

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

AGENDA

Thursday, April 18, 2024

1:00pm – 3:00pm

City Hall

1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 305

San Francisco, CA 94102

Members of the Public who are unable to attend the meeting in person, but would like to provide public comment or watch the meeting can do so remotely through the following zoom information:

Join Zoom Meeting

- <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81716545397?pwd=U0FocWltOWMwZ2FqVU9kN082bDlZdz09>
- Meeting ID: 817 1654 5397
- Passcode: 797944

Dial by your location

- +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)
- Meeting ID: 817 1654 5397
- Passcode: 797944
- Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kcSP42G15s>

Note: *Each member of the public will be allotted no more than 2 minutes to speak on each item.*

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

1. Call to Order and Introductions.
2. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement (discussion only).
3. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below as for “Discussion Only.” (**NOTE:** public comment on items listed as “possible action” will occur during that agenda’s time).
4. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes of January 18, 2024 Council Meeting (discussion & possible action).
5. Staff Report on Activities of the Reentry Council and its Subcommittees (discussion only).
 - a. Staff Updates
 - b. Subcommittee Updates
 - 1) Women 1st Subcommittee
 - 2) Legislation, Policy, and Practices Subcommittee
 - 3) Direct Action Subcommittee
6. Approval of the Subcommittee Rosters (discussion & possible action).
7. Current State Legislation (discussion & possible action).
 - a. AB 1186, AB 1877, AB 1986, AB 2045, AB 2055, AB 2354
 - b. SB 987, SB 1001, SB 1005, SB 1011
8. Regular Update on Activities of the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Sentencing Commission, Collaborative Courts, and Community Corrections Partnership, STARR (discussion only).
9. Racial Equity Work Updates –Departments are welcome to provide a Racial Equity Update for their Department (discussion only).
10. Council Members’ Comments, questions and Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion only).
11. Public Comment on any item on today’s agenda, or on other business within the purview of the Reentry Council (discussion only).
12. Adjournment.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE REENTRY COUNCIL

Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit to the Reentry Council, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. These comments will be made a part of the official public record, and brought to the attention of the Reentry Council. Written comments should be submitted to: Victoria Westbrook, Interim Reentry Policy Planner, Adult Probation Department, 880 Bryant Street, Room 200, San Francisco, CA 94103, or via email: reentry.council@sfgov.org.

MEETING MATERIALS

Copies of agendas, minutes, and explanatory documents are available through the Reentry Council's website at <http://sfreentry.com> or by calling Victoria Westbrook at (415) 930-2202 during normal business hours. The material can be FAXed or mailed to you upon request.

ACCOMMODATIONS

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Victoria Westbrook at reentry.council@sfgov.org or (415) 930-2202 at least two business days before the meeting.

TRANSLATION

Interpreters for languages other than English are available on request. Sign language interpreters are also available on request. For either accommodation, please contact Victoria Westbrook at reentry.council@sfgov.org or (415) 930-2202 at least two business days before the meeting.

CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES

To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: www.sfgov.org/sunshine.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE:

Administrator
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
San Francisco, CA 94102-4683.
Telephone: (415) 554-7724
Fax: (415) 554-5163
E-Mail: soft@sfgov.org

CELL PHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Reentry Council

City & County of San Francisco

LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and web site <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/>

Reentry Council

DRAFT Minutes

Thursday, January 18, 2024

1:00pm – 3:00pm

City Hall

1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 305

San Francisco, CA 94102

Members of the Public who are unable to attend the meeting in person, but would like to provide public comment or watch the meeting can do so remotely through the following zoom information:

Join Zoom Meeting

- <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81716545397?pwd=U0FocWltOWMwZ2FqVU9kN082bDlZdz09>
- Meeting ID: 817 1654 5397
- Passcode: 797944

Dial by your location

- +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)
- Meeting ID: 817 1654 5397
- Passcode: 797944
- Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kcSP42G15s>

Note: *Each member of the public will be allotted no more than 2 minutes to speak on each item.*

Reentry Council

Members Present:

