



**MENDOCINO COUNTY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL (JJCC)  
SB 823 SUBCOMMITTEE  
FINAL & APPROVED MINUTES  
Monday, August 30, 2021  
Virtual Meeting**

**1. Call To Order:**

Meeting Called to order at 3:07 p.m.

**1a) Welcome**

Chief Locatelli welcomes everyone to meeting.

**1b) Introductions**

Everyone knows each other. No public attendance present. Introductions are not necessary. Chief Locatelli commences with visual rollcall.

**1c) Additions or Corrections to Agenda**

Additions to August 30, 2021 agenda - Added section 3e) Review, Discussion and Approval of Draft Language Part 8: Data (WIC 1995(c)(7)).

**2. Public Comment for items not on agenda**

*Members of the public are welcome to address the JJCC SB 823 Subcommittee on items not listed on the agenda, but within the jurisdiction of the JJCC SB 823 Subcommittee. The JJCC SB 823 Subcommittee is prohibited by law from taking action on matters not on the agenda. Individuals wishing to address the JJCC SB 823 Subcommittee under Public Expression are welcome to do so via email at [jjcc@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:jjcc@mendocinocounty.org). All correspondence received by 8:00 A.M. the day of the meeting will be attached to the item.*

No Public Comment.

**3. Consent Calendar**

**3a) Approval of Minutes of August 16, 2021**

Sheryn Hildebrand makes motion to approve SB 823 meeting minutes from August 16, 2021 with the three corrections Chief Locatelli explained. Tawney Fernandez seconds the motion. Kim Turner states she abstains due to her not attending the last meeting.

Voting commenced. All in favor. No nays. Kim Turner abstains. Katie Ford and David Barrett abstain as they are not voting members. Motion passes with corrections.

**3b) Review, Discussion and Approval of Language Edits as discussed at the August 16, 2021 meeting as to Part 3: Programs and Services (WIC 1995 (c)(2)), Part 4:**



### **Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Funds (WIC 1995(c)(3)(a-f)) and Part 5: Facility Plan (WIC 1995(c)(4)) of the DJJ Plan**

Kim Turner makes motion to approve part 3, 4, and 5 plan edits as discussed at the last meeting. Tawney Fernandez seconds the motion.

Bekkie Emery thought parts 3, 4, and 5 had been approved at the last meeting. Katie Ford clarifies these are new drafts with edits that include a few new changes. Katie Ford states the red items represent the current changes made at the last meeting. Chief Locatelli explains that parts 3, 4, and 5 have already been approved and at this point they are adding any additions or making changes based on last meetings recommendations.

Voting commenced. Unanimous vote. All in favor. No nays. Katie Ford and David Barrett abstained from voting. Motion passes.

### **3c) Review, Discussion and Approval of Draft Language Part 6: Retaining the Target Population in the Juvenile Justice System (WIC 1995(c)(5)) of the DJJ Plan**

Chief Locatelli introduces part 6 draft language by stating that the section is new information written in the plan as a draft. Katie Ford explains that part 6 addresses how we will retain the target population and not refer the youth to the adult system. Katie Ford states part 6 talks about what our processes will look like when working with the youth, for example involving the youth on their own case planning development. Katie Ford talks about how we will be using the transition plan committee, our multidisciplinary team, by having them review the youth's progress and then having recommendations if they have additional ideas on how to engage the youth. After having a final review process with herself or the chief on recommendations to the courts if it gets to that point of potentially considering filing a motion for a transfer from the juvenile courts.

Kate Gaston expresses her concern of the importance of providing information like the number of staff working with the youth and what organizations will be in charge. Kate Gaston feels it is missing a human element as to how and why this will be different versus systems. She states it is missing who will be involved in ensuring these youth get the connections with humans that they haven't had most of their lives, which is why they have been in continuing cases to fail the system. Kate Gaston feels it would be beneficial to call out the quality of what we anticipate doing as the connections we make with the youth through the funding we are giving through all the programs we will be leading them through versus just checking off another box on the list.



Sheryn Hildebrand suggests changing the word foster to allow on the first paragraph, line three because she thought it meant foster youth. Sheryn Hildebrand reminds Kate

Gaston that the information she would like added in has already been added in part three. Kate Gaston states she sees no concern with repeating the information in another section because, in her opinion, there isn't as much depth as she would like it to have.

Chief Locatelli explains that there is a concern that with no Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), the criminal system could be willing to pass more kids who would have been eligible for DJJ to receive services in the Juvenile Justice system and sentence them straight to an adult prison.

Alexander Diener discusses a case they had earlier this year before June 1st 2021, where a decision was made to commit a minor to DJJ because DJJ was still an option at the time. Alexander Diener states he could see it becoming an issue now that we aren't going to have DJJ facilities at the state level.

Chief Locatelli states that his thoughts are the same as Alexander Diener. Chief Locatelli states it is more about pre-plea dispositions to decide whether we trust there are enough rehabilitation programming at local levels. Or in the secure tracks with other counties to not see a spike of 25 to 45% of cases moving from the juvenile courts into the adult courts only because there isn't trust in the local DJJ system. Chief Locatelli clarifies that it is also part of the plan that was written that we would work with a consortium and secure track youth could be placed in facilities outside of our county. Only if our own county isn't able to deal with the high risk needs behaviors. We will have to discuss all the programs that we have and the ability to still hold youth accountable locally even though there isn't a state DJJ to convince the justice system that there is quality local programming.

