
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review—Nancy Skinner, Chair

JOINT HEARING

Agenda

Senate Budget Subcommittee No. 3 on Health and Human Services and No. 5 on
Corrections, Public Safety, Judiciary, Labor and Transportation
Menjivar and Durazo, Chairs



Wednesday, February 14, 2024

9:30 a.m.

1021 O Street - Room 2100

Consultants: Elizabeth Schmitt and Nora Brackbill

Oversight of Juvenile Justice Realignment

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a Senate Committee hearing, or in connection with other Senate services, may request assistance at the Senate Rules Committee, 1020 N Street, Suite 255 or by calling (916) 651-1505. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

Panelists

Panel 1: Status of Juvenile Justice Realignment

- Orlando Sanchez Zavala, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Katherine Lucero, Director, Office of Youth and Community Restoration
- Karen Pank, Executive Director, Chief Probation Officers of California
- Jasmine Dellafosse, Youth Advocate
- Brooke Harris, Executive Director, Pacific Juvenile Defender Center

Panel 2: Realignment and Juvenile Justice in LA

Subpanel A

- Kathleen Howard, Executive Director, Board of State and Community Corrections
- Jonathan Byrd, Vice President, AFSCME Local 685
- Milinda Kakani, Director of Youth Justice, Children's Defense Fund California

Subpanel B

- Tony Brown, student, Cal Poly Pomona
- Magic McKay, student, UC Berkeley
- Miguel Espinoza, Supervising Judge, Juvenile Justice Division, Los Angeles Superior Court
- Rhyzan Croomes, Supervising Staff Attorney, Loyola Law School Juvenile Justice Clinic
- Scott Budnick, Founder, Anti-Recidivism Coalition

Panel 3: Policy Implications

- Alisa Hartz, Ombudsperson, Office of Youth and Community Restoration
- Vanessa Fuchs, Sonoma County Chief Probation Officer
- Analisa Zamora, Policy Director, Young Women's Freedom Center

*Department of Finance will be available for questions.

Background. Youths accused of a crime that occurred before they turn 18 years of age start in juvenile courts. If the court determines the youth committed the crime, the court then determines where to place the youth based on statute, input from defense and prosecution, and factors such as the youth’s offense and criminal history. Youths are typically allowed to remain with their families with some level of supervision from county probation officers. However, some youths— typically those who have committed more serious crimes—are housed in county juvenile facilities, such as juvenile halls or camps. As of September 2023, there were 2,878 youth housed in juvenile facilities statewide, compared to 2,146 in December 2022. In addition, if a transfer request is filed, the court may choose to transfer serious youth cases to adult court in certain circumstances.

DJJ Closure and Realignment. The 2020-21 Budget Act included a plan to permanently close the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) at the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). While most youth were already housed or supervised locally, prior to July 1, 2021, counties could choose to send youths who had committed violent, serious, or sex offenses to state facilities operated by DJJ. There were typically about 650 youth statewide in DJJ facilities. DJJ permanently closed on June 30, 2023, and the last youths were transferred to counties, completing the realignment of the juvenile justice system to the county level. The plans for DJJ closure and realignment are outlined in SB 823 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 337, Statutes of 2020 and SB 92 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 18, Statutes of 2021.

Youth housed in DJJ facilities largely did not have access to the types of rehabilitative programming and community connections that are necessary for a humane and successful juvenile justice system.¹ First, the location of DJJ facilities meant that many youths were moved far from home, making it difficult to maintain ties with their families and communities. Second, DJJ facilities were notorious for violence and had high recidivism rates.² Overall, the facilities operated more like adult prisons than as spaces where young people could develop and prepare for adult life outside the criminal justice system. In addition, due to decades of declining juvenile crime rates, both DJJ and county juvenile facilities have been operating under capacity. Realignment is intended to move juvenile justice in California toward a rehabilitative, trauma-informed, and developmentally appropriate system.

As a result of realignment, counties are responsible for caring for youth with more serious needs and who have committed more serious offenses. The realignment plan outlined a process for counties to establish Secure Youth Treatment Facilities (SYTFs) for high-level offenders who would have previously been housed at DJJ. To assist counties with their increased responsibility, the state provides block grant funding to counties for each realigned youth, and one-time funding for planning and juvenile facility infrastructure needs, which is described in detail in the funding section below.

