

BY DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION



**FULL COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, January 10, 2024, 5:30pm**

**Meeting held in-person with public comment at:**  
**City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Hearing Room 408**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Full Commission:**

Margaret Brodtkin, President  
Johanna Lacoé  
Allison Magee  
Linda Martley-Jordan  
Toye Moses  
Manuel Rodriguez  
James Spingola

**Meeting Minutes**

In person meeting only. Comments would have to be from public sitting in audience.

**1. Roll Call:**

- A. Meeting called to order at 5:34pm.
- B. Members Absent: James Spingola

**2. Public Comment on items not on the agenda:**

- A. No public comment.
- B. Motion: None

**3. Juvenile Probation Department Deep Dive Regarding Out of County Youth:**

- A. Celina Cuevas presents data of Out of County young people on JPD's active caseload.  
Link to Presentation: [https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2024-01/Out-of-County\\_Youth\\_on\\_JPD\\_Active\\_Caseload\\_Presentation\\_1.10.24.pdf](https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2024-01/Out-of-County_Youth_on_JPD_Active_Caseload_Presentation_1.10.24.pdf)
- B. Discussion and Questions (including CARC and Huckleberry):
  - i. As Judge Chan could not attend meeting due to being ill, Chief Miller says that "Judge Chan wanted her to communicate that for him the biggest challenge for kids who live in other counties when we have their cases here is that inter-county coordination and that sharing of services but the question I think is most appropriate for him is the question about his judicial decisions."
  - ii. Doug Styles, Executive Director of Huckleberry Youth Programs, invited to speak about what CARC does in connection with out of county youth and their impression on what is going on. "As you saw in the data, we do have youth from out of county that are coming in through CARC and the standard procedure is to connect them to the county in which they're engaged. So, if they're living

out of county but they're in school in San Francisco or if major connection is in San Francisco we may be working with them in San Francisco. If they live out of County, they're in school out of county, they're engaged out of county we would be looking for a referral to the county where they are engaged. We think it's incredibly important that people are engaged and served and work in the community where they're spending most of their time and engagement. That's kind of the big picture. We do through the AFTER program as you're hearing we're expanding that we're working with more people who are out of county in that program as well. I would just echo the connection to services out of county is hit or miss. There are times that we have great connections with CBOs, and it works, and the transfer is real easy and then there's times we're spending a lot of hours on the phone trying to connect up to their Juvenile Probation Department. It's a lot of labor to move somebody on and of course if a young person is in need of some immediate service we're not not doing anything, we're making sure that that handoff happens in a smooth and effective way and will service and work with young person before that happens."

iii. Commissioner Lacoé asks, "Where are the major gaps, is it specific counties, is it a specific type of service that we're not able to connect these out of county young people to, was there something that San Francisco residents are getting that seems really beneficial that we just can't give to out of county young people?"

1. Celina Cuevas responds and says that mental health services seems to be a gap and that Contra Costa has more mental health services available.
2. Chief Miller mentions that Mental health is probably one of the biggest gaps right now in San Francisco. "I spoke to Mona Tahsini from SPY and JPD staff about how we handle connecting young people to mental health services. The way it works right now is that there is no formal kind of handoff or referral process between public health and San Francisco and counterparts and other counties. The staff at both SPY for detained youths and AIIM Higher for kids who are out of custody do identify service providers and they are aware of them, that they know in those counties, and they will share that information with our PO's and PO's will then get to work on determining if there's eligibility, if it'll work as a connection for the young person, but it's really at that kind of case to case level. There is a disproportionate percentage of our Latinx young people who live out of county and the Spanish speaking clinician at SPY has been actively working to cultivate relationships with providers in Alameda particularly those who can provide mental health treatment to Spanish speaking young people, so that's an active kind of endeavor that they're doing right now. Another thing is that we are often trying to find services during the pendency of a case and as you know it can take a long time to get from pre-adjudication in San Francisco through adjudication of the case. Until the case is transferred, there are services that will not be provided in those counties so there's a range of community organizations funded in turn by their Probation Departments in those other counties that frequently will not accept a young person until they are on probation in that county because that is the funding stream and conditions that tied to those contracts. It's a challenge for us to ask them to take on young people when their own funders won't do that."

