

Alameda County SB823 Subcommittee Minutes

3.11.21

SB 823 Subcommittee Members in Attendance:

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

Vamsey Palagummi, JJDPC
Emily Young, DPN
Hayden Renato, Free Our Kids Coalition
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

1. Call to Order & Roll Call
 - a. Chief Still at 12:31 pm
 - b. Roll Called by Adrienne Chambers
2. Minute Approvals
 - a. 2.25.21
 - i. Moved to approve
 - b. 3.4.21
 - i. Correct spelling of Juan Taizan's last name
 - ii. Moved to approve

New Business

3. Data Request Updates
 - a. See slides from Robert Walton, ACPD
 - b. Questions and Comments
 - i. None
4. Secure Track
 - a. See slides from Chief Wendy Still, ACPD
 - b. Questions and Comments
 - i. Interested in seeing what the 779 process will look like. Interested in what the language will look like regarding the possibility of holding a youth one year longer than their sentence.
 - ii. Is the baseline term the maximum set by the judge or is it based on the category of offense?
 1. A: It's the maximum set by the judge.
 - iii. Do we know when the language will be finalized?
 1. A: No, but it is close to being finalized.
5. Presentation from Alameda County Office of Education



- a. See slide from Monica Vaughan, ACOE
 - b. Questions and Comments
 - i. Appreciate the CTE component. We want to build a model that will prepare our students for a pathway to a career. We should have conversations with trades in the Bay Area about apprenticeships for our youth. SB 823 students should have access to weekly job training while in JJC.
 - ii. Is the plan to blend JJC kids with the SB 823 kids in the same classroom?
 1. A: ACOE open to as much flexibility as can be exercised.
6. Discussion of Plan A Draft
- a. See slides for Dr. Soto, IJ
 - b. Questions and Comments
 - i. Are we considering the use of focus groups comprised of youth currently at DJJ, as we youth we will be serving under SB 823?
 1. A: Yes, we are planning listening sessions with youth at DJJ; current and former JJC youth, family members, and caretakers of impact youth, stay at JJC including Behavioral Health and ACOE staff and advocates from the community.
 - ii. Is possible to get photos, video, or a virtual tour of the units and rooms, to get a look at what it looks like from the youth's perspective?
 1. A: Yes. ACPD will provide at future date.
 - iii. We will have a workgroup dedicated to facilities; plan to bring in architects to help think through what is possible; will be hearing from members of BSCC as well.
 - iv. How much outside time will youth receive?
 1. A: That will depend on the program we come up with. The BCSS sets the minimum standard; we'll do more than the minimum standard.
 - v. Will SB 823 youth be able to leave the facility if they obtain jobs before their release?
 1. A: Anything that's designed would have to have the court's approval, but that is the goal.
 - vi. Will the secure track actually be secure?
 1. A: What we know is secure track means the time inside a secure facility; rehabilitative and public safety. The legislation is being written that allows for part of the time to be spent on a reentry basis; that court will decide that.
 - vii. In reference to language found in Section 2, "trends have demonstrated an increase in adjudications for serious and violent felonies"; is it possible to put any amount of data there as a point of reference?
 1. A: Yes.
 - viii. Erin Palacios sent an email to the subcommittee with questions and comments pertaining to sections 1 & 2.
 - ix. In reference to language found in Section 2, "Consistent with statewide trends, ACPD has experienced a decline in detained youth. However, there has been an increase in the number of youth with petitions with increasing severity, both in terms of criminal sophistication and needs". What is that based on and has the

pandemic played a role in this? If that is the case maybe we won't see an increase in more crimes and dispositional findings. I feel like that a huge assumption.

1. A: We will provide the statics and data that support the final language that we come up with.
 - x. The DJJ needs didn't actually look high; there weren't a lot of high risks. The data we saw didn't square with that.
 - c. Subcommittee Roundtable Discussion
 - i. Chief Still: We are not receiving any youth back from DJJ on July 1. In the future DJJ may approach the county; they have not done that and we are not planning for that as part of SB 823. July 1 we have to be ready to open our doors with staffing, a full program that meets the requirements of SB 823. We do not have our plan finalized. Phase A has to be presented to the board in April; it has to include, staff package and program elements. We have to officially notice the unions. We are drafting an interim plan that will us to be ready July 1, with the understanding that the final plan is not due to the State until January 2022. There will be input from the SB 823 subcommittee, the community, family members, youth in JJC, youth in DJJ, and youth who have come back from DJJ will shape the final plan; which the subcommittee will draft together. The cover letter to the board will clearly state this is an interim plan and the cover letter will be made available to the subcommittee before it is submitted.
 - ii. Will contracts with the unions tie our hands with regards to the final plan we develop? How long will that contract last?
 1. A: It does not tie our hands. This is the meet and confer, this isn't part of the MOU, this won't be part of the contract. When the final plan is done we will meet with the unions again.
 - iii. Will the cover letter be shared with the subcommittee?
 1. A: Yes.
 - iv. Where is visitation happening and what does it look; it's traumatic for children to enter environments that don't look homelike; for younger siblings as well.
 1. A: We will put it on the agenda for either next week are the following week to have a deeper discussion on this.
 - d. Additional Editing Meeting Needed?
 - i. Can there be an agenda with times so that we can join where we feel we could add the most value?
 1. A: Yes, but some parts might take more make time.
7. Public Comment
- i. Are we considering integrating ethnic studies into the educational programming of our youth?
 1. A: We will pose the question to Monica Vaughan and will bring that back for discussion at the next meeting; agreeing and understanding how important that is for their curriculum and the program.
 - ii. What models outside of the current youth punitive paradigm has ACPD explored?



1. A: We are not exploring a punitive paradigm; the plan states that. The goal is for it to be rehabilitative programming; bring services that help the youth be successful in their educational goals and in reentry.
 - iii. Guest: Pleased to hear the Phase A plan is temporary. SB 823 gives us an opportunity to fundamentally rethink what healing can look like; the juvenile justice realignment block grant funds and the plan that the committee must develop gives us an opportunity to rethink the model we want to invest in. Hope that as we shift to Plan B I hope we develop a plan that honors youths' humanity and sees their potential outside of a custodial setting and outside of a punishment model.
 - iv. Guest: My concern is if we're going to have to build on this Phase A plan; I want to make sure this Phase A plan is bounded in time and in resources, that we don't invest so many resources in this Phase A plan that we can then no longer pivot away from it; the Phase A plan is about putting young people in Juvenile Hall, which is not something we want to see in the Phase B plan; assuming we're all on the same page about a rehabilitative model.
8. Next Steps
 9. Meeting Adjournment- 2:31 pm