¹http://www.cici.org/uploads/cici/documents/unmet_promises_continued_violence_and_neglect_in_california_division_of_juvenile_justice.pdf, <https://ijie.org/2020/05/19/californias-closure-of-djj-is-victory-with-significant-challenges/>

² <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2021-02-15/california-youth-prisons-closing-criminal-justice-reform>, <https://www.mercurynews.com/2007/02/27/report-finds-cya-prison-still-fails-inmates/>, <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1999-dec-24-mn-47028-story.html>

OFFICE OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY RESTORATION (OYCR)

OYCR. To support counties in this transition, the realignment plan included the creation of the OYCR to provide statewide assistance, coordination, and oversight. OYCR is under the Health and Human Services Agency (HHS) rather than under CDCR or the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), reflecting the intended shift away from corrections and toward services and treatment. The mission of the Office, as defined in statute, is “[T]o promote trauma responsive, culturally informed services for youth involved in the juvenile justice system that support the youths’ successful transition into adulthood and help them become responsible, thriving, and engaged members of their communities.”

Mandates of the OYCR include:

- Identify policy recommendations for improved outcomes for court-involved youth.
- Identify and disseminate best practices to inform rehabilitative and restorative youth practices.
- Provide technical assistance to develop and expand local youth diversion opportunities.
- Evaluate the efficacy of local programs being utilized for realigned youth and report to the Governor and Legislature by July 1, 2025.
- Develop a report on youth outcomes in the juvenile justice system based on the updated JCPSS (Department of Justice) System.
- Provide an ombudsperson to investigate complaints and resolve where possible and report regularly to the Legislature.
- Concur with the BSCC on any juvenile grants.
- Assume administration of juvenile grants no later than January 1, 2025.
- Concur with the BSCC on new standards for secure youth treatment facilities.

Welfare and Institutions Code 2200 requires that all juvenile justice grant administration functions at the BSCC move to OYCR by January 1, 2025.

FUNDING

Realignment Funding. The 2020-21 budget included \$9.6 million General Fund for planning and facilities, and the gradual implementation of block grants to counties at a rate of \$225,000 per realigned youth per year. This funding is known as the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG) and amounts to \$209 million statewide in 2024-25, based on a projected daily population of 928 realigned youth. This funding is scheduled to transition to OYCR by the end of this calendar year. Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code 1991, the Governor and Legislature must work with stakeholders to establish a distribution methodology for this funding that improves outcomes

for this population by January 10, 2024. The Governor’s proposed 2024-25 budget would extend the deadline for establishing a distribution methodology for this funding to January 10, 2025.

The 2022-23 budget included \$100 million one-time General Fund for counties to invest in their juvenile facilities, in anticipation of the closure of DJJ. The funding could be used to support modifications, renovations, repairs, and maintenance for existing county-operated juvenile facilities, with a focus on providing therapeutic, youth-centered, trauma-informed, and developmentally appropriate rehabilitative programming for youth. This was not a competitive grant, and every county received some funding.

The state has also provided resources to counties for juvenile justice several times throughout the years, corresponding with changes in alignment and totaling over \$200 million annually. These include:

- *Youth Offender Block Grants*. This provided counties with \$117,000 per ward for lower-level offenders that were realigned to the county level in 2007, per SB 81 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 175, Statutes of 2007.
- *Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility Construction*. SB 81 also provided counties with lease-revenue funding to construct or renovate juvenile facilities. A total of \$300 million was allocated.
- *Juvenile Reentry Grants*. The state provided funding to the counties after juvenile parolees released from DJJ were realigned to the county level as part of the 2010-11 budget.

OYCR Funding. The 2021 Budget Act included \$27.6 million in 2021-22 and \$7 million ongoing for OYCR. The 2021-22 funding included \$20 million for technical assistance, disseminating best practices, and grants. The 2022 Budget Act included an additional \$10 million ongoing for the Office, and language detailing the duties and responsibilities of the Ombudsperson within OYCR. The 2023 Budget Act continued the \$10 million appropriation for OYCR for technical assistance, disseminating best practices, and issuing grants to counties and probation departments for the purposes of transforming the juvenile justice system to improve outcomes for justice involved youth.

Juvenile Justice Data Collection. In addition to the \$10 million budget for OYCR, the 2023 Budget Act included \$3.54 million to facilitate the collection of specific juvenile justice data related to realignment. These 2023 Budget Act made these funds available to county probation departments to provide OYCR with the following data for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 fiscal years, disaggregated by gender, age, and race or ethnicity:

1. Number of youth and their commitment offense or offenses, if known, who are under the county’s supervision that are committed to a secure youth treatment facility, including youth committed to secure youth treatment facilities in another county.
2. The number of individual youth in the county who were adjudicated for an offense under subdivision (b) of Section 707 of the Welfare and Institutions Code or Section 290.008 of the Penal Code.