iv. Commissioner Magee asks the following:

1. "San Francisco providers can serve out of county youth, correct?"
  1. Chief Miller responds, "It's always been kind of a little bit of like don't ask don't tell, find a connection to the city. I will note that in the version of the DCYF RFP that's in process right now, we explicitly called out that that restriction does not apply to the justice system grantees, so going forward we have that real clarity that if they are being served by one of the agencies funded to support kids in the justice system, it doesn't matter where the kid lives."
  2. "Can Out of County providers be funded by San Francisco to support San Francisco kids who are out of county?"
    1. Chief Miller responds, "Out of county providers are not ineligible to apply to the RFP but DCYF called out in the RFP that we wanted to make sure that in the array

of agencies that get funded through this process that they also include the capacity to serve kids who live in other counties because this keeps coming up as a population that we've all talked about a lot whether that's done by a nonprofit in another county directly applying or through some kind of a subcontract and partner relationship. I think there's different ways that can happen, but we do want to make sure going forward that we have the capacity to serve kids wherever they live."

- v. Commissioner President Brodtkin did not find the report conclusive. It is not clear what the scope of the problem is. Some questions asked are: what we plan to do, what role CARC plays, what is the plan, what does the Commission need to do to help the plan? Do we know how many are from another county? How are we going to tell in a year whether we are doing a better job or is it important?
  - 1. Chief Miller lists the following actions taken to address issue: 1) remove ambiguity on serving youth out of county (done via DCYF's RFP), 2) shared responsibility between JPD and CBO – YWFC is a good example of regional capacity to serve youth." "It is important, if a young person is on Probation across the bay, then we are not even talking about them tonight. The young people that we are talking about are the young people who we have an obligation to supervise because they are going through the court process, they are either released on home detention or they are going through adjudication and they have some kind of orders, or they have completed the Court process and they are on probation with us. We have an obligation to be supervising and supporting them. I want to stress that that is why in the next funding round, we are making sure that our CBOs can serve kids from other counties that we have things coming online, getting more formal on making sure we have capacities in other counties to serve our kids."
- vi. Commissioner Moses asks the following:
  - 1. San Francisco is a so-called sanctuary city and that we cannot turn people away and is wondering whether this applies to the situation that we currently have.
    - 1. Chief Miller responds, "It's been a challenge because there are some funding sources that fund services for kids in the city that are restricted to people who live here. I would say for our perspective for serving the needs of young people and their families and for community safety, it's in all of our interest to do our best job to give kids who commit crime in San Francisco the best services that we can, wherever makes the most sense for that child. I do think it's very much a case by case situation."
  - 2. "Is this 38% ongoing or this is happening suddenly?"
    - 1. Chief Miller responds, "This is an ongoing situation, the number changes a little bit from time to time and it's never been low for San Francisco. We are very easy to get to and people come here for lots of things. I would say we will always have a higher percentage of out of county kids coming through the justice system than other counties."
- vii. Commissioner Martley-Jordan asks the following questions:
  - 1. 1. "(page 6) – The demographics, these are large percentages, are these new cases versus recidivism?"
    - 1. Chief Miller responds, "(page 6) - This is everyone who is on our caseload right now, so for some young people it maybe their first time with us and for some it's not. It's everybody that we're working with."
  - 2. "(page 10) – Are services mandated?"
    - 1. Chief Miller responds, "(page 10) - The services listed here are not mandated. There are times when a judge will release a young person with a Court approved release plan so the judge will approve a release plan and may call out a specific agency for that purpose."
  - 3. "(page 25) – How often is the CBO list updated and how do you validate those CBOs that you get, what measurements do you use to see exactly what's happening with them that

could benefit youths that are in San Francisco?”

