

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION



FULL COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 8, 2024, 5:30 pm

Meeting held hybrid with public

comment at:

**City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
Hearing Room 408 San Francisco, CA 94102**

<https://sfpublish.webex.com/sfpublish/j.php?MTID=m022f274170c5e7186727c568f6a0b65c>

Full Commission:

Margaret Brodtkin, President
Linda Martley-Jordan, Vice President
Johanna Lacoce
Allison Magee
Toye Moses
Manuel Rodriguez
James Spingola

Meeting Minutes

Hybrid meeting. Comments would have to be from the public sitting in the audience or by using the meeting link listed above.

The meeting was called to order at 5:36 pm.

1. Roll Call:

1. Margaret Brodtkin, President – Present
2. Linda Martley-Jordan, Vice-President – Present
3. Johanna Lacoce – Present
4. Allison Magee – Present
5. Toye Moses – Present
6. Manuel Rodriguez – Present
7. James Spingola – Present

2. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda:

- a. No public comment.

3. Juvenile Justice System Diversion

- a. **Presentation from Commissioner Johanna Lacoce on Overview of Diversion Practices – see attached [PowerPoint](#)**

b. Presentation from Hilary Buren, Director of CARC, on CARC Diversion – see attached [presentation](#).

i. Other key points made by Hilary Buren:

1. San Francisco CARC has three pathways for young people to have contact:
 - a. Point of arrest, specifically from Juvenile Probation. Youth have to be ages 12-17 with misdemeanor citations or certain felony citations
 - b. Cite back appointments – referral to CARC at a later date. Youth must be ages 12-17, a resident of San Francisco, and misdemeanor citations. They can take the program up to three times. Upon completion, their records are sealed and expunged.
 - c. Deferred appointments – JPD & DA's office 654 referrals. The youth have to be ages 12-17 with a felony citation. JPD, DA, or Court determines that a young person has the opportunity to participate in diversion programming. If a young person completes programming, their record is sealed and expunged.
2. The expansion of SF CARC will allow more contact with young people.
 - a. Future pathways – point of arrest and young people detained at JJC (currently, this is not a service).
 - b. Eligibility – all young people 12-18 who are cited by law enforcement or point of arrest. The level of citation will no longer be a factor.
 - c. New collaboration with law enforcement for referrals to CARC. CARC will receive significantly more referrals from SFPD than from juvenile probation.
 - d. CARC will need to expand hours of operation to 7 days a week, 8:00 am to midnight, at 112 hours/week.
 - e. CARC will not close moving forward.

ii. Public Comment:

1. **Denise Coleman:** The presentation showed that the numbers would double from what San Francisco CARC had seen previously. In that number doubling, many of those kids will be a pre-arrest diversion. They have been working on developing this with SFPD for the last two years and are looking forward to having the resources necessary to push this forward. Our young people deserve the opportunity not to be labeled and categorized as being arrested and being put into the system. Those factors stay with them throughout their lives and prevent them from being able to do other things in their life. We are not asking the police to bring young people to CARC in a diversion aspect. The scope is to meet the young people and the police where they are in the streets, not give them a citation, but instead to give them an appointment time to

come to CARC, talk with the staff, and get to know what the program is about as an incentive to go, get them to sign an agreement along with the parents, send them and the police on their way. We are hoping that can happen within a 15-30 minute timespan.

