

STANISLAUS COUNTY

JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

Thursday – October 15, 2020

Stanislaus County Probation Department – Microsoft TEAMS

MEMBERS/DESIGNEES PRESENT

MARK FERRIERA, Chief Probation Officer, Probation Department, Chair
LETICIA RUANO, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Probation Department
JEFF MANGAR, for Birgit Fladager, District Attorney
DAVE HARRIS, District Attorney
EVELYN STARMAN for Kristin Olsen, Board of Supervisors
LT. JOSHUA CLAYTON for Jeff Dirkse, Sheriff
CHAU-PU CHIANG, Community-At-Large
CHIEF RICK COLLINS, Ceres Police Department
ROBERT HOUSDEN, Behavioral Health & Recovery Services
KATHY HARWELL, Director, Community Services Agency
CINDY DUENAS, Director, Center for Human Services
JODY HAYES, Chief Executive Officer
ANGELICA RAMOS, Chief Executive Officer
MONICA CORYEA, Chief Executive Officer
DAVE CHAPMAN, Juvenile Field Services Division Director, Probation Department
MARIAN MARTINO, GJJI Volunteer
JANICE CREE, Data Manager, Probation Department
RENEE FLORA, Center for Human Services
AMY SOLIS, Deputy Probation Officer, Probation Department
MICHELL CAMACHO, Without Permission

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 12:01 p.m. by Chief Probation Officer Mark Ferriera. Members of the group present on the TEAMS meeting were identified.

II. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

No members of the public were present.

III. **APPROVE AUGUST 2020 MEETING MINUTES: JJCC**

Motion: Kathy Harwell. Second: Cindy Duenas. The minutes of the August 2020 meeting were approved unanimously.

IV. **JUVENILE DETENTION REPORT**

Janice Cree, Data Manager, from the Probation Department, presented the Juvenile Probation Detention Analysis Report (The presentation is attached). The statistics provided are from the beginning of 2008 through the end of 2019. The following are highlights of this report:

- Average Daily Population (ADP):
 - Juvenile Hall decreased by 62%. The decrease is partially attributable to the Juvenile Commitment Facility opening in 2013.
 - Juvenile Commitment Facility since 2013 decreased by 32%.
 - Juvenile Hall and Juvenile Commitment Facility combined decreased by 43%.
- There was a decrease in bookings by 63%, and detentions by 65%.
- Booking Offenses:
 - Violent offenses decreased by 57.6%.
 - Serious offenses decreased by 31.3%.
 - Battery offenses decreased by 2.8%.

V. **GENERAL UPDATE**

Chief Probation Officer Mark Ferriera provided an update of SB 823, the realignment of the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). During the JJCC meeting in August, he advised the group of two different proposals presented for the realignment of DJJ: The Governor's proposal and the Legislature's proposal. On August 31, 2020, the bill passed through the Assembly, the Senate and signed into law by the Governor on September 30, 2020. He noted there should be a trailer bill with language clarifying details regarding the DJJ realigned population, such as the mixing of populations during their commitment, DJJ dispositions in law, and release from custody, to name a few. He provided the following highlights of SB 823:

