

Planning Template for DJJ Realignment Subcommittee Topic Areas

Topic Area: Settings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Limited options for behavioral health treatment:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(C) Family engagement in programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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