2. **Dawn Stueckle:** I feel torn because I am torn and terrified about this situation. There is not nearly enough money to do what we must do. I am concerned about young people (18-24) in the adult system needing to be served. We were told yesterday that these justice grants would serve kids in the juvenile justice system. In my head, I am thinking, what is CARC going to do with all these kids that get cited and are not on probation and are not in the juvenile system when many organizations weren't funded and/or received gigantic cuts to what we currently have? I am concerned about the landscape we are looking at and whether there is any connection, warm handoffs, and support for these kids. As Denise said, prevention is crucial, and I think we all have been doing this work for a long time. We don't want to wait until kids are in the system, but we essentially do. I know the city is experiencing a budget shortfall, but I feel like the city budget is a document that clearly shows the city's values. When cutting on the backs of the city's most vulnerable, we show our hand on what we prioritize. I hope this Commission can stand up for the needs of these families and the 18-24-year-olds who graduate from system to system. I'm concerned about the landscape. We have divested from what we have been trying to do for years.
3. **Dan Macallair:** I'm a bit confused. We spent a year on the closed Juvenile Hall Commission. This was a significant point of discussion, and I thought we were changing the process. So, when at the pre-intake or not to intake at the, the rest. Before intake, they would go to CARC. CARC would be the starting point. That is key because that is where the police decide what charges to recommend—having a CARC representative in the room and a representative from the community agencies. It was to change the historical dynamic between law enforcement and probation. Having a community voice there can have a significant effect. Otherwise, this is just the same old process. I want some clarification because this is not what we talked about. During our year-long meetings, we discussed CARC as a central component. It would be the central point of intake, but that's not what I hear now.
4. **Molly Brown:** I want to echo what Dan said and explain why we advocated so much for it. It is to bring another voice into the room at that moment when the police are deciding on the charges. There have been different ways this has been done in the past. Sometimes, when CARC is on the phone, CARC can talk them down. We must have another voice when those charges are being made. If we don't have that, then this isn't what we were advocating. This will make a difference in what happens with these kids in the next step, whether detained or cited. Several things are going to be decided by this. The other point of every kid going to CARC, not going up to the hole first, is because CARC would be in

that position to speak with the youth and decide on the appropriate community care coordinator. So that we can get these youth attached to CBOs as quickly as possible. Going up to the Hall to do this work is not ideal. You can imagine that because of the environment up there. So, anything that could be done outside of the Hall is preferable. Thank you.

iii. Comments & Questions from the Commissioners:

1. **President Brodkin:** It sounded like there was a step that I thought was incorporated into this new system that maybe is, and I didn't hear about it. It sounds like young people would decide whether to detain or not for many kids before the intervention with CARC, which I thought would be inclusive and involve everyone in a multidisciplinary approach from which we would decide whether young people would be detained or not.
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** No, that's not what the expansion includes or what is happening now. Juvenile Probation uses the systems in place to ensure it is as equitable and accurate as possible. They determine the disposition of a young person. That disposition could be cited to CARC at the moment, cited and released to a guardian, cited to JJC for a later date, or booked at Juvenile Hall. The community has no say in some of these situations on whether a young person is booked, but it isn't very easy in their systems in place. No, the future would not be the future community voice in whether a young person is a place. There are a lot of complicated laws. Community safety must be taken into consideration depending on the level of citation.
2. **President Brodkin:** I want to ask our Chief what I failed to understand. My understanding was that the whole idea of this was that we would have CARC convene a voice that would include the community, maybe probation, but that would be a point at which we would decide on detention or not. Now, we will keep the same system, and you will involve CARC, but the whole decision-making process will remain the same. Is that true?
 - a. **Chief Miller:** That is true. The new model does contemplate a difference in how a decision is made. The police general order is that the call is placed. If CARC is open, then start with CARC and then come to the on-duty probation officer. If CARC is closed, it goes straight to the on-duty probation officer. Probation uses the detention tool we presented here to determine whether the young person will be detained in the hall or cited. Right now, the only young people who have any touch points with CARC are the young people who are cited. They do not interact with detained young people. One of the significant changes is that all young people will have that preliminary conversation with CARC regardless of whether they are cited or detained. The decision-making process doesn't change. It is still our detention decision-making tool that is used.