1. Chief Miller responds, “(page 25) - I would say that on an individualized level our Probation Officers are getting that sense as they're working with the CBO who is working with one of our young people. They're talking within their teams about how that's working whether that organization seems to be a good fit for our kids.”
4. “Could you also please speak to the mental health services that are out of county on page 25, out of county youth are limited and the impacts of that, what is happening to those young people?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “Those are the young people for whom the Public Health staff here are trying to help us find connections when they can in the county that they live in where they are eligible and that gets back to the gaps that I spoke about earlier. The Public Health here does not have that formal referral process. It's really them identifying providers that they think might be a good fit that they are aware of for our young people and it is Probation Officers really helping them make that link. There is no formal mechanism for warm handoffs between two departments. That is a limitation that we have on both sides of the Bay right now.”

viii. Commissioner Magee asks the following questions:

1. “The motion to transfer out, is that a default or is that is that automatic for all out of county kids where the motion to transfer out is made and it's up to the court whether or not to?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “There could be case by case exceptions, but it is largely the practice for us.”
2. (page 46) – It looks like it's a small percentage of kids that are transferred out, is that correct?
  1. Chief Miller responds, “(page 46) – References disposition slide, 21% of kids with an out of county address who got transferred out by the court, so it is pretty low.”
3. “Why does the court generally decline to do the transfer?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “The general reason is they find that they believe for whatever circumstance, it's in the best interest of the minor but the other piece and I think the judge is the best person to give you that information more robustly but I would be remiss if I didn't say - and I also don't want to speak for defense - that very often defense counsel are advocating against transfer and there is a reason for that which is that there is concern about what the disposition may be in another county.”
4. “Are they ever transferred out of county post disposition?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “If they move out of county/relocate. We also have kids who have come back in over time.”
5. “Given the numbers, what is the capacity for Probation and really our CBO partners to supervise young people out of county, how often do they visit, how does that impact just workload and capacity?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “We'll talk later today about the way we did our reorganization of our Probation unit, but one of the rationales for us is that it makes it easier for Probation Officers with the supervision caseload to be out in the field so they can have a day like that to go visit youths.”
6. “Do you have a sense for our CBO partners on their ability to support young people who live out of county?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “We've all learned through the CARE Team process that it is much harder to come up with plans of support for kids who do not live in the city. I am really looking to Dinky and Dawn to speak more about that.”
7. “Who puts together the Bay Area Resource Guide? And that's updated every year?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “It's something that we assemble just based on our outreach to other departments and other Bay Area counties. We work on making

sure we have current information.”

8. “What is the biggest challenge for JPD as it relates to serving this group of people given their diverse needs?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “The biggest challenge is making sure that we can find the things they need wherever they are. We have a broad geographic range.”

ix. Commissioner Rodriguez asks the following:

1. Regarding referral challenges, how and what can we do as a Commission or maybe it's the Program Committee of this Commission to support that?
  1. Chief Miller responds, “I think the Program Committee is a great place for two specific conversations related to this topic. One is as we're rolling out kind of new structures going forward it's a great place to talk about how that's going. The second piece gets to what President Brodtkin said, I think that the program committee is a good place to talk about how are we assessing if there's progress, how are we measuring what progress on this problem looks like, so I think both of those discussions are really well situated in the Program Committee.”
2. (page 22) – “Regarding offense types, what is your take on this? Do we want to see those levels (drugs, robbery, etc.) equal, lower, what are you seeing as a trend here?”
  1. Chief Miller responds, “I would like to see none of those. I think you will see some real changes in the drug numbers. We have seen the number of young people coming in for drug sales cases which do tend to be Latinx young people who live in Oakland dramatically fall off since August. We actually had no bookings into the hall in December for that charge. I think you'll see that shift. That is the operation, is that there's people who live in Oakland who are coming into San Francisco to sell drugs and often have caught up young people in that enterprise. The robbery piece I would say, the same way that commissioner Magee said, we're a destination city. I do think that is something people come here to do also, and we see that around Union Square and other places.”

