

Alameda County SB823 Subcommittee Minutes 10.14.21

12:30pm - 2:30pm

Virtual Meeting Information Below

[Teams Link: Computer or Mobile](#)

Or call in (audio only)

+1 415-915-3950,,338306473#<tel:+14159153950,,338306473#> United States, San Francisco

Phone Conference ID: 338 306 473#

[Find a Local Number](#)

[Meeting Options](#)

SB 823 Subcommittee Members in Attendance:

Interim Chief Marcus Dawal, ACPD
Matthew Golde, ACDA
Alphonso Mance, PD
Michelle Love, ACSS
Juan Taizan, ACBH
Monica Vaughan, ACOE
Hon. Ursula Jones-Dickson
Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel
Sgt. Young OPD
Vamsey Palagummi, JJDP

Emily Young, DPN
Ericson Amaya, FOK
Caryn Quezada, District 1 Representative
Davida Scott, District 2 Representative
Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative
Trevor Arceneaux, District 4
Representative
Kelly Thompson, District 5 Representative
Xochtil Larios, Youth Representative

1. Call to Order & Roll Call
 - a. Call to order by Interim Chief Dawal at 12:30
 - b. Deputy Chief Chambers took roll call
2. Approval of Minutes
 - a. 10.7.21
 - i. No corrections or comments to minutes
 - ii. Al Mance moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Juan Taizan
 1. Unanimously approved
3. Opening Remarks
 - a. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Want to acknowledge that last week's meeting was facilitated differently due to the urgency of finalizing the plan. Update on secure track youth: 2 youth have been committed to secure track, currently using Plan A, emphasize the need for a new plan. Some may feel apprehensive about the pace of the meeting, but we have only this meeting and one more before voting on 10/28. The goal is to review 30 lines of edits and come to a consensus. The 3-minute timeline per section is not to limit discussion -- have met in subcommittee and workgroups, emphasizing that time is of the essence to finalize the plan. Can achieve goals if we focus and keep to a timeline. Appreciate IJ facilitation and overview of sections, done in the spirit of Emily and Monica's viewpoints to go over themes and

comments by Erin and Vamsey on paying attention to details. Trying to balance. We hope to vote on consensus from last week's discussion. Hope to come to a consensus on a comprehensive plan.

4. Alameda County SB823 Realignment Plan - Review
 - a. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: We will go over the summary in the chart, hoping to move through items where there is consensus. Pilar will summarize and review core programming (pg 25-38) and Brandon will review reentry (38-45). Reiterating that it is our plan to start and end this meeting on time, adhere to time constraints, and move through. We are still asking folks to raise hands and wait to be called on, you will be muted if it is not your turn to speak. Important to hear a variety of voices. The 3-minute time limit will allow us to adhere to the time for each section. Difficult to see the chat so if you want to say something, use the raise your hand feature. If someone else has already made your point, lower your hand. My job is to move this forward, please help me to do that, doing it in the spirit of respect.
 - b. Core Programming (pg. 25-38)
 - i. Pilar Victoria, Impact Justice: Summarized core programming edits and suggestions
 1. Line 41: ACPD suggests deleting the text in column D as SB 823 does not provide funding for an expert consultant or call for local evaluation, IJ recommends rejecting this change as the subcommittee has committed to oversight.
 2. Line 42: Clarifying question: does ACPD already provide family finding services? IJ's recommendation will depend on the answer.
 3. Line 43: Andrea requested clarification on the makeup of success team/MDT, added language defines youth success team. Revision made based on last week's meeting, expanded to include members of the youth counsel team as members of MDT.
 4. Line 44: Edit to language by ACPD, exploring a program where youth are paid for their work.
 5. Line 45: Erin and Vamsey's specific proposal for a youth income plan, interested in hearing from ACPD and other subcommittee members.
 - ii. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Questions on Lines 41-45?
 1. Erin Palacios requested an answer to the question in line 42
 - a. Chief Dawal referred to Deputy Chief Chambers to answer
 - b. Deputy Chief Chambers, ACPD: Family finding begins at the introduction to the system on the front end, ACPD currently has a contract with a foster family agency to provide extensive family finding services.
 - c. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: The question is if this would just be an extension of the ongoing service? Is that correct?
 - d. Deputy Chief Chambers, ACPD: Yes, that service is available to any youth served by ACPD.