3. **President Brodkin:** You decide whether to detain a kid and then you bring in CARC to do what?
 - a. **Chief Miller:** CARC still provides that initial conversation with every young person and then determines which of the justice service care coordinating agencies will be attached to and supporting that person throughout their time in the justice system. For every young person early in their justice system, involvement is meeting with CARC and then being connected with one of those five agencies. But it doesn't change the decision-making process for who gets detained and who gets cited.
4. **Commissioner Spingola:** Did I hear that the arresting officer decides whether the child goes to CARC?
 - a. **Chief Miller:** That does not happen. In San Francisco, the police general order provides that any time police have a young person in their custody whom they want to arrest, they must make the phone call that ultimately comes through CARC or probation. Either way, it winds up with the on-duty probation officer, who then makes that determination. The police do not make the decision. But it is very primarily based on the offense that the police are determining what they are arresting the young person for.
5. **Commissioner Magee:** It was mentioned that the expansion to work with the police department cannot be done yet due to resources. Can you expand on that?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** Currently, with the funding climate, the best practice intervention for pre-arrest programming is not within CARC's operating budget.
6. **Commissioner Moses:** What happens when a young person doesn't complete programming, and are there other opportunities for them to complete programming if they are under 17?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** If a young person is unsuccessful in completing but is willing to reengage, we partner with the juvenile probation to re-open it. Hence, the young person can reengage and complete the programming. They get three opportunities to complete CARC programming to get their record sealed and expunged.
7. **Commissioner Moses:** What is the success rate?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** Last year, 79% did not have police contact for one year. That is not an accurate measure of all young people who have completed programming successfully.
8. **President Brodkin:** Who decides if a young person is booked at JJC?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** Based on their metrics, juvenile probation decides whether a young person is booked or not.
9. **President Brodkin:** Do you have the money for the expansion?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** No, CARC did not receive enough funding at

this stage for this level of expansion. I am concerned for different providers as they received even less.

The role of advocacy CARC plays in the moment of arrest is to speak to the officers to understand the situation truly, to see who is on the scene, and to see if we can advocate for lessening the level of the citation to be eligible to either come to CARC or admonished. We still collect all the data. If a young person is admonished, we still have the information to reach out and engage them in possible needed services voluntarily. When we talk about CARC's role in advocating for how they interact with the system, it is on the phone with the police officers and staff advocating, depending on what we learn of the situation. But that is not the role of juvenile probation, and we aren't able to advocate like that.

10. **Vice President Martley-Jordan:** I recall that this new plan included an additional set of ears, reasoning, and a voice. It sounds as though some things have changed, but not all. You still have to have a police officer assessing the crime and CARC present to do the advocacy. But you aren't present, you are on the phone. Am I understanding that right? Within the three of you, you determine where the youth is going or how the process will happen. Am I right in following all of that?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** Yes, and SF CARC has no authority to determine what happens. We use our advocacy to try to sway decision-making. I must be clear that CARC has no say in these final dispositions. Other than that, you are correct.
11. **Vice President Martley-Jordan:** No say currently, but would your future expansion provide you with a voice to help make the decision, or will you still have no say?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** We will still have no say.
12. **Vice President Martley-Jordan:** You can view the situation from a different lens and provide that input so that everything is weighed out when the decision is made. Am I understanding that?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** Yes.
13. **Vice President Martley-Jordan:** That is the difference. I believe we all thought there would be a whole different set of guides and a different set of guide rails to get to the young person and whether they are placed in JPD. We now understand that you are limited in what you can do and bring into the situation. Am I correct?
 - a. **Hilary Buren:** Yes, we are. That is why I spoke about pre-arrest diversion. That is where the community and CARC efforts will have more of a voice in determining what happens with the young person. This pre-diversion programming is essential for diversion and keeping young people out of the system. That's where those opportunities will lay.
14. **Vice President Linda Martley-Jordan:** Define what you mean by

community.

- a. **Hilary Buren:** Currently, the community comprises the SF CARC staff. In the future, that will include the five CBOs funded for JSCCs (Justice Service Care Coordinators). Unfortunately, we do not have a system that can do that beforehand. Still, in the process and after, CARC plays a massive role in supporting the families in general, understanding their rights and the legal process so that they have the skills to advocate for themselves moving forward. Through this pre-arrest programming it will give families more voices to advocate.

15. **Commissioner Magee:** What is the dollar figure shortfall?

- a. Hilary Buren: The budget we submitted was just under \$2 million (\$1.95 million). CARC's operating budget is over \$1.5 million, and we were awarded that amount.

16. **Commissioner Magee:** Did that \$1.9 million include the work with diversion?