- Intake at DJJ stops July 1, 2021.
 - Youth currently at DJJ will remain at DJJ facilities.
 - Youth committed on or after July 1, 2020, will remain local, and DJJ will close through attrition.
- Establishes the age of jurisdiction up to the age of 25.
 - Age 23 for youth adjudicated of WIC 707(b) offenses.
 - Age 25 for youth adjudicated WIC 707(b) offenses that would result in a 7-year or more sentence if sentenced in adult court.
 - Age 21 for all other youth.
- Creates the Office of Youth and Community Restoration. Their office will be housed within the Health and Human Services Agency and will be responsible for the following:
 - Reporting on youth outcomes.
 - Identifying policy recommendations.
 - Providing best practices and technical assistance.
- Creates an Ombudsman authorized to do the following:
 - Investigate complaints from youth, families, and staff about the conditions at juvenile halls.
 - Ability to investigate complaints received.
 - Provide reports to the Legislature about complaints received and subsequent findings and actions taken.
- Requires the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council to develop a subcommittee.
 - The Chief Probation Officer will be the Chair.
 - Members will include representatives from the following offices:
 - District Attorney
 - Public Defender
 - Community Services Agency
 - Behavioral Health and Recovery Services
 - Office of Education
 - The Court
 - Three representatives with experience providing community-based youth services, youth justice advocates with expertise and knowledge of the juvenile justice system or have been in the juvenile justice system.
 - JJCC Subcommittee will be required to develop a detailed plan for the Board of Supervisors on how to service realigned youth and how to spend the county allocations received.
 - For FY22/23 funding, the county must develop and file a plan with the Office of Youth and Community Restoration by January 1, 2022; the Board of Supervisors must consider the plan when making any allocations in 21-22.
 - The Office of Youth and Community Restoration must review and approve the plan, which will require certain elements.
 - Funding for counties will be based on a weighted percentage.
 - 30% will be based on DJJ Population snapshots of December 2018, June 2019, and December 2019; the snapshots of the three dates will be of youth this county had at DJJ.
 - 50% will be based on the local population of youth who have committed certain violent and felony crimes.

- 20% will be based on the total number of youths in this community aged 10 to 17.

CPO Mark Ferriera advised a workgroup meeting related to DJJ realignment will be held on October 20, 2020, at 11:00 a.m.; He expressed his appreciation to everyone participating in this workgroup.

Chief Mark Ferriera reported the Juvenile Hall and Juvenile Commitment Facility combined population is 62, with 8 females and 54 males. The DJJ current population for this county consists of 2 youth in Juvenile Hall awaiting delivery to DJJ, and 22 youth already at DJJ. DJJ Intake has reopened after being closed for COVID-19 related issues. He advised one youth was recently delivered to DJJ from Juvenile Hall.

The group discussed the use of the juvenile facilities and the DJJ population's arrival. CPO Mark Ferriera expressed the importance of the upcoming workgroup meeting for ideas and solutions to prepare for the DJJ transition.

VI. **LOCAL ACTION PLAN UPDATE:**

Dave Chapman, Division Director from the Probation Department, reported effective July 1, 2020, the Youth Assessment Center (YAC) has opened and is in Modesto next to Modesto High School. The YAC opening is the beginning of the implementation phase, the third phase of a three-phase project modeled out of a Los Angeles program. In partnership with BHRS and Sierra Vista Children and Family Services, the YAC will be a one-stop-shop for youth and families needing services that address early intervention and keeping youth out of the juvenile justice system. Earlier in the week, a presentation was given to local law enforcement agencies showcasing the project's intent and the collaboration needed for a successful outcome. The goal will be to expand into the school districts, having community referrals, and eventually establishing a YAC into family resource centers throughout the county.

Mr. Chapman summarized the YAC implementation phase's initial process, how referrals would be handled, how contact would be made with youth and families, the program's services available, youth progress and outcome tracking, and operation hours. He reported that approximately 600 referrals are received each year from local law enforcement that will now be handled by the YAC. He advised the Youth Assessment Center will be tracked for a year, and modifications will be made if needed.

Mr. Chapman expressed interest in a mobile referral system currently being used by local law enforcement directly linked to SCOE; this allows SCOE to identify students who have had contact with law enforcement. He will be meeting with SCOE to discuss the development details, noting the intent of developing a mobile app or a website that would allow law enforcement officers to make referrals directly to the YAC, bypassing the criminal justice system. Mr. Chapman noted that everyone involved in this partnership is very committed to the project. He would like to see the project implemented and running next year. Additionally, he is gathering data showing the project's outcome to establish it in other parts of the county.

VI. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No announcements were made.

VII. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting will be scheduled for January 14, 2021, at Noon.

The meeting adjourned at 12:48 p.m.



Juvenile Probation Detention Analysis Report

Mark Ferriera
Chief Probation Officer
Stanislaus County Probation Department

September 2020



INTRODUCTION

The Stanislaus County Probation Department is an integral part of the law enforcement community focusing on safety and professional integrity while using evidence-based practices to provide early intervention and rehabilitation to our youth. The Probation Department is made up of several divisions, including the subject of this report, Juvenile Institutions.