C. Public Comment:

- i. Dawn Stueckle, Director of Sunset Youth Services and co-chair of JJPA, comments, “I just wanted to speak as one of the CBOs in the room and as the co-chair of the JJPA my other co-chair partners here as well. Our organization does work with a lot of out of county kids. I would say about 40% of the kids that our justice team has on their caseloads are out of county. I will say that that also includes Superior Court cases for the adult system for TAYA kids so that's not all through the juvenile system. However, we do serve a lot of kids through the justice system that are out of county and through the CARE Team process that Chief Miller brought up earlier. We specifically said CARE Team would take out of county kids and I think the thing to realize with CBOs is CBOs are not necessarily doing supervision. We're doing support and so a lot of what we are asking case managers to do when they take these out of county kids is figure out whether these kids should be being served in this county or not. Sometimes that means that they're spending time over in Oakland, they're hooking up with Courage, they're taking kids over to these different places and seeing if there's an opportunity for them there, they're hooking up with their schools and seeing what kind of after school stuff there is, trying to find out as they build trust with the young person where the best place for this young person is and how they can continue to be in that relationship but make sure that whether the kid is being served in this county or in the county that they reside in that what this young person is asking for and really going to engage in and be safe in is outside of court orders obviously. There's a process to that. It takes time to build that relationship, to earn the trust, to get those kids to go with you to check out a boxing you know gym or whatever and then to try to figure out what it looks like on that end to make sure that there's transportation. It's already been said but I will say again most of the counties around here do not have what San Francisco has, so we are sharing our resources liberally with kids who are moving all over and I know that was my buzzer but I'm going to just say one more thing and that is county lines don't mean anything to kids. They don't mean anything to the families. That's why CBOs have been pushing for a long time not to be restricted by counties where young people and families are

residing. It's almost impossible to live here and so we have to continue to serve people that are being driven out."

- ii. Mollie Brown, District One Resident and Volunteer with JJPA, comments, "I want to thank you for this. It's a lot of information and it certainly is helpful to try and get a better idea of who some of these kids are. I see some of this as a resource issue in terms of if you have a clientele if you will that's 38% from out of county but I think as a Commission as a department they need to be looking at providing services to those people in those counties which I think they're planning on doing. I mean there has been opportunities to work with those youth. The changes in the DCYF RFP is going to be very helpful for these youth and I think a lot of it will be to try and design those contracts to allow the staff to do it and in the amount of time it actually takes to accomplish it. I think the other thing is a management issue. I mean I have to believe there are POs who live out of county and some of these counties the same with just the staff and the CBOs and that's the new management issues, you say OK for the next, for this week you're work in Alameda. Those are solvable problems. I mean HART does it with their exploited youth program and so that's again those are the kinds of decision. I wouldn't be surprised if they're not already made this way but I think taking these opportunities to review the types of services that these youth receive is a very helpful exercise for both the Commission, the Probation Department, and the CBOs to know what's missing. The one question I still have about this is the number of youths in the out of county group that are the undocumented youth because their services are going to be quite different with what they need and that I think that would be helpful information. Otherwise, I do feel like there's ways we can serve these kids better and I think the efforts are in place to try and do it and we need to kind of help figure out a way to know that it's being done so that we feel better about it."
- iii. Sandra, Young Women's Freedom Center, comments "Some of the work that we do, we are in different counties, but we're in different levels at different counties. It's not the same as how we are here. We're more integrated here within the system because we've been around for 30 years. Our key for our young people is that we don't do court mandated things. It has to be consent based and that's what has worked for our young people. Our young people show up because they're given the choice to show up. It definitely helps in court, so we show up and speak to a young person before they actually go to court to really make it that it's consent based, it's part of their self determination to navigate these systems. I will say you know there is a lot of nonprofit supporting a lot of the young people. What the center does is definitely a little bit different because of the consent base. We do see the transformation. We have a lot of transformation stories. We do get funded by DCYF, so that limits us on how we can work with young people. Our advantage every once in a while has been if we get a referral from someone coming from another county, if we have a Young Woman's Freedom Center in that county, then we can hand them off like that but we're handing it off without really knowing what resources that young person is going to get in that specific county because some of our centers are still building up in those respective counties. Our model works, I say you guys need to do some research on what models work and funnel some more resources and funding there because that's what's going to require us to work with these youth. The youth are coming to this county because you know maybe they're not looking at the cost of living right away. They're probably looking at oh I can get paid more up in this county, people get paid more here in San Francisco county, but then they come here and they're faced with the reality check of oh my gosh I can't afford a room or housing and I can't afford the food because it's outrageous food, the food is cheaper crossing the Bay Bridge to Oakland. Somebody needs to do a study on that because we're barely able to fund, I'm going over budget every month trying to fund food for our young people. They're trying to show up. You could say the food bank and all that, but a lot of our young people don't have access to a kitchen, so they can't cook raw food. All that food that came from COVID-19 if their families don't have it, they don't have it. Some of these kids that may come from families that have parents who can't meet even with food stamps not covering food the whole month right now because the food is so outrageously expensive. This funnels back to our young people. Their basic needs need to be met. Those basic needs are primary before a young person can even pick themselves up by their