- a. **Hilary Buren:** Yes, the \$1.9 million included the staffing to expand to seven days a week and included the funding for CARC to get the proper training, cars, and resources to go out into the field for pre-arrest programming.

4. **DCYF Justice Funding for 2024-2029, with Focus on Care Coordinators and CARC – see attached [presentation](#).**

I. **Other key points made by Maria Su & Jasmine Dawson:**

a. DCYF Result Areas:

- a. Children and youth are supported by nurturing families and communities
- b. Children and youth are physically and emotionally healthy
- c. Children and youth are ready to learn and succeed in school
- d. Youth are ready for college, work, and productive adulthood

b. DCYF 2024-2029 RFP Awards:

- a. Over \$414 million was requested, and only \$92 million was awarded.
- b. 285 agencies applied, and 142 funded.

c. Justice Services Proposals RFP:

- a. \$36.6 million was requested, with \$12.7 million awarded.
- b. 40 agencies applied, and 28 were funded.
- c. Out-of-Home Placement

d. Fully funded by CYF and/or Grants:

- a. Young Adult Court Case Management

- b. School Crisis Support Initiative
- c. Whole Family Support
- d. Young Adult Court Case Management Initiative
- e. Strategy Goals:
 - a. Establish CARC as the central intake, assessment, and referral hub for all justice involved young people.
 - b. Ensure that all youth who come into contact with law enforcement in San Francisco are assessed by CARC and connected to Justice Services Care Coordinators at the earliest possible point in the juvenile justice process.
- f. Justice Services Care Coordinators:
 - a. Young Community Developers
 - b. BACR Reset
 - c. CJCJ
 - d. MNC Inspiring Success
 - e. Sunset Youth Services

II. Public Comment

- a. **Dan Macallair:** Be careful when coming to a consensus. Often, consensus turns into groupthink, where the decision is made by the most powerful player in the room. Over time, decisions become static, and we are back to the old system. It's essential to have an adversarial component to have agencies like mine that can challenge conventional practice. That forces the system to innovate and constantly examine its processes and procedures. It can't all be about collaboration because if it is about collaboration, we return to the old static system. I want to put that caution out there. We go through this every 3-5 years, and often, you get the competition between the city bureaucracy and community agencies.
- b. **Ron Stueckle:** We are one of the justices funded five. I saw the different funding sources and know the other requirements that have been set out. I don't see the correlation between where the funding sources are and the decision to force the five agencies that were funded to not be able to serve prevention or TAY. It seems that money can be shifted within those funding sources. Our agencies provide essential services, and seeing the funding obliterated is a struggle. I also saw the willingness to refer to the line. The difference is the willingness vs the requirement to refer. What forced that decision to happen? I think it is a monumentally wrong decision. I think we are setting ourselves up for an increase in crime. We are being given responsibility without authority, especially CARC. When crime increases, it will be all of us who are blamed even though we have had our abilities to serve it cut. I would like to know what is forcing that decision and how we can discuss how to work that out.
- c. **Molly Brown:** I think we can't cut ourselves off at the knees by not

funding these agencies to do what we are tasking them to do. I encourage people to return to the drawing board and see what they can do. Accountability is going to be critical here. I'm nervous because I have had many years of seeing agencies fulfill their contractual obligations and have seen many who haven't. We need accountability. Agencies who got money to be these community care coordinators are not taking those kids now. I am upset that people who got funded are not taking those young people. I want to make sure that is going to change. I was hurt to hear about ROCA coming into the picture. These agencies have had so many consultants thrown at them. They are never asked who they would like to go in. These agencies get paid a lot of money. I don't think it is fair.