Juvenile Institutions includes Juvenile Hall (JH) and the Juvenile Commitment Facility (JCF). Their goal is to provide a temporary safe and secure detention environment for youth who are alleged to have committed law violations and are pending juvenile court hearings, awaiting court ordered placement, are court committed or are awaiting transfer to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Juvenile Institution staff are committed to providing a safe, secure, and clean living environment for the youth in their care.

In its effort to provide continuous and consistent supervision, Juvenile Intake currently implements a risk assessment tool to maintain public safety. A needs assessment is then performed post-disposition to provide youth-specific services. Juvenile Institutions in collaboration with Juvenile Field Services, community-based service providers, volunteers and education professionals, provide programs, services and vocational training to youth to facilitate their successful reintegration with the community. The Stanislaus County Probation Department is a continuously evolving department focused on promoting healthy outcomes.

Included in this report are Juvenile Hall (JH) and Juvenile Commitment Facility (JCF) statistics from 2008 to 2019. Data collected for this report came from the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), Stanislaus County Probation Department Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS), State of California Department of Finance and the State of California Department of Justice. The average daily population (ADP) and the average monthly population (AMP), found in this report, represent the number of youth in custody at any given point in time which are reported to the Board of State and Community Corrections.

HIGHLIGHTS

- **Overall Population Trends:** Juvenile Hall ADP has declined by 62% since 2008. Part of the decline in Juvenile Hall can be attributed to the opening of the Juvenile Commitment Facility in 2013. Since its opening, the Juvenile Commitment Facility ADP has declined 32%. The combined population of the two facilities declined 43%. The statewide ADP has declined 66.9%.
- **Booking and Detentions:** Since 2008, bookings have declined by 63%, and detentions pending an initial court appearance declined 65%.
- **Offenses:** From 2008 to 2019 bookings for violent offenses were reduced by 58% (for the definition of these categories, see the [Offenses](#) section of this report). Bookings for serious offenses were reduced by 31% and property offenses were reduced by 51%. Bookings for charges listed under 707(b) of the [Welfare and Institutions Code \(WIC\)](#) declined by 52% from 2008 to 2019.
- **Length of Stay:** The average length of stay increased by 11.1% in Juvenile Hall and 15.6% in the Juvenile Commitment Facility.
- **Outside Commitment:** An average of 7 youth were committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) annually. Annual commitments ranged from a low of 2 in 2016 to a high of 11 in 2010. In 2019, 8 youth were committed to DJJ.
- **Demographics:** In 2019, the majority (59%) of youth booked between ages 11 and 17 were Hispanic, which was consistent with [County estimated demographics](#). White youth were under represented by 9% and African American youth were over represented by over 5 times the estimated population. The average age of detained youth was 16. Male bookings decreased by 65%, while female bookings declined 56%.
- **State and County Comparison:** Stanislaus County and California state-wide court detentions decreased 67%. The ADP declined in all comparison counties and statewide over the period analyzed.

POPULATION TRENDS

In the institutions, the average daily population (ADP) trends show a fairly consistent decline of 43.2% (Figure 1). Juvenile Hall (JH) population declined 62.1% (Figure 2) dropping from an ADP of 132 in 2008 to 50 in 2019. Part of the decline at Juvenile Hall can be attributed to the opening of the Juvenile Commitment Facility (JCF) in June 2013. The JCF houses youth who have been ordered by the court to spend a specific period of time in custody as part of their disposition. Youth who are awaiting resolution of their charges, awaiting placement, or represent a safety and security risk are housed at JH. Since its opening in June of 2013, the Juvenile Commitment Facility ADP has declined 32.4% (Figure 3).

Figure 1: ADP Stanislaus County Juvenile Facilities




Figure 2: Average Daily Population JH, 2008-2019




Figure 3: Average Daily Population JCF, 2013-2019






Figure 4: Average Length of Stay in JH




Between 2008 and 2019, the average length of time youth stay in the institutions has increased. Juvenile Hall stays increased by 4 days or 11.1% (Figure 4) while Juvenile Commitment Facility stays increased by 7 days or 15.6% (Figure 5) since its opening in 2013.