bootstraps and become self-determined individuals to take control of their lives and be able to transform themselves and that's how we get our young people to work in that way. We do it as an agency by getting some of their basic needs met, getting a little bit of food in their belly and trying to get them to come into our space to do some self-determination advocacy for our young folks. You like our model, fund our model.”

- iv. Commissioner Laco comments, “Program Committee might look into is what services out of county youth participate in, what specific types of services they participate in, and what they need, and whether the resource guide has recommendations for all of those things or if there are specific types of gaps that we can try to fill. As a short-term thing, we can discuss that.”
- v. Commissioner Magee comments, “Curious about the relationships that our CBO partners are able to forge with the folks out of county in terms of other providers.”
  - 1. Dawn Stueckle (with permission of the Commission speaks a second time), Director of Sunset Youth Services and co-chair of JJPA, comments, “I will say it's a couple things. One is I think it's a time thing and people move around because we don't pay CBO staff well and so CBOs lose a lot of their staff to city jobs to be quite frank and foundation jobs because that's where the money is. People are trying to survive and so the staff turn over. As soon as you get some good contacts the next time you try to use those contacts, sometimes they're already gone. Then it's a timing thing. One of the things that we're trying to do right now with Oakland specifically is that we had a few CBOs from here us, Huckleberry, IFR, we went together just as folks from those organizations, over to Oakland and met the team from CURYJ, which is where Ricardo is now, and hung out, got the feel of their space, met their staff, had a really great sort of like interaction, here's what we do, here's what you guys do, how can we work together, how do we hand kids off and that was really successful. We also did a similar thing with UCAP and our organizations is prioritizing that and getting time where people can actually make it work which is why part of us from the JJPA have been trying to do it together so that we can just do a one-time thing it takes everybody's time at the same time. Those are the two main things that I think make it difficult to keep those connections.”

#### **4. Chief's Report:**

##### **A. Monthly Data Report Highlights:**

- i. Celina Cuevas, present monthly data highlights from the provided memo:
  - 1. Slide 22 – PS Chart 1: Probation Referrals, CARC Intake and Make it Right Referrals
  - 2. Slide 6 – JH Chart 1.1: Admissions & Release
  - 3. Slide 7 – JH Chart 1.2: Average and Peak Population
  - 4. Slide 10 – JH Chart 2.2: ADP by Race/Ethnicity
  - 5. Slide 15 – JH Chart: 3.2 Average Length of Stay for Youth Released
  - 6. Slide 38 – PS Chart 5.1: Active Warrants by Type
- ii. Questions/Comments:
  - 1. Commissioner Laco asks, “I know that the judge had been working on clearing a lot of those warrants that had stuck around for a long time so it dipped, but now we're going back up, is that a change of policy, is this something else that's going on?”
    - 1. Chief Miller responds, “I would say it's primarily driven by two factors, one factor, you can see that increases in both the bench warrants and then the petition warrants, so related to a number of our drug cases that have come in and the young people with those charges as young people have failed to appear for court hearings the court has been more likely to issue bench warrants and I think that those types of cases that tends to happen more and for a variety of reasons. In addition, I will say that in the latter part of the fall we've had just a lot more police activity. The police are bringing us a lot more cases of what becomes then a petition warrant so that is the police bringing a case to us and then into the DA's office saying that they have concluded an investigation and have identified somebody for whom they want to have the court process initiated. We've just seen more of that happening for a variety of cases in those months.”

