grill.
5. All these changes have been made for the long-term young people.
- iii. How do we make these same changes to all the units?
 1. Funding is needed.
 2. They are discussing if a kitchen can be put in place for the young people to use for themselves.
 3. They are discussing how they can remove the concrete beds.
 1. Estimates are still being discussed with Public Works. The most recent estimate was \$27,000 per bed to remove the concrete.
 2. Public Works is unsure if they would do the work themselves or have JPD get estimates, and another provider complete the work.
 4. We must discuss building a vocational space for long-term young people.
 1. How can we have space that aligns with the skills and certifications the young people want to develop without feeling like we are passing together?
 5. We've discussed changes we want to make to the admissions building. It currently feels very dated and cold.
 6. At the June Commission meeting, we will discuss the JJC, specifically the AIR survey and other feedback the young people have given. We will talk about the work we have been doing to address the young people's feedback.
 7. We can't change the make-up of the units (in terms of it looking like a prison). The architects suggested turning double rooms into single rooms by removing the second beds.
- iv. Regarding the number of beds, she is not sure what the correct number of beds is right now.
 1. The number of referrals to the Juvenile Justice System has returned to the numbers in 2019.
 2. We have a long-term responsibility that we never had before the DJJ closing.
 3. We want to know if we have enough beds for every young person the Court might order into our custody. If we don't have enough beds, they will have to go to another county which does not align with our values and intentions of our process.
 4. We need to have the ability to be agile so we can move the kids around in different considerations of each other.
 5. When we talk about the number of beds, we are not talking about filling them but being able to make choices.
- v. Commissioner Lacoë: What share of the beds are currently empty?
 1. Chief Miller: We have 150 beds, and 26 are filled.
 2. Some of the units are not usable as units. Unit 4 is the recreational center.
 3. Unit 3 was turned into a fitness center for the long-term young people.
 4. There are 8 units total and usually 4 or 5 are being used.
 5. We try not to use the upper tier of units so that all the young people are on the same level.
- vi. Commissioner Lacoë: It is essential to continue to bring up the share of beds because the argument is often if you have the beds, you are going to fill them – you're not filling them. Since there is no more room for renovation, it seems like prioritizing the comfort and function of the young people there is much more important than dealing with other empty units.
- vii. Commissioner Rodriguez: Confirming the short-term goals of Commissioner Lacoë's questions were the beds, space for vocational skills, and personalized space.
- viii. Chief Miller: Regarding the alternative conversation, we have flipped the ratio on how many young people wind up detained versus cited out. Some young people have never turned in a referral, for example, how we handle probation violations. A critical discussion is what diversion is and how it links to things. We hope every person will be connected to CARC, but that doesn't mean they will all be diverted from detention.
 1. We need placements, so young people are not with us for too long. AFS has been significant. The amount of group homes available has drastically declined in the last two

years.

2. Commissioner Laco: If we don't have those alternatives, more people will stay with us in the long term.

C. Public Comment:

- i. No public comment.

4. Discussion of Diversion Practices:

A. What should be discussed regarding diversion at the full Commission meeting?

- i. Decision points
 1. Decision from and to
- ii. What is diversion – generally and in San Francisco?
 1. What programs exist in San Francisco right now?
 2. Generally, what kinds of programs exist?
- iii. Not everything CARC does is diversion. They have two roles:
 1. We connect everyone to CARC for services – this is not diversion.
 2. They provide pre-adjudication (and pre-filing) diversion services for misdemeanors.
- iv. Who are the people who can decide to prevent a young person's case from moving forward?
 1. Why does that matter?
 2. If we don't divert, the consequence is that your case gets presented to the DA's office, and they will file a petition. They are ultimately resulting in a conviction.
 3. If the police divert things and they don't come to probation, it does not trigger a mandatory referral to the DA's office.
 4. We can no longer divert once it goes to the DA.
- v. To change how diversion functions, we must understand the mechanisms. We can't change policy or what JPD or CARC does, State law must be changed.
- vi. Commissioner Rodriguez: In the context of putting this on the agenda, here's the version, here is how we do it, here is what's defined as the systems and structure around it, and this is how it relates to CARC. At the end of the agenda, what are we hoping to accomplish?
- vii. Commissioner Laco: Is it true we are not diverting enough kids? What are the options? Are we using them? Is there a policy shift? Is there something we need to be doing? We just want to be on the same page.

B. Public Comment:

- i. Hilary Buren: CARC does two things currently. They are separate and do not always intersect. There's a difference between intake and linkage to services and diversion via the 654 order. In regard to police diversion, it is currently being called alternatives to arrest. Currently, all of our referrals are from JPD and not from the police. We will be meeting to get answers regarding this process and what it will look like.
 1. How does San Francisco define diversion?
 2. Our current CARC model isn't true diversion since there is some level of law enforcement involvement.
 3. We are underutilizing diversion for young people issued citations for a felony.

5. Discussion of JPD Data Reports from the March and April Juvenile Probation Commission Meetings.

- A. Not enough time. We will discuss this at the next meeting.
- B. Public Comment: No public comment

6. Review and Approval of the Program Committee Meeting Minutes for November 27, 2023:

- i. Minutes will be reviewed and approved at the next meeting.
- ii. Public Comment: No public comment

7. Adjournment:

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:03 pm.