Figure 5: Average Length of Stay in JCF




BOOKINGS AND DETENTIONS

The number of bookings into Juvenile Hall have declined by 63.0% over the period analyzed dropping from 1,823 in 2008 to 675 in 2019. After booking, Probation Officers evaluate the youth's age, the youth's personal history, and the current law before making a decision on how to process the case. Several options are available from closing the case, to referring the case to the District Attorney for filing of formal charges. In cases involving more serious offenses or youth posing a higher risk to public safety, the youth may be detained pending a detention hearing in Court. The number of youth who were detained pending their initial appearance in Court for a detention hearing fell 65.4% from 1,361 in 2008 to 471 in 2019 (Figure 6).




In 2019, 132 (19.5%) youth who were booked into Juvenile Hall (JH) had subsequent bookings. The majority of the multiple bookings (58.3%) were for youth booked into JH twice with three youth having been booked six times (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Youth with Multiple Bookings, 2019



The following chart shows the four major categories of booking offenses committed by youth who were booked multiple times. There were a total of 135 bookings. These bookings most frequently included property offenses. (Figure 8). Of the 89 youth booked for a violent offense in 2019, twenty-six or 29.2% had multiple bookings.

Figure 8: Offense Type for Multiple Bookings, Including Initial and Subsequent Offenses, 2019




OFFENSES

Legislation influences how Probation assists youth and their families. Three pieces of State legislation enacted between 2007 and 2019, substantially impacted the Juvenile Justice system. SB 81, also known as Juvenile Justice Realignment, limited the types of offenders who can be placed in state institutions. It provided funding to counties to improve their capacity to handle higher risk offenders and develop programs and services to address the needs of at-risk youth and youth who come into contact with the justice system.


More recently, California Propositions 47 (Prop 47) and 57 (Prop 57) were passed by voters. In 2014, Prop 47 reclassified certain theft and drug possession offenses from felonies to misdemeanors for both adults and youth. Prop 47 was retroactive, which allowed youth to petition the Court for resentencing under the new provisions. Prop 57, which was passed in 2016 and went into effect in 2017, ended the ability of prosecutors to directly file criminal complaints against a juvenile in Adult Court. As a result, the juvenile court must hold a hearing to determine if the transfer to adult court is appropriate.

Figure 9 shows a decline in felonies and misdemeanors in JH from 2008 to 2019, based on the Average Monthly Population (AMP) reported to the [Board of State and Community Corrections \(BSCC\)](#). Also illustrated in this chart are the years Props 47 and 57 were passed.



For purposes of this report, offenses are defined by the [California Legislative Information website](#). The following graphs are limited in scope and include charges which have been separated into six categories; violent, serious, battery, property, vehicle, and drugs.

Figure 10: Juvenile Hall Booking Charges



The most severe category includes violent offenses. The violent category is defined by California Penal Code [667.5\(c\)](#) and includes, but is not limited to murder, rape, robbery, and kidnapping. Violent bookings declined 57.6% dropping from 210 in 2008 to 89 in 2019.


The serious category is defined in [1192.7\(c\) PC](#) and [1192.8\(a\) PC](#). The serious category expands on violent offenses to include offenses such as assault with a deadly weapon, any felony where a dangerous or deadly weapon was used, and discharging a weapon at an inhabited dwelling or vehicle, or aircraft. Serious offenses have declined by 31.3% from 99 in 2008 to 68 in 2019.

Battery is a lesser offense and can be charged even when no injury was suffered. Battery realized a small decline of 2.8% (Figure 10).

The property category consists of offenses against property including, but are not limited to: commercial burglaries, and theft. Bookings in the property category realized a reduction of 51.2% dropping from 201 in 2008 to 98 in 2019 (Figure 11).


Vehicle Code violations declined by 55% which include offenses such as auto theft, evading a Police Officer and DUI. Drug offense bookings dropped 90.2%.