- e. Alphonso Mance, PD: In this context, how would the kid access that service? This language clarifies that we're going to do this.
 - 2. Alphonso Mance, PD: Is line 41 intended to say we're going to continue with the consultants we have had to help us?
 - a. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Based on the discussion last week, probation stated there is no funding, however, IJ recommends saying we will have consultants, rejecting probation's proposed language
- iii. Pilar Victoria, Impact Justice: Continuing to review lines 47-52
 - 1. Line 47: Clarification by ACPD to define inside/outside model
 - 2. Line 48: Linked to a footnote that is redundant, content is included within the document
 - 3. Line 49: ACPD has expanded language
 - 4. Line 50: Original text makes reference to the importance of sleep, IJ suggests rejecting ACPD suggestion to specify inline with Title 15 requirements, as subcommittee wants to go beyond minimum legal requirements
 - 5. Line 51: Request for clarification by Andrea Zambrana
 - 6. Line 52: Two components
 - a. Makes reference to sample programming table, concerns expressed on sample schedule by subcommittee members because it did not include time for education or school activities. IJ's suggestion is to delete the table on page 34 and replace it with a sample schedule provided by Dr. Khumalo. Addresses both concerns addressed about time allocation for education and Dr. Khumalo's suggestion not to over program youth. Should start mid-afternoon and last no more than 90 minutes per best practices.
 - b. Refers to edits that were made by IJ, added a sentence about variation in weekend schedules
 - 7. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Are there questions or concerns in this section?
 - a. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Line 49: Was "Credible Messenger" deleted?
 - i. Pilar Victoria, Impact Justice: ACPD's suggestion is to expand the language so that it isn't limited to Credible Messenger or therapeutically trained animals.
 - ii. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Understand that the language is more expansive but the words Credible Messenger were deleted.
 - 8. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Clarification on Line 51?
 - a. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: The language came out of the core programming group, what can we do to provide clarification?

- b. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Timing question, whether the daily schedule is going to be given to the subcommittee prior to the annual realignment plan?
 - c. Brian Ford, ACPD: Is your question when the subcommittee will receive the daily schedule? Tough question to answer -- also need to consider the frequency with which the subcommittee will meet, hasn't been determined yet.
 - d. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: What is probation envisioning?
 - e. Brian Ford, ACPD: It wasn't our language.
 - f. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: I can clarify. Clunky language but the point is just that in the next iterations of annual planning, the subcommittee will review the existing daily schedule prior to approving plans.
 - 9. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: Line 49: Language changes the overall paragraph in that it makes everything something that will be pursued, whereas before it was "will find" the things that are listed. Not just a tiny change.
 - 10. Judge Jones-Dickson, Juvenile Court Representative: No objection to therapeutically trained animals but we have found in court that some people in Oakland are not fond of animals/dogs, some fear of dogs, here we seem to assume that everybody has the same feeling about animals, and if a therapeutically trained animal is around kids it should be individual, have had that situation in court, may not be comfortable
 - a. Antoinette Davis: IJ team will look at language again
 - 11. Alphonso Mance, PD: Line 50: Minimum required standards, existing MOUs are vague, can we get a sense of what those are referring to?
 - a. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: We can ask for probation but want to clarify that IJ is rejecting this language.
 - b. Alphonso Mance, PD: Withdraw the question.
- iv. Pilar Victoria: Reviewing changes to Line 46
 - 1. Pilar Victoria, Impact Justice: This pertains to the programmatic advisory subcommittee. Two main suggestions: 1 from ACPD -- in red. Significant revisions from Erin and Vamsey -- in green. First through ACPD: proposes that language should be the Programmatic Advisory Subcommittee of the Youth Advisory Council to allow ACPD to leverage FLY's existing contract. Reflected later in paragraph and final paragraph. IJ and ACPD edit incorporated, provide YAC with relevant program outcomes. Other significant revisions from Erin and Vamsey, keep the language that refers to the Programmatic Advisory Subcommittee, who they would

