

Alameda County SB823 Subcommittee Minutes

2.25.21

JJCC Subcommittee Members Present:

Chief Still, ACPD
Eileen McAndrew, DA
Alphonso Mance, PD
Juan Taizan, ACBH
Hon. Ursula Jones Dickson
Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel
Monica Vaughan, ACOE

Vamsey Palagummi, JJDCP
Emily Young, DPN
Hayden Renato, Free Our Kids Coalition
Caryn Quezada, District 1 Representative
Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative
Trevor Arceneaux, District 4 Representative
Kelly Thompson, District 5 Representative

Meeting Participants:

Dr. Danielle Soto, Impact Justice
Donna Linton, Impact Justice
Brandon Miller, Impact Justice
Meryl Klein, CAO
Shahidah Lacy, BOS, D5
Chris Miley, BOS, D2
Rodney Brooks, PD
Brian Ford, ACPD
Adrienne Chambers, ACPD
Julie Marques, ACPD
Alicia Mitchell, ACPD

James Rivers, ACPD
Laura Chavez, ACPD
Robert Walton, ACPD
Tammy McGuire, ACPD
Charles Pattillo, ACPD
Charlie Eddie, Urban Strategies Council, Justice
Reinvestment Coalition
Laura Ridolfi, W. Haywood Burns Institute
Louise Anderson, JJDCP
Anna Kane, ACPD

1. Call to Order & Introductions
2. Minute Approvals
 - a. 2.11.21 & 2.18.21
 - i. Corrections: Several name misspellings to be fixed
 - ii. Rodney Brooks is not on the committee, as listed on 2/11; he's a guest
 - iii. Kelly Thompson: add attendance to 2/11
 - iv. Update Christopher Miley to reflect district 2
 - v. Update Shahidah Lacy to reflect district 5
 - vi. Update Charles Eddy to reflect Justice Reinvestment Coalition representation
 - b. Motion to approve made & seconded; minutes approved by unanimous consent, with 1 abstention (Andrea Zambrana due to absence at 2.18 meeting)

New Business

3. Data Request Updates

- a. See attached slides from Dr. Laura Chavez, ACPD
- b. Q&A:
 - i. Can we get a breakdown of the 6 youth who are waiting to be sent to DJJ, what crimes are they committed on?
 - 1. A: 1 robbery 2nd degree & and sexual penetration with force, 1murder, 1 assault with a firearm
 - ii. Do we have information on how many have HS diploma (21) breakdown of 6 who haven't gone to DJJ yet? Also how many will need a diploma/GED vs post-secondary education
 - 1. A: ACPD will present that info at next week's meeting
 - iii. Regarding the YLS/CMI assessment scores, is this self-reporting? Are parents interviewed?
 - 1. A: Combination of self-reporting and any documentation ACPD may have; the parents are interviewed, considered a collateral source, they maybe be able to confirm some of the categories on the assessment
 - iv. Does the YLS require an extensive one-one interview? Where does the example place youth on the risk scale?
 - 1. A: Yes, requires an interview; 0-2 low, 3-5 moderate, 6-8 high
 - v. If 3.5 is moderate do we have concerns about sending young people to DJJ with a moderate risk level?
 - 1. The YLS does not assess risk of violence, the tool identifies needs not a risk of violence. Need a validated tool for youth in detention, DJJ tool CA-YASI is validated. Requires in-depth interview of youth

4. Risk & Needs Assessments

- a. See attached slides
- b. Q&A:
 - i. Explain what PACT and CA-YASI are validated to predict, how will information be used to determine what young people on the secure track need?
 - 1. Tools not designed to indicate the level of security needed. Need separate screening tool for security level
 - ii. What about these tools has been validated so that it gives us important information about these young people, that is going to be used to figure out their needs, or how else will it be used? If these tools are used to determine a more intensive level of system involvement or if young person should be subject to secure track that needs to be highly investigated. If not, what information is from these tools is important to know for the young people and what their needs are when they're on the secure track.
 - 1. Tools not used to determine 823 youth. Secure track is crime committed, sentence how it's disposed, process of public defender, consul, DA, ultimately Judge is the decider. These tools used to determine the needs of youth, separate from secure track. These tools used after disposition.
 - 2. The underlying theoretical framework for these tools is that if we effectively provide treatment and service and programming aligned with needs of the youth, this will reduce recidivism. Have been validated to reduce recidivism when applied correctly. What validated indirectly is that it does appear that identifying needs, providing

treatment and services aligned with those needs reduces recidivism. We should also be thinking about other measures of success in terms of youth well-being, etc.