Figure 11: Juvenile Hall Booking Charges




Not all youth are detained after booking. The following graph shows the number of youth held pending their initial court appearance or detention hearing based on booking charges (Figure 12). Between 2008 and 2019, the number of youth who were detained until their initial court appearance for violent offenses declined 54.0% dropping from 124 to 57. During the same period, serious offense detentions were reduced 31.5% going from 111 to 76 and battery detentions declined 54.2%.

Figure 12: Juvenile Hall Bookings Held Until Initial Court Appearance



Property offense detentions declined by 55.6% dropping from 99 in 2008 to 44 in 2019. Vehicle code offenses had the largest decline of 74.4% decreasing from 86 in 2008 to 22 in 2019 while drug offense detentions were reduced 89.2% in the same time period (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Juvenile Hall Bookings Held Until Initial Court Appearance



707(b) W & I Code

Offenses listed under 707(b) of the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) include, but are not restricted to: murder, arson, rape with force, and robbery. For a full list of 707(b) WIC offenses, see the [California Legislative Information website](#).

In Stanislaus County, youth booked for offenses listed under 707(b) WIC declined by 51.6%; dropping from 153 in 2008 to 74 in 2019 (Figure 14). Youth who were detained pending their initial court appearance fell by 43.2% from 118 in 2008 to 67 in 2019. Youth who were released pending their initial court appearance realized a reduction of 80.0% dropping from 35 in 2008 to 7 in 2019 (Figure 15).

Figure 14: All 707(b) WIC Booking Offenses






Figure 15: 707(b) WIC Booking Offenses that were Detained and Not Detained



The majority of youth who were booked for 707(b) WIC offenses were male, representing 84.9% of the youth. Between 2008 and 2019, male bookings for 707(b) WIC offenses have realized a 49.6% reduction. Female 707(b) WIC offense bookings have declined at a relatively steady rate realizing a reduction of 61.5% (Figures 16).

Figure 16: Male and Female 707(b) WIC Offenses, 2008-2019




DIVISION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND PLACEMENT

The [California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation \(CDCR\)](#) Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) houses youth ages 12-25 who have the most serious criminal backgrounds and need the most intensive treatment in a structured and secure environment. Youth can be committed to DJJ by the juvenile court or if tried as an adult, they can be committed to DJJ by a criminal court or committed to the Division of Adult Institutions, but ordered housed in a DJJ facility.

Stanislaus County has historically had a low number of youth committed to DJJ (Figure 17). Annual commitments ranged from a low of 2 in 2016 to a high of 11 in 2010 with an average of seven youth committed per year. In 2019, 8 youth were committed to DJJ. Five of the youth were committed to DJJ for armed robbery, two youth were committed for assault likely to produce great bodily injury, and one was committed for voluntary manslaughter.

Figure 17: Youth Committed to Division of Juvenile Justice




Placement

The Juvenile Programming and Placement Unit sees to the care and well-being of youth who are ordered into out-of-home placement by the Stanislaus County Superior Court.


In July 2017, Probation Officers began using the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS) assessment tool. The JAIS tool helps officers identify appropriate supervision strategies based on each youth’s strengths and needs, anticipated behaviors and attitudes. The JAIS also helps identify the reasons behind the behaviors and attitudes. As a result, Officers are better able to identify Short Term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTP) which offer treatment programs to meet the youth’s needs.

During the period assessed, the number of youth in placement has decreased by 70% falling from 76 in 2008 to 23 in 2019 (Figure 18).



Certain youth remain in Juvenile Hall while they are waiting to be placed in a treatment program or “pending placement”. Two factors have the most impact on how quickly a youth can be placed; the unique needs of the youth and bed availability. From 2010 through 2014, there was an increase in the placement of youth in out-of-state placements. Unfortunately, the out-of-state placement process can be lengthy and take more time to complete. Therefore, a longer length of stay could be expected. Beginning in 2016, California began to accredit STRTP Programs designed to provide intensive treatment and quickly transition youth back into a permanent home. The increased STRTP beds availability within the State, and our decreased need for out-of-state placement, coincided with a substantial drop in the length of stay for youth who are pending placement.