be, and how it would be structured. Following paragraph, minor edits: Chief and Presiding Judge, second edit composition of Programmatic Advisory Subcommittee. The final sentence would work closely with other relevant stakeholders.

- a. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Pilar, will you clarify the main differences between the two proposals?
- b. Pilar Victoria, Impact Justice: The main difference is the first revision by ACPD -- rather than this being a programmatic subcommittee, proposed as the Youth Advisory Council. Erin and Vamsey's proposal is to keep the Programmatic Advisory Subcommittee of the JJDP.
- c. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDP: To clarify, we added language for the ACJJDP, existing members to support probation and community with what's needed. The Youth Advisory Council just got started, adding additional duties that were not originally thought about is not reasonable at this point. ACJJDP already has statutory authority to have access to programs, really tried to discuss where there is already existing statutory authority to do this well; which is why we picked the ACJJDP advisory subcommittee versus the YAC; we included language that we would partner with them as well.
- d. Judge Jones-Dickson, Juvenile Court Representative: JJDP's subcommittee is a discussion that needs to be had with the court; when this came out the membership was confusing; it was stated as members from the JJDP and community members, this is problematic because JJDP has the ability to review things and confidentiality issues with the community. Need to clarify, currently written as adding by JJDP subcommittee which should come through court. Seems to me the youth should have the biggest voice, YAC should be the ones talking about situations like those they were in or are in. Most importantly to hear from youth in the community.
- e. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Understand Vamsey's points, discussed during workgroup, Judge mentioned I think it's a natural fit for the YAC, acknowledge that it's a new body but gives youth voice to give recommendations to probation which is really what the council is put in place to do, natural fit to allow youth to provide recommendations.
- f. Raymond Lara, County Council: Concerning are confidential materials, I'm not too familiar with the council, believe it was created under a different statutory scheme, I don't see any reference to this

under SB 823, as I read it and seeing the council, jurisdictions seem to be different because SB 823 deals with 707b and DJJ commitment; the council statute predates that.

- g. Trevor Arceneaux, District 4 Representative: Echo what Vamsey shared, important that YAC or a programmatic advisory subcommittee falls under JJDP, as it's written in the plan, this subcommittee would be responsible for proposing extensions, RFPs, not really the purpose of a youth advisory council. Ways our young people can support that process but the concern is that if we didn't align with JJDP, would the FLY advisory council be responsible for those types of responsibilities?
 - h. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: Important to point out that the point is to have an independent group providing advice, not one contracted with probation. Lots of what is in this plan aren't directly reflected in the statute.
 - i. Judge Jones-Dickson, Juvenile Court Representative: I think this is a huge grab to be asking to review RFP; the expectation would not be that the YAC would review RFPs, they would share their opinions on what types of services would be important, I think that this is an interesting grab by JJDP, don't know that a subcommittee is appropriate; this conversation should be had with the court if the subcommittee is appropriate and what scope should be.
- v. Pilar Victoria, Impact Justice: Reviewing Lines 53-60
- 1. Lines 53 and 54 refer to the same paragraph, language modified by ACPD in 53, IJ in 54 reflecting conversation with the Education workgroup.
 - 2. Line 55: Change reflects Education workgroup meeting. IJ noted concerns about providing specialized services, can we clarify whether these are already assessed by IEPs?
 - 3. Line 56: IEP clarification requested by Andrea -- who determines what is needed?
 - 4. Lines 57 and 58: ACPD suggests deleting two lines that refer to existing programs. IJ suggests to reject, using this program as an example, could further modify to say ACPD "could consider."
 - 5. Line 59: Modified to access to hands-on learning activities provided when feasible
 - 6. Line 60: Too vague, modified to say that ACPD will make this a priority, IJ notes that other vital documents are included in Reentry
- vi. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Clarification on Line 55: Are speech, language, etc. included in IEPs?