3. Number of youth, including their commitment offense or offenses, if known, transferred from a secure youth treatment facility to a less restrictive placement.
4. Number of youth for whom a hearing to transfer jurisdiction to an adult criminal court was held, and number of youth whose jurisdiction was transferred to adult criminal court.

The 2023 Budget Act requires the data listed above to be submitted to OYCR by December 30, 2023 for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 fiscal years, and by December 30, 2024 for the 2023-24 fiscal year. OYCR is currently in the final stages of compiling this data, and a summary of the available data is below.



AB 102 Data Updates

	FY 2021-2022	FY 2022-2023
A. Number of youth committed to SYTF	237	427
B1. Number of youth adjudicated of a 707(b) offense	1,459	1,730
B2. Number of youth adjudicated of a PC 290.008 offense (not counted in B1)	98	74
C. Number of youth transferred from SYTF to LRP	*	100
D1. Number of youth for whom a fitness hearing was ordered	197	221
D2a. Number of youth transferred to adult criminal court	43	33
D2b. Number of youth NOT transferred to adult criminal court	80	94

Note: The data displayed reflect a statewide count.

Note: For FY 21-22, nine counties had no youth to report. (n=48)

For FY 22-23, eight counties had no youth to report. (n=49)

One county was excluded from analysis due to data accessibility challenges.

* Data not displayed for privacy – less than 11 youth

COUNTY REALIGNMENT PLANS

County Realignment Plans. To be eligible for JJRBG funds, each county is required to convene a subcommittee of the multiagency juvenile justice coordinating council chaired by the chief probation officer and including representatives from the district attorney, public defender, department of social services, department of mental health, the county office of education or school district, and the court, along with at least three community members. The subcommittees develop a plan for juvenile justice realignment within the county. These plans must include information on how counties will provide trauma-informed, culturally responsive, and developmentally appropriate programs and a description of data collection and outcome measures, among other

topics detailed in statute (Welfare and Institutions Code Section 1995(c)). Counties were required to submit their initial plans by January 1, 2022, and must update their plan annually. OYCR is required to review these plans, return plans to counties for revision as necessary, and make the plans available on its website. Note that AB 505 (Ting), Chapter 528, Statutes of 2023, described below, made some changes to the development of these plans.

According to OYCR's 2022 County Plan Summary Report, requests for revision primarily fell within the following categories: expanded data, facility improvements, culturally responsive programming, family engagement and reentry, housing approach for secure treatment, and program effectiveness. Thirty-three counties are adapting existing facilities to serve as a SYTF, while other counties that have had historically low referrals to DJJ are entering into regional agreements. The report notes that some counties have indicated that they are not able to care for specific sub populations, such as youth who need specialized treatment related to mental health or sex abuse offenses. Twelve counties identified a step-down placement for youth in their plan, and other counties stated that they plan to establish relationships with community service providers to develop step down plans. OYCR's report notes the importance of step-down placements in supporting youth to successfully reenter society and not stay in maximum security facilities for extended periods of time.

OYCR's 2022 County Plan Summary Report also identified priority areas for OYCR to work with counties to support best practices and provide technical assistance. These areas include: addressing the unique challenges for small, rural communities; developing methods for measuring effectiveness and outcomes relating to court-involved youth; retaining youth in the juvenile system and not in the adult prison system; and developing therapeutic facilities and building capacity to develop step-down options from secure facilities to less restrictive environments with greater access to community-based activities.

Recent Changes to OYCR Ombudsperson and County Realignment Plans. AB 505 (Ting), Chapter 528, Statutes of 2023, made several changes to statute governing the authority of the OYCR Ombudsperson to access juvenile facilities and records, and the development of county realignment plans, including:

- Authorizes the OYCR Ombudsperson to access juvenile detention facilities at any time without prior notice and to access juvenile facility records at all times.
- Authorizes the OYCR Ombudsperson to interview sworn probation personnel in accordance with applicable federal and state law, local probation department policies, and collective bargaining agreements.
- Provides that the OYCR Ombudsperson may recommend changes to improve services or to correct systemic issues.
- Requires the OYCR Ombudsperson advise all complainants that retaliation is not permitted and constitutes the basis for filing a subsequent complaint.