The average length of stay in JH for youth who are pending placement decreased by 21%, dropping from 57 days in 2008 to 45 days in 2019 (Figure 19).



DEMOGRAPHICS

The Probation Department has worked diligently in the area of racial disparities by engaging a network of community members and organizations to work together. Two evidence-based practices were implemented as a result of the collaboration, the Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (DRAI), and the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS). The DRAI informs detention decisions by measuring the degree of public safety risk posed by the youth if they are released. The JAIS also measures public safety risk as well as the strengths and needs of the youth and recommends effective supervision strategies. The goal is to lessen time youth are on supervision and reduce recidivism.

The 2019 [Department of Finance \(DOF\)](#) population estimates for Stanislaus County were used to analyze the demographics of detentions and bookings within the County (Figure 20). DOF data limited our analysis to youth ages 11 through 17. Due to the age limitation, the following comparisons are also limited to youth ages 11 through 17.

Figure 20: 2019 Stanislaus County Population Estimate, Ages 11-17






Figure 21: Bookings and Detention By Race/Ethnicity, 2019



Findings show the majority of youth (59%) who were booked were Hispanic (Figure 21), which is within the DOF Hispanic youth population estimate (Figure 20). Booking rates for White and Asian youth were below the County population estimates while those for African American youth were over five times higher (Figures 20 and 21).

The percentage of African American and Hispanic youth who were held until their initial court appearance was consistent with booking percentages. The percentage of White youth detained at booking was marginally lower (-1%) and the percentage of Asian youth was 1% higher than the booking percentage. (Figures 21 and 22).


Figure 22: Age at Booking, 2008-2019



Analysis of age groups ranging from 11 to 17 (Figure 23) showed the majority (60%) of the youth booked are 16 and 17 years old. The average booking age has consistently been sixteen.

Youth under 11 years old were not detained by the Court during the period examined. However, one 8 year-old and one 9 year-old were booked for aggravated assault. In addition, three 10 year-olds were booked for robbery and one 10 year-old was booked for burglary. All were handled informally and released after the booking process.

Figure 23: Total Bookings By Gender 2008-2019




Male bookings from 2008 to 2019 have typically been higher than female bookings (Figure 23). This is consistent with data found on the [Board of State and Community Corrections \(BSCC\) Data and Research](#) page. Further analysis based on gender found male bookings have decreased by 64% from 2008 to 2019, while female bookings decreased by 56% during the same time period (Figure 23.)

COUNTY AND STATE COMPARISONS

This section compares Stanislaus County to the State of California and three California counties, Merced County, Sacramento County, and San Joaquin County. These counties have been identified by Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors as being comparable and can be located in the [Stanislaus County Code under Title 2, Administration, 2.04.030](#).


Detentions

The California Department of Justice collects data from all counties in the state to be used in their annual [Juvenile Justice in California publications](#). The information provided in the publication was the basis for the following detention comparison between Stanislaus County and the State of California. Court detentions within the State of California and Stanislaus County have both declined 67% since 2008. (Figure 24).



Average Daily Population

According to the [BSCC](#), Stanislaus and comparable counties all reported a decline in ADP. Stanislaus County realized the highest decrease at 62.1% dropping from 132 in 2008 to 50 in 2019. Sacramento County followed with a decline of 56.1%, San Joaquin County declined 52.9%, and Merced County declined 51.2% (Figure 25).



Institutions in California reported a decline of 66.9% in their average daily populations compared to a 62.1% decline in Stanislaus County (Figure 26).





Figure 27: Average Daily Male Population County Comparison



A look at the average daily male and female populations showed the male population has declined in all counties, ranging from a 64.6% decrease in Stanislaus County to a 44.4% decrease in Merced County (Figure 27). Female populations have decreased in all counties except Merced County; which increased from 7 to 13. In Stanislaus County, the female population decreased 56%. (Figure 28). Sacramento County realized the largest decrease of 77.3%.

Figure 28: Average Daily Female Population County Comparison