1. Monica Vaughan, ACOE: Yes, included, we have a speech and language pathologist and OT services, which are much rarer and are handled through a contract
- vii. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Clarification on Line 56?
 1. Monica Vaughan, ACOE: Needs can be observed or questioned at any time, not necessarily in situations assumed in a comment. Requests can be made by anyone, most frequently from a teacher or other school personnel, guardian, or another advocate, but only move forward with approval of educational rights holders.
- viii. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Pressing questions for this section?

None, moving to the next section.
- c. Reentry: Brandon Miller summarized Lines 62-71
 - i. Brandon Miller, Impact Justice: reviewing Lines 62-65
 1. Line 62: ACPD suggestion to delete Column D language, workgroup unaware if we would know when youth released, ACPD said baseline term would be known
 2. Line 63: Will return to review, Trevor Arceneaux provided additions
 3. Line 64: Workgroup provided specific language that Reentry Case Manager comes from outside of probation, ACPD recommends it's within ACPD, for the committee to discuss.
 4. Line 65: Based on last week's discussion, IJ clarified that ACPD and Defense counsel will work together as a reentry case manager
 - ii. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Questions or comments on this section?
 1. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Line 62? What is your suggestion?
 - a. Brandon Miller, Impact Justice: IJ suggests deleting the language because it's irrelevant
 2. Emily Young, DPN: General question about Reentry Case Manager role: inconsistent throughout, as we figure out if it's ACPD or CBO, very unclear where they show up and in what capacity, the subcommittee has talked about the importance of them being consistent but not reflected in the full document.
 - a. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: IJ will adjust that
 - iii. Line 63: Reviewing Trevor's comments
 1. Brandon Miller reviewed suggestions in the document
 2. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Trevor added a lot of contexts: next section, one thing needs discussion, several things we highlighted and suggested rejecting because the court will have to determine feasibility. May warrant further discussion beyond what we have here. The final section - other suggestions we suggested rejecting.
 3. Judge Jones-Dickson, Juvenile Court Representative: Request to review every 60-90 days with the court, the court needs to

determine when reviews need to occur, can't be legislated; it's a separation of power issue. Part of the secondary recommendations for court input are similar but probably would be the same answer, days the court has to have a progress hearing, will be individual to the child.

4. Alfonso Mance, PD: Line 65 talking about reentry, having a reentry coordinator, in the past probation has partnered with the public defender or other representatives, seems like it's now going to be handled by ACPD and that concerns me. There is an advantage to having at least coordination with groups outside of ACPD.
 5. Trevor Arceneaux, District 4 Representative: Regarding the reentry phase notes: really consider 1) having youth identified community supports as part of the MDT process, can be CBOs or pastor, families should have that opportunity 2) needs to be a shift from having reentry planning happening in phase 3 to phase 2, if we're bringing outside people in, the reentry case manager can be instrumental in that process
- iv. Brian Ford, ACPD: Line 64: Briefly, we can modify that language, what we understood was one or the other, but in hindsight, both exist, have an internal person but also have a current CBO contractor that does it for our DJJ population and will continue with SB 823 population
 - v. Brandon Miller: Reviewed Lines 66-71
 1. Line 66 and 67: employment opportunities for youth, ACPD language is more expensive to services based on residence throughout the county
 2. Line 67: Emphasize importance for youth who are justice-involved
 3. Line 68: Suggestion from Monica, more expansive language to include full transcripts
 4. Lines 69, 70, 71 have to do with step down option:
 - a. Line 69: ACPD suggested deleting, IJ suggests rearranging language to the appropriate section
 - b. Line 70: Provide youth with an SB823 handbook on programming
 - c. Line 71: Request for clarification from Andrea. Still, standing?
 - i. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: No.
 - vi. Emily Young, DPN: Line 66: want to state on the record that there is more available for Oakland, was glad to see South County originally mentioned because Oakland is more heavily resourced than Hayward.
5. Proposed Action Regarding "Edits to Pgs 3-25"
 - a. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: We are asking the subcommittee for a vote. This section of the plan, pages 3-25 were reviewed in detail 3 weeks ago, and one week ago reviewed suggested edits that were suggested by subcommittee members in the intervening time frame. The table