- Requires the OYCR Ombudsperson staff conduct a site visit to every juvenile facility and premises within the control of a county or local agency, or a contractor with a county or local agency, at least once per year.
- Makes various changes to the JJRBG county planning process, including: requires plans to be updated annually; requires the subcommittee to convene at least twice per year; allows the subcommittee to have a co-chair in addition to the probation chief; requires plans to be approved by a majority of the subcommittee; adds a new plan element regarding progress on implementation and development of innovative solutions to programs and services for youth; and requires the subcommittee to include at least three community members who have experience and expertise with community-based youth services and the juvenile justice system.

OYCR UPDATE

General OYCR Update. The OYCR Director was hired in January of 2022, and began hiring staff in spring 2022. As of August 2023, OYCR has authority for 28 full-time positions, with 17 positions filled across research and data, health policy, systems change and equity, and the Office of the Ombudsperson. Leading up to the closure of DJJ on June 30, 2023, OYCR provided technical assistance to courts and counties to support the return of DJJ youth with various service needs.

Some of OYCR’s current projects include: a collaboration with the Vera Institute of Justice to support four counties in reducing and ending the incarceration of girls and gender expansive youth; releasing grants for less restrictive program innovation, community-based organization capacity building, intensive transitional services for youth with acute mental/behavioral health needs; trainings in coordination with California Tribal Families Coalition; family engagement services for youth at Pine Grove, and disseminating the Youth Bill of Rights.

OYCR Ombudsperson Update. The OYCR Ombudsperson line opened in August 2022. As of August 2023, the OYCR Ombudsperson had a total of 171 cases, 109 of which were in Los Angeles County. At that point in time, 53 percent of cases were closed, 46 percent were open, and one percent of cases were referred out. The most frequent issue characterizing investigations was conditions of confinement, followed by staffing, immediate safety, communication access, programming, physical health care, education, mental health care, and other issues.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE GOVERNOR’S BUDGET

Governor’s Budget. The Governor’s proposed 2024-25 budget includes the following proposals:

- **Budget Change Proposal: Transfer of Juvenile Justice Programs to OYCR.** The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) requests to shift the federal Title II Grant Program administrations to OYCR effective July 1, 2024. Grant administration functions include supporting the mandated state advisory group required by the Title II Grant Program known as the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP); as well as compliance monitoring functions under the Juvenile

Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA). This proposal is specific to the above-mentioned federal grant; however, pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code 2200, all juvenile justice grants, including the JJRBG and other state grant programs, will move under OYCR by January 2025.

- **Trailer Bill Language Proposal: Delay of Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG).** Welfare and Institutions Code 1991 requires the Governor and Legislature to work with stakeholders to establish a distribution methodology for the JJRBG that improves outcomes for realigned youth. The JJRBG provides \$209 million for counties to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services for realigned youth (those youth who would have been committed to DJJ prior to DJJ closure.) The Governor proposes to delay the development of a new distribution methodology from January 2024 to January 2025.

JUVENILE FACILITIES IN LOS ANGELES

Ongoing Issues in LA County Juvenile Facilities. Los Angeles County is the largest juvenile justice system in the state, with an average daily population of over 500 youth, roughly twice the number of youth in the next biggest county³. Los Angeles has had numerous issues in its juvenile facilities, many of which predate the closure of DJJ and the subsequent return of those youth to the county. These include staffing challenges⁴, violence and staff misconduct⁵, sexual abuse⁶, and substance use (including the fatal overdose of a youth⁷), among other issues. These issues have resulted in increased scrutiny by the county and state⁸. The BSCC, which is responsible for inspecting juvenile facilities, found both Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall and Central Juvenile Hall unsuitable in September 2021⁹, but BSCC gave numerous opportunities for the county to bring the facilities into compliance. In March 2022, LA County moved all the youth from Central to Barry J. Nidorf ahead of a scheduled BSCC inspection¹⁰. BSCC ultimately ordered the two halls closed in May 2023¹¹. In response, LA County reopened Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall, although similar issues have followed the move¹². A description of the LA County facilities is below.

LA County Juvenile Halls, SYTFs, and Camps. Juvenile facilities in Los Angeles County consist of the following institutions:

- **Barry J. Nidorf SYTF.** Barry J. Nidorf was formerly one of Los Angeles’s main juvenile halls for temporarily housing youth prior to their court dates, known as pre-disposition.