- iii. Is implementation and staff training within the scope of the plan were able to develop? Can we make recommendations on how staff gets trained and how often they get the refresher? Is that part of the consideration as we're moving forward selecting tools?
 - 1. yes we can add to the agenda, around staff training around assessment programming (parking lot)
- iv. How else will the information be used other than programming. Will they be used to determine sentence length?
 - 1. Assessment is used post-adjudication, it does not impact sentencing at all.

5. Programming, Treatment, & Gaps

- a. See attached slides
- b. Q&A

- i. Juan Taizan: Point of clarification: We do provide individualized treatment for severe mental health needs for youth in JJC. Most youth awaiting placement at DJJ do have comprehensive mental health assessments and individualized treatment plans. Increasing ability to provide evidence-based and promises practices around group treatment and family engagement. Looking to increase staff
 - 1. Some of the youth will be at JJC a long time, our current model is not set up for that. Something for the subcommittee to work on
- ii. Will SB 823 be able to participate in the existing JJC programs. Will there be limits around age?
 - 1. Yes. The intention for at least Phase A is to extend the existing programming that's happening at JJC to the new population, no limits on age. Any youth in JJC still under juvenile jurisdiction, will be treated as such.
- iii. Are providers going to be compatible with programming. Modifications to the programs will be needed.
 - 1. Programs offered at camp will be brought to JJC. In conversation with college for culinary course. Looking at partners like Google for computer technology and an apprenticeship program.

6. Subcommittee Roundtable Discussion

- a. Reminders from Dr. Soto re: shared Dropbox with the committee, sent the committee demographic information for review.
- b. Programming Gaps/Concerns
 - i. Will be enough and robust CBT for youth
 - ii. What will the visitation model be? Are we thinking about programming that incorporates youths' children?
 - 1. We have parenting programming at the camp that JJC will be looking at. Planning to update visitation space at JJC. Will address and detail in Phase A
 - iii. Need more clarity around what services behavioral health and education are going to be providing. Emphasis on Family therapy. Culturally responsive, social justice lens
 - iv. County should pay for therapy (CBT)



1. Therapy will be paid for by county or states fund. Seeking to end payphone fees and forgive fees that were collected in 2020. Going to board in march no later than April for approval
 - v. Wants interview or focus groups with youth at DJJ who spent time at JJC for input on what they see the needs are
 1. Impact Justice will look into interviewing youth at DJJ, plan on doing focus groups with youth who have been recently released from JJC, youth under community supervision and their families as well as staff and other stakeholders. Staff has a wealth of information on gaps.
 - vi. Juan Taizan: I will present more in-depth on what behavioral health offers. I want to be clear around what's in place, where we can expand, and what those models look like, building on what's in place. Clear on what our individualized model looks like. Will need support and input from committee members.
 - vii. Is vocational training and employment part of education
 1. Yes
7. Public Comment
- a. Update from Charlie Eddy: CA Supreme Court unanimously upheld the constitutionality of SB 1391. Is there room on the agenda to do updates on what's going on at state level around the office of youth and community restoration. How does what's happening at the state level affect county abilities?
 - i. Not going to impact 823. Not going to change legal requirements for what we need for July 1. Will keep the committee updated on Secure track, as this directly impacts what we're talking about. Draft secure track language has been released. Will ask Judge Dickson to speak to the committee. Will share the legislative language with the committee.

Meeting adjourned- 2:22