Chief Locatelli asks Alexander Diener if he and the court will feel like there would be some faith in the program to keep secure tracks knowing that it's different from 602.

Alexander Diener states he agrees but he is not speaking on behalf of Judge Moorman. Alexander Diener thinks the priority should be trying to go through the juvenile system first and transferring as last resort.



Chief Locatelli clarifies that in the first part of the paragraph they are going to have to address that everything they are doing along with the programming are to keep the disposition in the juvenile justice system where they can still receive high intensive but different than 602 treatment. Chief Locatelli mentions that AB503 wanted to make 602's mandatory 6 month probation terms no matter the crime. Chief Locatelli explains that what if there was a serious robbery or burglary or rape and you could only have 6 months of formal probation (with some extensions). Chief Locatelli comments no one would trust that's enough rehabilitation and it could have created more secure track or adult sentences. Chief Locatelli summarizes that we are trying to get the local system and the system as a whole to trust that we are still going to use the Juvenile Justice System and not just saying every 16 and 17 year old who has committed a 707b offense will be treated by the adult system.

Chief Locatelli asks if there are any further discussion in part 6 proceeding with the language and adding some verbiage in there for clarifying, as well as adding some of Kate Gaston's suggested language.

**3d) Review, Discussion and Approval of Draft Language Part 7: Regional Effort (WIC 1995(c)(6)) of the DJJ Plan**

Katie Ford states part 7 talks briefly about using the consortium and using some of the realigned funds for this purpose.

**3e) Review, Discussion and Approval of Draft Language Part 8: Data (WIC 1995 (c)(7))**

Katie Ford states Part 8 addresses data to be collected on the youth and the actual programming that's utilized in order to capture what is working and what is not working. Katie Ford stated Probation would be identifying the data components to be collected and in the following year report we can specifically list out the data captured and comparison data in the following years from there. The last piece of part 8 talks about outcome measures and the data we will be looking at to assess the outcomes.

Sheryn Hildebrand suggests mentioning any data necessary from partners.

Chief Locatelli states any programs that will be delivered by the Probation Department or any Community Based Organization (i.e. Mendocino County Youth Project



(MCYP or Aikido) have to be tracked. He stated Probation will make sure that language is added to part 8.

Sheryn Hildebrand amends agenda 3e discussion of language part 8. Kate Gaston seconds the motion.

Voting commenced taken. Unanimous vote. All in favor. No nays. Katie Ford and David Barrett abstained from voting. Motion passes.

Katie Ford summarizes that for the next meeting she will be updating the edits and new edits identified today. Additionally, her plan is to take the state template and turn it into a Mendocino County report that will contain all of this information previously discussed along with some background and introduction information on SB 823.

Kate Gaston asks for clarification on the last sentence, about the length and time after they sustain a healthy life skills.

Chief Locatelli explains he is still waiting for legislation to finish drafting SB 823 on how courts locally without DJJ identify when they are eligible to be released into the community and for how long supervision is afterwards. Until then, Chief Locatelli is unsure how reentry will look and how long the parole length for DJJ will be. He suggests that we monitor the supervision for programmatic outcomes however long that supervision period should be. Chief Locatelli states he will be doing some follow up with the State and CPOC regarding this matter.

Chief Locatelli looks for a motion to approve the draft language with some changes to part 6 to discuss it with the group next time and approval of 3b, c, and e which was added.

Kim Turner makes the motion. Sheryn Hildebrand seconds the motion.

Chief Locatelli asks if there are any further discussion needed on 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, or 6, 7, or 8.

Voting commenced. All in favor. No nays. Tawny Fernandez is abstained from voting due to her having to take an emergency call. Katie Ford and David Barrett abstain as they are not voting members. Motion passes with corrections.

#### **4. State Implementation Updates**

##### **4a) Legislative Update**



Chief Locatelli summarizes the 503 being on suspense, the bill that would have made 602's on 6 months' probation turn max which would have had a huge impact on the Juvenile Justice System as a whole. At that point it could have made this plan a wider net of youth.

**4b) Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) Update**

CPOC with CCAC and the COOA want to form an association to form a consortium which pools some county funds of their realignment dollars that will get you a membership which has already been discussed in the past. It allows us to be partnered with other counties and have MOUs for when we have youth that we can't meet the needs for and the training and everything that comes with it. Chief Locatelli states that is his recommendation because he does not feel Mendocino County is secure enough to be isolated from the other counties.

**4c) SB 823 County Collaboration Consortium Workgroup Update**

See 4b minutes language.

**4d) Host and Partner Counties Secure Track Information Update**

Chief Locatelli explains he has been talking to surrounding counties on regional partnerships.

**Adjournment:** The next Regular JJCC SB 823 Subcommittee meeting will be held virtually on September 20, 2021, at 3:00pm. For full review of the entire plan and discussion of the full plan with a vote to move forward. Four days later would be the full JJCC meeting where the subcommittee would come before the full committee and be requesting approval of this SB823 plan. From there Cathy would be getting a place holder on the Board of Supervisor's agenda for late October for and information discussion on what the SB823 plan is.