³ https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/JDPS-1Q2002-3Q2023_Trends_12.21.23.pdf

⁴ <https://www.latimes.com/local/countygovernment/la-me-juvenile-halls-chaos-pepper-spray-detention-probation-20190519-story.html> ; <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-11-28/la-county-juvenile-halls-inside-chaos>

⁵ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-01-11/eight-probation-officers-placed-on-leave-after-incident-at-los-padrinos>; <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-02-11/video-of-l-a-county-probation-officer-bending-teen-in-half-sparks-outrage-claims-of-child-abuse> ; <https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-juvenile-hall-officer-pepper-spray-abuse-charges-20190406-story.html>

⁶ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-12-28/district-attorney-reviewing-cases-against-la-county-probation-employees-accused-of-sex-abuse>

⁷ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-10-13/fatal-overdose-la-juvenile-hall-mother-grieves-drugs-remain-threat>

⁸ <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-brings-enforcement-action-against-los-angeles-county-due> ; <https://poc.lacounty.gov/newsroom>

⁹ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2021-09-18/state-finds-l-a-county-juvenile-halls-unsuitable-for-the-confinement-of-youth>

¹⁰ <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-03-16/la-county-empties-central-juvenile-hall-ahead-of-state-inspection>

¹¹ <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/news/bscc-finds-la-juvenile-halls-unsuitable/> ; <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-05-23/la-county-juvenile-halls-unsuitable>

¹² <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-08-27/los-padrinos-chaotic-first-month-los-angeles-juvenile-hall>

Upon the implementation of realignment, Barry J. Nidorf also became the location of LA County's SYTF for realigned youth. On May 23, 2023, the BSCC found Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall to be unsuitable for the confinement of minors pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code 209. However, the SYTF unit has remained open. As of September 2023, the average daily population at Barry J. Nidorf SYTF was 52 youth.

- **Central Juvenile Hall.** Central Juvenile Hall was also formerly one of Los Angeles's main juvenile halls for pre-disposition youth. In March 2022, according to the LA County Office of Inspector General, "the Los Angeles County Probation Department conducted a hasty transfer of all of the approximately 140 youths housed at Central Juvenile Hall to the Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall. The move was precipitated by Probation Department concerns over failing to meet the BSCC suitability requirements by a hearing date on whether required improvements had been completed."¹³ A BSCC inspection was scheduled a few days after the transfer of the youth took place. BSCC found Central Juvenile Hall to be unsuitable for the confinement of minors pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code 209, along with Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall. There are currently no youth housed at Central Juvenile Hall.
- **Campus Kilpatrick SYTF.** Camp Kilpatrick is a juvenile camp that opened in July 2017. According to LA County Probation, Campus Kilpatrick is an example of the new "L.A. Model," which consists of "a small-group treatment model that is youth-centered and embodies a culture of care rather than a culture of control."¹⁴ Campus Kilpatrick serves as a second SYTF in Los Angeles. As of September 2023, the average daily population at Campus Kilpatrick was 17 youth.
- **Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall.** Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall serves as Los Angeles County's facility for housing all pre-disposition youth. It was re-opened in the wake of the BSCC-ordered closure of Central Juvenile Hall and Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall. As of September 2023, the average daily population at Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall was 289 youth.
- **Other juvenile facilities and camps.** Los Angeles County's juvenile facilities also include Dorothy Kirby, which houses approximately 50 youth, Camp Afflerbaugh, which houses approximately 23 youth, Camp Joseph Scott, which houses approximately 9 youth, Camp Paige, which houses approximately 23 youth, and Camp Rockey, which houses approximately 34 youth.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- **Capacity of Counties to Deliver a Wide Range of Programming for a Small Number of Youth.** The needs of justice-involved youth are diverse, with individuals at different educational levels, desiring different vocational programs, and requiring different levels of security. For example, a county may only have one or a few girls in their custody, and may not be able to offer any gender-specific programming for that population. They may only have one secure track youth at the college level, requiring nearly individual teaching. It will be a challenge for the state to balance the desire to consolidate programs across

¹³ [Transfer of Youth from Central Juvenile Hall to Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall](#)

¹⁴ [Campus Kilpatrick and the L.A. Model – Probation \(lacounty.gov\)](#)

counties with the original goals of realignment, namely bringing youth closer to home. The state should consider how to support the counties in meeting youth's individual needs.