- d. **Dawn Stueckle:** The cuts were so significant that I hold it's going to be challenging to plug young people into engaging programming at the level we think that we are going to do that when the cuts are so deep and wide. The city needs to consider its priorities, such as where and how we spend our money and what it means every time there is a budget crisis. We are balancing the budget on the backs of our most vulnerable folks. Agencies have been eviscerated, and I don't know what they will look like. We haven't seen cuts like this in decades. CBOs tend to show up and do the work whether there is money or not. In this push, we asked for livable wages and were on par with our city partners. Instead, we are being asked to do more work for less money. We will continue to show because the kids need us, but it's not right.
- e. **Dinky Enty:** We have unfortunately seen the City, landscape, and politics go to an incarcerative approach. During this landscape when our justice partners – the police and the district attorneys are all going toward this overly incarcerated state. As a community, we are being asked to do more for much less. You saw how much more CARC is being asked to do physically, literally less than they have now. My concern is for those of us who are not in the room. I don't mean physically. We have community partners who have not made it to these 5 case managers. We have community partners that are not funded, which will essentially eliminate the service population for entire communities. They haven't asked us to do this, so I am doing it on my own. CYC and IFR have not been funded at all in the justice category. The concern I have is when we have agencies with such niche populations with such expertise, for example, undocumented young people. They are not funded, and they are not in this room to be able to talk about and brainstorm with us about how to resolve the genuine issues we are facing as a city right now. It gives me great concern. We need to support our partners. Because if they are not in this room. We won't have anyone to refer our kids to. A healthy service linkage is to an organization that can provide services beyond case management. So that there is a healthy, ongoing natural network for this young person to continue to flourish. And when we cut agencies out entirely, we're cut in communities out. That makes me extremely anxious and nervous when we are finally pushed to ask for the wages your staff deserve.

Because, as Dawn mentioned, we do this on the backs of our people. They are being asked to do more in a much more challenging landscape with much less. So, I am concerned about the communities absent from these conversations.

III. Questions from the Commissioners:

a. **President Brodkin:** How much were the add-backs, and can we still fight for them? How much did you leave out of your budgeting that had been related to add-backs?

a. **Maria Su:** Between one-time add-backs and philanthropic dollars, approximately \$52 million.

b. **President Brodkin:** How much can we get back?

a. **Maria Su:** Currently, there is no breakdown of the add-backs. We received a generous donation of \$25 million from a philanthropic organization to cover our summer programs. We received another \$15 million to support wellness services. We received \$10 million to help smooth the cliff of the decline over the 2 ½ years. We received less than \$5 million in one-time add-backs. Most funds were from philanthropic organizations to address the COVID crisis. This is the discrepancy we are experiencing right now.

c. **President Brodkin:** How long before the new plan goes into place?

a. **Chief Miller:** I want to summarize that what is significant about what's described is that we are talking about every young person in police custody being assessed by CARC and then being connected quickly to one of five anchor organizations. Despite all the challenges we will have, working together to make this happen is a seed change for us. Your goals as commissioners have been to ensure that kids are diverted as much as possible and that every young person who comes through this system is connected to a community provider. Over the years, you have heard a lot about how that has not come to fruition at scale. Whether a young person is in custody or the community, CARC will see that young person, engage with them, and determine who they are linking them to.

We need to plan to make that happen. How do we now make what is on paper a reality? There are a few things to know:

i. The switch does not flip on July 1st. This is not only because these are new grants but also because we all need to figure out everything that needs to be put in place for that infrastructure to exist. Some things will happen quickly, and some will take time to figure out and implement. We aim to start working together on that collective planning in June, but we will not be done by July. We will be sequencing what needs to be figured

out fast and what will take longer, and we will work together.