represents the edits to pages 3-25 from last week, and that we are recommending for a mass motion vote. The motion we would like the subcommittee to consider is "to adopt the edits to the plan as represented in column E of the Proposed Mass Motion spreadsheet noting that there are two items (rows 19 and 35) where we are rejecting the suggested edits and keeping the language as is". Following a motion, and second, we will have subcommittee comments, then public comment, and then the vote.

- b. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDPC: Motion to adopt the mass motion but removing 18, 23, 35
 - i. Caryn Quezada, District 1 Representative: Second
- c. Subcommittee Discussion on Motion:
 - i. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: Confused by our process.
 - ii. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Going to ask the Chief as Chair to speak next
 - iii. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Speaking to the motion on the table, emphasize that we have reviewed and discussed these items, in the best interest to move forward
 - iv. Juan Taizan, ACBH: Wondering why we're pulling those three out? What is the justification?
 - v. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: Clarification on the process? Motion for a mass vote, did that happen?
 - vi. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Yes.
 - vii. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: We need to figure out which process we're following, didn't vote on whether people will be required to make a mass vote, anybody can pull something out, can't have a majority rule vote to make everybody consider all the items as one vote, would need to vote on things that people aren't asking to pull out. Motions that have to do with curtailing discussion under Roberts rules require a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority work if we're going to use it to curtail on discussion, otherwise, we need to remove the items
 - viii. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDPC: I withdraw the motion
 - ix. Alphonso Manse, PD: If that motion goes, it will be easy to have the vote on the other ones, tabling 18, 23, and 35 this vote will move us along
 - x. Juan Taizan, ACBH: In alignment with Erin, we're having the discussion, before we vote on pulling those three out
 - xi. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: You don't have to agree to have independent votes, you have to agree to have a mass vote.
 - xii. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Suggests that Ray comment on Erin's question
 - xiii. Raymond Lara, County Counsel: Don't know if this subcommittee has adopted Robert's rules specifically, that being said, a motion that is on the table can't be withdrawn, has been seconded. Motion, as it is, doesn't raise any concern, no reason for a $\frac{2}{3}$ requirement, board of supervisors customarily have a mass motion and will pull items for discussion as was done here.
 - xiv. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: No issue provided that we are able to pull items.

- xv. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Will turn to Donna and continue with the discussion
- xvi. Judge Jones-Dickson, Juvenile Justice Representative: To Juan's point, asking this question in hopes that we may not have to pull all of those. If we can discuss, maybe we can come to a consensus. Form over substance, we need to have the discussion.
- xvii. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Had asked Vamsey for an explanation of those three items.
- xviii. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDPC: Line 35: based on youth feedback, the most stress anxiety in parole hearings, Column E says that we'll work to create a process that avoids anger reported in the focus group IJ convened. Line 23: Expands language into the purpose of what we're doing, talking about the expansive use of family, don't understand why it would be taken out. Line 18: Having a broad expansive definition of MDTs makes the most sense, every MDT has used folks the youth want to be involved...Oh, see the recommendation is adopted, maybe that isn't the one.
- xix. Alphonso Mance, PD: Commented on the changes made last week on Line 18 after hearing comments, green language is okay, spoke to social workers who were involved in MDTs, the advantage of social workers is that if we get a kid who might go to DJJ we assign a social worker, the only person that is there from day one, excluding that person from the MDT out of hand is a mistake. When I spoke up last week I was wrong, I need to correct that.
- xx. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Maybe some confusion. IJ suggesting adding the language in green. Would Vamsey like to amend his motion?
- xxi. Alphonso Mance, PD: Green language does not allow social workers to participate. Amend language to allow social workers the opportunity to participate in the MDT.
- xxii. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Had revised language in another section, language that explained that this involved the social worker. If we need to revise we can.
- xxiii. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Green language is that MDTs will consult regularly which is different from having them in the meetings. To Al's point, the language is not adopting what I was asking for.
- xxiv. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: My understanding on Line 18 is that the MDT will be meeting either weekly or biweekly, that a team of folks will be meeting and reviewing individuals in secure track as well as how the therapeutic milieu is functioning. Whether or not it's possible to have the social worker at weekly or biweekly meetings is a scheduling concern. Reason for keeping language flexible, social workers would be on the success team, but the frequency of MDT meetings and needing to review programming is why social workers are not included.
- xxv. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: How do folks want to move forward?