- **Development of Less Restrictive Placements.** While the state's vision for realignment encompasses a trauma-informed, evidence-based, culturally responsive system that promotes healthy adolescent development, youth in the state's 36 SYTFs are largely confined to juvenile halls, which are prison-like physical environments. This presents a serious barrier to achieving transformational change in the juvenile justice system. The state should consider how to support the development of less restrictive placements for youth that serve as alternatives to confinement and focus on strengthening youth and families.
- **Use of Restrictive Placements.** As counties develop local programs, the state should monitor how county SYTF populations compare to the historical DJJ population, to avoid more youth being committed to highly restrictive settings than were prior to DJJ closure. Pursuant to the 2023 Budget Act, the Legislature is anticipating data from OYCR on commitments to SYTFs in each county over the last two years.
- **Adult Charges of Youth in Custody.** A long-term goal of the Legislature has been the retention of youth within the jurisdiction and rehabilitative foundation of the juvenile justice system. However, there is concern about situations where new, adult criminal charges are being filed against youth in custody who are over 18. In Los Angeles County alone, data requested by the Probation Oversight Commission shows that in the six months between July 2023 and January 2024, there were 8 new criminal case filings in adult court (out of 39 new criminal case filings overall), including 5 at Los Padrinos and 3 at Barry J. Nidorf SYTF. See Appendix A for more detail on criminal case filings in LA Juvenile facilities. The culture and physical environments in juvenile halls can contribute to unrest or substance issues that can lead to new charges. The state should consider how to prevent situations that result in new, adult charges, both to prevent youth from being funneled into the adult system and to protect the safety and security of juvenile facilities and their officers.
- **JJRBG Methodology.** Existing law requires the Governor and the Legislature to work with stakeholders to establish a distribution methodology for the JJRBG that improves outcomes for the realigned youth population. The current interim formula established in Welfare and Institutions Code 1991 is a \$209 million block grant based on each county's projected share of the realigned youth population. It does not contain a mechanism to measure progress toward improving youth outcomes. Regardless of whether the Legislature approves the Governor's proposed trailer bill language to delay the revised methodology for JJRBG, the state should consider how to meet the statutory mandate of developing a methodology that improves outcomes for youth.



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROBATION DEPARTMENT

JUVENILE OPERATIONS
9150 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY – DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242
(562) 940-2513



GUILLERMO VIERA ROSA

Chief Probation Officer

February 6, 2024

TO: Wendelyn Julien, Executive Director
Los Angeles County Probation Oversight Commission

FROM: Kimberly Epps *Kimberly Epps*
Chief Deputy

SUBJECT: **CRIMINAL FILINGS AT BARRY J. NIDORF SECURE YOUTH
TREATMENT FACILITY, LOS PADRINOS JUVENILE HALL, AND
CAMPUS VERNON KILPATRICK**

On January 17, 2024, the Probation Oversight Committee (POC) requested information regarding new criminal filings at Barry J. Nidorf Secure Youth Treatment Facility (BJN-SYTF), Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH), and Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK) from July 2023 through January 2024. Information for criminal filings, court of jurisdiction, and types of cases filed is as follows:

BJN-SYTF

- 3 new criminal case filings since July 2023.
- Cases filed were ineligible for filing in juvenile court.
- 3 cases were filed in adult court.
- Three cases were filed for violation of Health & Safety 11350 (a), Possession of a Controlled Substance, a Misdemeanor.

LPJH

- 36 new criminal case filings since July 2023.
- 31 cases were filed in juvenile court.
- 5 cases were filed in adult court.
- Most cases were filed for violation of P.C. 245(a)(4), Assault by Means Likely to Produce Great Bodily Injury, a Felony or P.C. 243(b), Battery on a Peace Officer, a Misdemeanor.

APPENDIX A

Criminal Filings at BJN-SYTF, LPJH, and Campus Vernon Kilpatrick

February 6, 2024

Page 2 of 2

CVK

There were no new criminal filings at CVK from July 2023 through January 2024.

There were thirty-nine (39) new criminal filings involving thirty-five males and one female during the past seven months (July 2023 - January 2024).

The highest number of new filings involved youth or young adults housed at LPJH and resulted from youth-on-youth assaults, known as “pack outs.” This type of assault involves multiple youth assaulting a single youth. There were thirteen assaults on detention officers by individual youth or by multiple youth attacking together.

Five (5) adult court filings resulted from allegations of P.C. 245(a)(4), Assault by Means Likely to Produce Great Bodily Injury, a Felony at LPJH. Three (3) filings resulted from allegations of Health & Safety 11350 (a), Possession of a Controlled Substance, a Misdemeanor at BJN-SYTF.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Kimberly Epps, Chief Deputy for Juvenile Operations, at (562) 922-0429 or email her at Kimberly.Epps@probation.lacounty.gov.

GVR:KE:ed