- ii. The role of ROCA is to help us move along in this process so we, around the table, can help focus the content of our conversations without any of us being the ones standing up, taking the notes, writing the minutes, and identifying the next steps. They are moving us through the process so that we all can be the experts around the table.
 - iii. Over the summer, many heavy conversations will happen. With that, we will be having the conversation, building the model, and determining a reasonable model rollout over time, both because of funding and because it will take time for us to do things.
- d. **President Brodtkin:** Given the involvement of CARC at the outset, given that every young person is to be connected with a CBO, we have selected CBOs who we believe can do the work. What is your vision? What I would like to see out of this system is many fewer kids to be incarcerated, many more families involved, young people to have more intensive experiences in the community, minimize the role of law enforcement agencies, and maximize the role of our community agencies. Do you have the same vision?
- a. **Chief Miller:** Yes and no. It will depend on the young person. For low-risk young people, the best we can do is get out of the way; community is the central response. Some kids may need almost nothing from the justice system or the justice system's providers. They may need an after-school program. Some young people will briefly be involved with us in the justice system. There are some young people whose DA's office won't file charges at all, and we won't keep them in our system. It would be a relatively fast interaction connecting them with community things that are for all kids. On the flip side, some young people will still be detained because of the offense they were arrested for. They may be in custody for a long time. They may get released quickly with the support of one of these organizations helping work on their release plan. There will be a lot of kids in the middle for whom we will be figuring that out. What part of the work is held by probation, what part of the work is anchored in their community, and where we are working together.
- e. **Vice-President Martely-Jordan:** What is the timeline for DCYF and the money that CARC will be able to receive?
- a. Maria Su: CARC and the grantees have already received their award. We are working with them to put in their work plan so we can go through the grantmaking process. We hope to have all grants completed and

ready to bill against starting July 1st.

- b. **Chief Miller:** Part of what we will be working on with the grantees is what we will need to have in place on July 1st and what we can develop over time.
- f. **President Brodtkin:** Looking at the funding sources that do not require a certain age group or kind of service, what is the rationale for not including the TAY population in the funding of the agencies that got the care grants?
 - a. **Maria Su:** We proposed a \$12 million cut because the mayor asked for that. \$12 million in year one and \$12 million in year two. That includes \$4 million in contingency cuts. Because of that, we had to make tough decisions. We made reductions in many categories within our RFP portfolio. Before that, we made many internal cuts. When there was nothing left, we had to go into the RFP. Part of the reduction was Juvenile Justice. The Chief was gracious and said JPD dollars can come in and close some of these gaps.
 - b. **Chief Miller:** We knew how much we had for the Justice Services portfolio. We knew how much of those dollars came from JPD or our Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act dollars from the State. We wanted to make sure things we needed to do could be funded. Most agencies who applied to be care coordinators applied for just under \$1 million each to serve juvenile and adult system young people. Four of them have received a grant of \$630,000, and one agency received a little less specifically to fund young juvenile people. Because we knew we had enough juvenile system money to make these investments, we knew we could do that. If you take that money and say we are going to serve some kids and some adult system young people, we are never going to be able to say every young person who comes through this juvenile justice system will be connected to a CBO. You can't cut into the pie and say that. To Maria's point, the only way to serve every person in the juvenile system and young adults in the adult system is to increase the size of the pie. That is where looking for those additional funds is critical. We are blessed to have the juvenile justice money as a part of this because it has enabled us to try to preserve this hope.
- g. **Commissioner Rodriguez:** With all the emphasis on CARC and expanded hours, how will we meet the staffing demand? Could you speak more about the approach to collaboration? How are we going to get all the stakeholders aligned? With this new model and system to bring this to life, what is our role as Commissioners to help enact this?
 - a. **Chief Miller:** Regarding CARC hours, negotiations are ongoing about what the budget can and cannot

accommodate. To answer your second question, it is hard to constrict how many agencies get funded to do case management. We are a city that has funded many organizations for a long time to provide case management to young people and the justice system. It was a strategic decision to consolidate down to five. One of the hopes is that it creates consistency and tight communication. The more streamlined the front end is, the more we can ensure that CARC can see a young person, decide which one of those five agencies is the best fit, and make that connection. If it's not happening, we will see and know it because it is more streamlined in a way that everyone is working as a team. It is hard to do that when are 25 agencies around the table. This will promote all of us being more accountable to each other, being more consistent, and having the size of the table that supports shared leadership.

- IV. Motion:** Vice-President Martley-Jordan motions to draft a letter to send to Mayor London Breed, the Board of Supervisors, and the Budget Committee, asking them to take a closer look at the different points we heard this evening. This will allow them to see if they have any recommendations or if there is any way they can address it to make the transition smoother for CARC, the other agencies, and Chief Miller.

a. Public Comment:

a. Dinky Enty: I can't thank the Commission enough for writing and sending a letter to the Mayor and Board regarding the budget and what we have heard today. I genuinely feel heard. In all of the years I've been attending Commission meetings, this is unprecedented as to how action oriented this Commission is. I thank you for your sincere care and support.

b. President Brodkin seconds the motion:

c. Votes: Yes – Brodkin, Lacoë, Martley-Jordan, Magee, Moses, Rodriguez, & Spingola

d. Motion passes.