- xxvi. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Need to continue. Have the motion on the table and a second, need to open for public comment.
- xxvii. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Restating motion: Adopt the edits to the plan as represented in column E of the proposed items for the mass motion spreadsheet, noting that there are two items where we are rejecting suggested language. Vamsey modified by removing 18, 23, 35. Seconded by Caryn.
- xxviii. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDPC: Are there any other items people want to pull out before we move forward?
- xxix. Raymond Lara, County Counsel: This would have to be done by another motion or an amendment if we're going to go with a mass motion.
- xxx. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: Amended motion: Have a mass vote on the items that are here except for items 4, 5, 8, 18, 23, 27, 35.
- xxxi. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDPC: Seconded
- xxxii. Raymond Lara, County Counsel: Confirmed that we have a proper motion
- xxxiii. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Discussion by the subcommittee
- xxxiv. Emily Young: Clarifying question: Voting on all the items other than the ones Erin said?
1. Erin Palacios, District 3 Representative: Approving the items not pulled
- xxxv. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Quickly want to reiterate that we're really going to derail this process and it's unfortunate, everybody knows the timeline, we discussed the items, discussed them in workgroups, it's unfortunate that we're going in this direction.
- xxxvi. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Most discussed section of the plan thus far, 3 weeks ago, last week, the table was distributed to subcommittee members this week along with the agenda, and this was the day set for a vote.
- xxxvii. Michelle Love, ACSS: Time to call the question and move to the vote.
- xxxviii. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: need to open to public comment.
- xxxix. Rodney Brooks, Public Defender: Clarification -- way that the motion is now, Line 19 is included, and if everyone votes for that, would you be accepting or rejecting IJ's vote?
1. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Accepting IJ's recommendations. So rejecting Lines 19 and 35.
- xl. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Are there public comments?
- xli. Yasmin Tager, Free Our Kids Coalition: Reiterate appreciation that these items are being pulled out, especially with item 35, we invited people to share their thoughts, and don't understand why we wouldn't adopt language in 35. Line 23 target population in the law does include youth charged with 707b offenses, taking that out does indicate that this won't be a priority for the subcommittee either which is concerning. Line item 19, language of regularly consult is not the same as people on defense team which is important, with regard

to scheduling can be taken up but shouldn't preclude social worker being involved.