2. Commissioner Martley-Jordan, asks:
  1. "I see that in April, May, June and July they were using Make It Right and then it dropped off and I see a tiny bit in October, what recommendations do you have to the Commission for the DA's office to step the game up?
    - i. Chief Miller responds, "I think it's a great conversation with the DA's office. They're making the decisions about which young people are going into Make It Right. It's not our decision to make and I think it's a good conversation for when you have the DA come."
  2. "Do you have numbers of these young people not committing crimes again since they've been in the Make It Right program, do you have that information?"
    - i. Chief Miller responds, "I can't give that to you for current numbers but I can tell you that the DA's office worked with California Policy Lab to do a five year study of the Make It Right program looking at the recidivism rates of young people who went through the program and like in the true kind of gold standard randomized control design and found really impressive differences in the recidivism of young people who went through make it right versus young people who went through the traditional system."
3. President Brodtkin comments:
  1. "It seems like there are some significant decreases in areas where we want them, on the other hand the Probation cases just keeps going up and even more than you think because the AB12 has gone down, so actually in relation the caseload has actually increased more than it would actually appear."
    - i. Chief Miller responds, "What you see in those October and November numbers and particularly November is a drop off from the month before that of new cases, but that doesn't affect the fact that for an extended period ahead of that for most of 2023, every month you often saw more cases coming in than a year previously and those cases and those young people are working their way through the system and through their time with us, so there's always going to be a lag between when you see a number drop down and then how that ultimately affects our caseload. I also do think that it's not unusual for us to see a seasonal drop in new cases coming in and it's not uncommon particularly during the holidays for us to see fewer new cases."
  2. "A significant number of young people are coming in because there's no non-secure option for them and so this is a major problem and issue for all of us and I don't know the answer to what we're going to do to find the beds that are needed so we're not locking out the young people who don't need secure option."
    - i. Chief Miller responds, "I actually feel that this is an issue that's been very dynamic and when you see a report next month you'll see a real difference in that so almost entirely that group of young people who you see characterized that way in this data are young people who are here by themselves without a parent or guardian. They're undocumented young people who've been arrested for drug sales. As you know we made the decision in August to start detaining young people and not citing them out for that and two things have happened like the two trends that we've seen happen pretty consistently since August. The first thing we saw and we've talked about it here was that as we were booking people who had identified as minors in those circumstances, a large number of them were turning out to be adults when they got to the hall and got booked or ID processed and so that was one kind of unexpected thing that we saw along the way. Since we changed our policy to that, the number of minors getting arrested for drug sales in the Tenderloin has dramatically dropped



off over time such that in December there were zero so there were zero young people detained in the hall under these circumstances in the month of December and it had been a continual decline since August.”

- ii. Commissioner Laco comments, “It’s just interesting because you’ve been hearing in the media about the crackdown about this type of activity so having zero come in is somewhat surprising.”
- iii. Chief Miller responds, “That doesn’t mean there are not a lot of arrests happening, but it is not people identifying as minors. There are very small number of minors cited for misdemeanor drug possession in December but not for drug sales and we don’t book for that, but yes those kinds of operations are still ongoing in a very robust way but it’s not people under 18.”

iii. Public Comment:

- 1. Sandra, Young Women’s Freedom Center, comments: “Just some concerns with the data that we’re seeing right now around active warrants and the amount of Latino youth that are now higher in YGC, our executive director did have a meeting with the mayor and basically what they’re doing is that the mayor and the chief DA decided that they’re going to work with ICE now, so one of the things that I do ask this Commission is I don’t know how you guys plan to protect undocumented youth because I want to know how many of those youth are undocumented that are already in there and I see some shock faces and I don’t know if this is news to you, but our executive director was in a meeting and the Mayor London Breed said that they are working with Chief and the DA’s decision was to work with ICE so that’s my first concern. Another concern with some of the youth and goes a little bit with the last topic that we talked about I know that we’re talking about CBOs and the work that CBOs can do, but I also want to know what more work the Probation Department can do. We had a young person that very recently in the last couple of months that came to our center and this young person ended up going AWOL. The Probation Department was supposed to give a rehabilitation placement told them to go home for three weeks, they showed up to our center three times because the agreement in the Court was for them to come to our center. They consented, they wanted to be at our center, they did everything possible to be at our center while the PO said that they would send a taxi. That taxi charged our youth three times, so three times supposedly this taxi was supposed to come over to Young Women’s Freedom Center, but the taxi was charging the young person so I don’t know that some of these systems need to be tightened up because now we have a young person that went AWOL and we know that it has to do with the fact that there was loose ends and so we also have to look at the Probation Department and look at how they can tighten up their work as well and what connections they have with these young people. This was a young person that did not have an address here in this city which was just reported to me right now by staff person.

- 1. Chief Miller comments, “We do not report to ICE for any young people in our custody and I don’t have any more information about what Sandra said. It would be helpful to hear the name of the young person that’s being described. We do have taxi services that we’ve arranged and paid for for young people, so it’d be helpful to know who we’re talking about.”

**B. Workforce Update:**

- i. Chief Miller reports:
  - 1. Hire of Assistant Director of Juvenile Justice Center, Dale Tafoya
  - 2. Retirees: DPO Dorothy Ellis and DPO Gwen Smith

**C. Transformation Update:**

- i. Chief Miller provides an update of the December 11, 2023 reorganization of the Probation Services Division. The reorganization chart/structure was shown to the Commission. In December 2023, Probation Services Division transitioned from a Vertical model structure to a Probation Services 1 (PS1) and Probation Services 2 (PS2) structure. PS1 and PS2 are no longer Vertical

staffing, meaning a given Probation Officer no longer works with a young person through the entirety of the case, but instead within those units the young person's case remains, so throughout a young person's time, they are going to the same unit in the building, working with the same team of Probation Officers and the same Supervising Probation Officer who is familiar with their case. With the new model, PS1 and PS2, Probation Officers are assigned to different aspects such as intake, investigation, and supervision. We now have realigned it so that we have some Probation Officer doing each of those functions. The rationale is that when we have one Probation Officer who is responsible for the entirety of the case, they have so many different functions and those functions get in the way for them to do any of the functions. We believe that this model will hold some familiarity for the family throughout their time with a set team of people, but really gives the Probation Officers the ability to have improved case management, improved time management, give opportunities to really be there for families, and to be available for court hearings.

1. Questions/Comments:

1. Commissioner Lacoé asks for an explanation of the transition from Probation Officer to Probation Officer as the case progresses and how you ensure it is kind of the warm handoff and the correct information is shared.
2. President Brodtkin asks, "Are you going back to where you were or is this some kind of combination?"
  - i. Chief Miller's response to both Commissioner Lacoé and President Brodtkin: "The way it used to be in the department was that there were wholly different units with different functions and that's what you would think of as a true horizontal model like an assembly line. There were two units of Probation Officers who just did intake and investigation and there was a unit that just did supervision for kids who had gone through the court process, placement, and the others and I think this is better than that because in that original kind of very common very horizontal framework, it meant that every time a young person moved through a new part of the case, not only did they get a new probation officer, but they also had a new supervisor over that Probation Officer who was also learning about that young person at the same time. What I like about this model is that that same Supervising Probation Officer throughout the time that a young person is with us also gets to know that young person, that family in those circumstances, and then also even just the fact that that whole unit is spatially located together means that if I'm coming in to see you, that is where the warm handoff happens. Everyone is co-located in the same suite in the building. If I come in to see you, I still get to see the PO who I knew in my first stage of the case. If something happens and you are not there, I know I can go to the PO I already knew so there's just more continuity throughout that time. I had great hope when we went to that full vertical model, that it would be an asset to families and kids for that true continuity and I would say that we have consistently heard really legitimate concerns from our staff about it. When we went through this very detailed mapping process that the Controller's office helped us go through, where we literally wrote down every single function that the staff does throughout cases, it really made it even more crystallized for me that as we ask our Probation Officer to do everything on a case, it means that the emergencies are always going to pull them off of that long term kind of stable work to the disservice of kids and families and to the disservice of the Probation Officer so I think this is kind of a blended approach that I am really looking forward to seeing how it works."
3. Commissioner Moses asks, "How is your morale?"



