

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President

Chief Kelly Vernon
Tulare County

President Elect

Chief Steve Jackson
San Joaquin County

Secretary/Treasurer

Chief Esa Ehmen-Krause
Contra Costa County

Legislative Chair

Chief Kirk Haynes
Fresno County

Past Presidents

Chief Mark J. Bonini
Amador County

Chief Brian Richart
El Dorado County

Chief John Keene
San Mateo County

Chief Jennifer Branning
Lassen County

Bay Region Chair

Chief Katherine Miller
San Francisco - J County

Central Region Chair

Chief Robert Reyes
San Luis Obispo County

North Region Chair

Chief Izen Locatelli
Mendocino County

Sacramento Region Chair

Chief Jeff Goldman
Nevada County

South Region Chair

Chief Tamika Nelson
San Diego County

Executive Director

Karen A. Pank

Deputy Director

Rosemary Lamb McCool

2150 River Plaza, Suite 310
Sacramento, CA 95833

T 916.447.2762

www.cpoc.org



CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS
OF CALIFORNIA

April 9, 2024

The Honorable Caroline Menjivar
California State Senate
1021 O Street, Suite 6720
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: SB 1057 – CPOC Oppose

On behalf of the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC), we write in opposition to SB 1057 which would repurpose and reprioritize new processes thereby redirecting the expenditure of critical juvenile justice investments which are expended in accordance with research-based standards and producing highly effective results. This funding has been foundational to supporting positive youth outcomes resulting in a 60 percent decline in youth detention rates and a 73 percent decline in juvenile arrest rates over the last decade. Additionally, the bill seeks to revise the composition of local Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils and make changes to multiagency juvenile justice plans. In so doing, this bill seeks to do away with collaborative and multi-agency approaches currently relied upon which have been essential tools in supporting an entire continuum that prevents juveniles from becoming more formally system involved through effectuating successful and expeditious re-entry post system involvement. This measure largely mirrors failed previous legislative efforts – AB 1007 (Jones-Sawyer, 2020) and SB 493 (Bradford, 2021) and AB 702 (Jackson, 2023).

First, it is important to understand that the current system supports both transparency and multi-disciplinary voices as fundamental pieces to advise the direction of these plans in each of the 58 counties. County probation departments have invested resources and organizational culture changes in the evolution of the juvenile justice system for over the past two decades by integrating system responses and focusing on the development of a continuum from prevention to re-entry. JJCPA supports our ability to provide cognitively designed, evidence-based and trauma-informed care. These efforts manifest in

either partnerships with other system stakeholders, contracts with non-governmental entities where appropriate, or specific skill building within the probation department to deliver direct prevention services and programming. SB 1057 would create further instability at a time when we are absorbing the responsibility and liability of moving the entire continuum to probation and counties as continue to advance the historical progress made to divert youth away from detention.

Second, SB 1057 would impact county funding in several ways.

- New language in the bill would allow the State via the Board of State and Community Corrections to withhold the funding if a county fails to establish a juvenile justice coordinating council. This mechanism is subjective, unclear, and sets a precedent for funding to counties to be withheld for service delivery that is provided by counties.
- Establishes a new request for proposals process for these funds to be disbursed and would prohibit a law-enforcement related agency from overseeing the process. Utilizing this process can result in bifurcated processes to get funding out into the field and into programs and may further delink the ability to fund programs and efforts that reflect the multiagency plan.
- Redirection of important investments in local systems would create instability and diminution for the provision of necessary supports and services for youth in our communities. We would reiterate the constitutional concerns associated with the requirement to redirect JJCPA resources, given that this funding resides within the 2011 fiscal structure that is constitutionally protected under the provisions of Proposition 30 (2012).
- Changes and adds new elements and information within what is required to be included in the local plans.
- Changes and adds new requirements for information that is included in the annual report to the State.

Third, while we support and acknowledge the benefit of having multiple perspectives on this committee, the local councils currently include an at-large community member as well as representatives from nonprofit community-based organizations providing services to minors. However, we are concerned that the changes proposed in this bill will have the adverse impact to its stated goals. It is important to note that there are instances within the current committee composition that despite probation's best effort to obtain participation for all of the members, there have been challenges in doing so. By requiring, rather than authorizing, additional members, it would create considerable obstacles rather than opportunities to fulfill the goals of the committee. Further, the changes to the composition further exacerbate the issues noted above regarding the ability of the state to withhold funding if a council is not established. Counties and probation are statutorily responsible for the safety and rehabilitation of all youth across the juvenile continuum, yet this bill removes probation from the role of coordinating the planning process with these statutory duties. Therefore, probation and counties take on the responsibility and accountability for

outcomes of juvenile services without the ability to coordinate and guide the plans to meet the goals, outcomes and requirements.

In conclusion, it is unclear how the approach in this bill, for the reasons outlined above, would support the advancement of integrated and coordinated delivery of juvenile prevention and diversion services. The provisions in this bill further bifurcate planning, program funding, and holistic efforts towards the outcomes outlined in the locally developed plan and from the historical progress to prevent and divert through from the juvenile justice system. It is also unclear why this change is being proposed in light of the evolution and decline of youth in detention and with counties' significant focus on preventing youth from coming into contact with the juvenile justice system through efforts such as JJCPA over the last decade.

For these reasons, we respectfully oppose SB 1057.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Danielle Sanchez". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Danielle Sanchez
Legislative Director

Cc: All Members and Consultants of the Senate Public Safety Committee