- xlii. Sandy, Organizer with Urban Peace Movement, Free Our Kids Coalition: Highlight that the information for this meeting was incorrect, hearing frustration that we've had enough time, unfortunate that we're not able to support community members who would be impacted to join the meeting, respectfully request that link in the agenda be updated, so we can try to make this accessible to the community. Continue expressing concern on how rushed the process is, and young people need to be more involved, hearing that there's not enough research on CBOs, etc, it is part of this subcommittee to reimagine the justice system, work with young people and families, and loved ones, thinking about broader impact to families, communities, culture. Getting to the root of issues, feel concerned that that's not everyone's commitment in the committee, feels rushed, decisions will have a large impact, want to slow down to include voices of young people and families
- xliv. Natasha Baker, Alameda County Resident, Civil Rights Attorney, former Juvenile Defense Attorney: Comment in support of Free Our Kids coalition reservations. Highlight specifically the proposal to allow for the use of pepper spray, chokeholds, solitary confinement as they transition from DJJ to county facilities. This is child abuse, this proposal would be legalizing child abuse if a parent did these things they could be charged with assault and battery among other things, but because the government it's okay, strongly disagree with this. Also exposing the county to legal liability and goes against the purpose of DJJ realignment which is recognizing the systemic abuse at the state level, don't want to replicate that at the county level, and reiterate the importance of setting accessible links
- xlv. Donna Linto: For clarification, the use of pepper spray is not included in the mass motion. The motion is to recommend the adoption of items as suggested in column E, recognizing that there are two lines, 19 and 35, where we are rejecting edits, and removing items 4, 5, 8, 18, 23, 35.
- xlvi. Deputy Chief Chambers called a Roll Call vote
- xlvi. Motion passed, 12 in favor, 5 opposed
- d. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: We have 10 minutes remaining, public comment on matters that are not a part of the agenda, or return to items that were excluded from mass motion?
 - i. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Open to public comment
- 6. Opportunity for members of the public to comment on anything not on today's agenda
 - a. Natasha Mahia, Resident of Alameda County, Policy Analyst at NICJR, Member of Free Our Kids Coalition: On agenda, Microsoft Teams link not working, have had issues getting into the meeting today and last few meetings, hope that we can correct the link going forward. Reiterate concerns about the use of pepper spray, hope we can see that eliminated. Also want to speak to something missing from these conversations, SB 823

requires a plan to provide youth programming for everyone who would have gone to DJJ, not just secure track, the concern is that we will see net widening, would like the subcommittee to commit to ensuring that we don't see youth detained on secure track, rather than focusing on ways for youth to heal through community-based alternatives.

7. Next Steps

- a. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Intend to bring forward a table that will represent the conversation today on Reentry and Core Programming, as well as 6 items pulled from mass motion today. Additional new material from the plan needs to be discussed. On October 21, we have critical items to discuss and agree on so that on the 28th of October the subcommittee can take a vote on the full plan. A lot of work ahead for next Thursday's meeting and we will need to adhere to the same process as today to get to the various edits suggested to the plan.
- b. Andrea Zambrana, Conflict Counsel: Request for the table: printed out table at 9 am, has changed, understand it's a living document but would be good to embed a timestamp so I can know that the version I printed might be different
- c. Vamsey Palagummi, JJDP: Since next week is our last meeting, hope we can make a motion to expand the time we have, option as well and want to present that to folks since next week is the last meeting
- d. Kelly Thompson, District 5 Representative: Comments in the chat, folks asking if the public comment had finished, and hand function not working for everyone, are there people who wanted to make public comments that couldn't do it?
- e. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Are there members of the public who would like to speak?
- f. Al Mance, PD: Suggestion -- people can send Dani or you or Antoinette their top three problems, so we know ahead of time and can concentrate our time in those areas, maybe would help to streamline
- g. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Want to address some issues with the link, will follow up immediately after the meeting, don't know that we have anything to do with raised hand but will follow up on that also, know we're asking a lot of public and subcommittee but please review documents
- h. Judge Jones-Dickson, Juvenile Court Representative: If we have a few minutes, we can go through things that could be easy write-offs, regarding dates for progress reports for reentry, should be easy enough to address that and leave less on our plate.
- i. Donna Linton, Impact Justice: Can accommodate that in the mass motion next week. When you receive the agenda next Monday, it will include scheduling time and a new mass motion table
- j. Antoinette Davis, Impact Justice: Can we have a motion to adjourn?
- k. Interim Chief Dawal, ACPD: Motion to adjourn
 - i. Alphonso Manse, PD: Seconded
 - ii. Meeting adjourned at 2:29 pm