streams for example to bring some programs and services into the hall that can serve everyone, but some things will always just be at least in the current framework for the young people with those long term commitments because that's what the funding source allows. That's why you're seeing the most change right now physically in the units where those young people are.”

**5. Finance & Governance Committee Report:**

- A. Committee did not meet. No discussion.
- B. Public Comment: None

**6. Program Committee Report**

- A. Committee did not meet. No discussion.
- B. Public Comment: None

**7. President’s Report:**

- A. President Brodtkin mentions hiring of new Commission Secretary is underway. HR has identified possible candidates.
- B. Public Comment: None

**8. Consent Calendar:**

- A. The following three items remain on the Consent Calendar:
  - i. Submission of request to amend the current Lacuna Ergonomic agreement to extend the original 12-month term by 10-months, for a revised total term of 32-months.
  - ii. Submission of request to enter into a new agreement with Law Enforcement Psychological Services with a proposed 12-month term and a not-to-exceed amount of \$9,999.
  - iii. Submission of request to enter into a new agreement with Bilingva with a proposed 12-month term and a not-to-exceed amount of \$9,999.
- B. Public Comment: None
- C. Motion to accept items on Consent Calendar:
  - i. Lacoé – First
  - ii. Magee – Second
  - iii. Public Comment: None
  - iv. Votes:
    - 1. Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoé, Magee, Martley-Jordan, Moses, Rodriguez
    - 2. Spingola (Not Present)
  - v. Motion passes.

**9. Future Agenda Items:**

- A. Discussion to add Future Items:
  - i. February: Budget Submission and Approval
  - ii. March: KMD Architect and Youth Recommendations
  - iii. April: Discussion regarding Community Providers and DCYF RFP Results
  - iv. May: Update on Juvenile Hall Survey report back
  - v. Performance Measures: Discuss at 2/26 Program Committee and bring to Full Commission in March (add item tentatively)
  - vi. Invite Judge Chan
  - vii. Invite DA
  - viii. Warrants Status discussion, maybe at the Program Committee
- B. Public Comment: None

**10. Review and Approval of the Program Committee Meeting Minutes for December 13, 2023:**

- A. Discussion:

- i. Commissioner Magee was not present for the December 13, 2023 meeting and asked to be excused from voting on minutes.
    - ii. Public Comment: None.
  - B. Motion(s):
    - i. Motion #1: To excuse Commissioner Magee from voting on December 13, 2023 minutes.
      1. Moses – First
      2. Martley-Jordan – Second
      3. Public Comment: None
      4. Votes:
        1. Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoce, Magee, Martley-Jordan, Moses, Rodriguez
        2. Spingola (Not Present)
      5. Motion passes. Commissioner Magee excused from voting on December 13, 2023 minutes.
    - ii. Motion #2: To approve December 13, 2023 minutes:
      1. Moses – First
      2. Lacoce – Second
      3. Public Comment: None
      4. Votes:
        1. Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoce, Martley-Jordan, Moses, Rodriguez
        2. Magee (Excused), Spingola (Not Present)
      5. Motion passes. December 13, 2023 minutes are approved.

**11. Adjournment:**

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:49pm