- V. Motion:** Commissioner Magee moves President Brodkin to write the letter.

a. No public comment.

b. Commissioner Lacoë seconds the motion.

c. Votes: Yes – Brodkin, Lacoë, Martley-Jordan, Magee, Moses & Rodriguez; No – Spingola

d. Motion passes

- 5. Chief's Report - Power points and written reports are [attached](#).**

- a. Monthly data report highlights
- b. Workforce update
- c. Transformation update
- d. No public comment

6. Finance and Governance Committee Report

- i. Discussed the next steps for the Log Cabin Ranch and possible partnership with the California Conservation Corp or other opportunities that may be available to us.
- ii. The Committee passed two motions that the Commission must approve to move for JPD to act.
- iii. The department will be working with the BSCC to resolve some issues that came up with documentation in Juvenile Hall. We will come back in June for more details on what is happening.
- iv. Motion: Commissioner Magee moves for the Commission to approve the following:
 1. The Juvenile Probation Department will work with the Real Estate Department to draft a Request for Proposal (RFP) and get information from Real Estate on their capacity, timeline, and costs.
 2. The Request for Proposal (RFP) will be designed for two purposes. Firstly, it will explore the potential to sell undeveloped land or transfer to a land conservancy. Secondly, it will consider the option to lease developed land for programming. The programming, which is not limited to the following, will be designed to:
 - a. Be voluntary.
 - b. Not to exclude justice-involved youth.
 - c. Serve youth and young adults.
 - d. Provide skill building/ education/ wellness.
 - e. Utilize the environment.
 - f. Leverage community partnerships.
 - g. Be residential.
- v. Public comment:
 1. **Violet:** I understood Log Cabin had been shut down. Is this motion to figure out what to do with Log Cabin Ranch, whether to sell it or repurpose it for all young people in San Francisco? Is there an operating cost to maintain the Log Cabin Ranch even with it not being open? Is this why this is up to question? Have any community conversations about how Log Cabin Ranch should be repurposed?
 - a. Commissioner Magee: One part of the reason is that they are incurring costs, but the other is that the Log Cabin Ranch is a resource to the City. We want to utilize the resources for young people here. This was a topic in our last commission meeting. We had a robust conversation with the community. Real Estate would not be determining what happens with the property. They would be helping us develop RFPs.
- vi. Commissioner Moses seconds the motion.
- vii. Votes: Votes: Yes – Brodtkin, Lacoë, Martley-Jordan, Magee, Moses, Rodriguez, & Spingola
- viii. Motion passes.

7. Program Committee Report:

- i. Discussed diversion.
- ii. We are changing the date for our next meeting to make it sooner to discuss the agenda for the July and October commission meetings.
- iii. No public comment.

8. Consent Calendar:

- a. Submission of request to enter into a new agreement with Alternative Family Services for Intensive Services Foster Care with a proposed 12-month term and a not-to-exceed amount of \$900,000.
- b. No public comment.
- c. Motion:
 - Commissioner Lacoce moves to approve the consent calendar.
 - Commissioner Magee seconds the motion.
 - Votes: Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoce, Magee, Martley-Jordan, Moses, Rodriguez, and Spingola
 - Motion passes.

9. Future Agenda Items:

- a. No public comment. May: Diversion
- b.

10. Review and Approval of the Commission Meeting Minutes for March 13, 2024 and April 10, 2024:

- a. Motion:
 - a. Commissioner Rodriguez moves to approve minutes.
 - b. Commissioner Magee seconds.
 - c. No public comments.
 - d. Votes: Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoce, Magee, Martley-Jordan, Moses, Rodriguez, and Spingola
 - e. Motion passes.

11. Adjournment:

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 pm.