Tara Agnese for District Attorney, James Caldwell for Mayor Breed, Sheriff Paul Miyamoto (SFSO), Alea Brown-Hoffmeister for Chief Cristel Tullock (SFAPD), Chief Chris Carubba-Katz (US Probation), Carolyn Goosen for Manohar Raju (Public Defender), Commander Eric Vintero (SFPD) Theresa Ick for Grant Colfax (DPH), Melanie Kushnir for Mark Culkins (Superior Court), Sam Logan for Supervisor Catherine Stefani (BOS), Peter Tram for Onyanga Dean (CDCR), Freda Randolph-Glen for Karen Roye (DCSS), Captain Vintero for Chief William Scott (SFPD), David McCahon for Trent Rohr (HSA), Antonio Napoleon (Mayoral Appointee), Allen Harven (Mayoral Appointee), Jusef Nathan (BOS Appointee), Jabari Jackson (BOS Appointee), L Hurshman (BOS Appointee) Cynthia Nagendra (HSH), Jasmine Dawson (DCYF), David Mauroff (BOS Appointee – Pretrial Diversion Services), .

Members Absent:

Tajuana Gray (OEWD), Chief Katherine Miller (Juvenile Probation), Chief Chris Carubba-Katz (US Probation), Joanna Hernandez (BOS Appointee), and Tatiana Lewis (Mayoral Appointee).

Vacant Seat:

Mayoral Appointed TAY Seat.

1. Call to Order and Introductions (discussion only)

Carolyn Gossin from the Public Defender’s Office called the meeting to order. She thanked Council members and members of the interested public for attending the meeting. She acknowledged the other five Co-Chairs:

- Cristel Tullock, Chief of Adult Probation
- Jabari Jackson, representing the formerly incarcerated Council Members
- Brooke Jenkins, District Attorney
- Paul Miyamoto, Sheriff
- James Caldwell, representing Mayor London Breed’s Office

Victoria Westbrook completed Reentry Council Roll Call and indicated that there was quorum.

2. Raymatush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment

The Chair read the Raymatush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement.

3. Public Comment on Items listed as for “Discussion Only” (discussion only).

There was no Public Comment

4. Review and Adoption of the Draft Meeting Minutes of October 19, 2023 (discussion only and possible action).

The Chair asked the Council for a motion to adopt the minutes.

Jabari Jackson made the motion to adopt the minutes.

Sheriff Paul Miyamoto Seconded the motion.

Victoria Westbrook conducted a roll call vote. The motion carried.

The Draft minutes from the October 19, 2023 meeting were approved

5. Staff Report on Activities of the Reentry Council (discussion only).

Victoria Westbrook, Reentry Policy Planner for the San Francisco Adult Probation Department, provided the following updates:

- The Annual Retreat is scheduled for January 22, 2024 at the San Francisco Main Library.
- **Women 1st Subcommittee:** The subcommittee to meet at the Women’s Resource Center on

Reentry Council

December 13, 2024 at 12 pm.

- **Legislation, Policy, & Practices Subcommittee:** No Updates
- **Direct Action Subcommittee:** Advisory Committee is planning the Black History Month Event at the CASC scheduled for February 21, 2024.

6. Regular Update on Activities of the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Sentencing Commission, Collaborative Courts, Community Corrections Partnerships, and STARR (discussion only).

Freda Glen provided an update for the Sentencing Commission

- Sentencing Commission met December 5th 2023 with the following agenda items:
- Mayor appointee Professor Nia Bird as the Academic Researcher
- Presentation on the Safety and Justice Initiative and the October Jail Population
- Next Commission Sentencing meeting is scheduled for March 28, 2024

Theresa Ick provided an update for STARR Grant

- A Health Worker will be joining the team
- Salvation Army Harbor Lights begs continue to be at capacity. Referrals are welcomed

7. Racial Equity Work Updates (discussion & possible action).

Carolyn Gossen, Update for PDR National Equity report for Racial Equity

- May 23, 2023, 16 week executives fellowship focused on understanding the roots and biases of racism BHS Leadership
- A six million dollar a year Maternal Health RFP Awarded in partnership with Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health to support pregnant, prenatal and postpartum African American people with mental health screening, linkages, and more.

8. San Francisco Sherriff's Office Access and Jail Clearance (discussion & possible action).

Mandatory orientation for volunteers and custody staff seeking a jail clearance. The orientation reviews mandatory reporting requirements, PREA, and contraband inside the jails. Orientation is held twice a month (third Wednesday) at 10 AM in person held at 70 Oak Grove Community Classroom; Evenings (first Wednesday) 6 PM at 425 7th Street conference room.

9. Mayor's Office San Francisco Public Safety Strategy (discussion only).

Commander Eric Vintero from the San Francisco Police Department shared 2023 crime data in the city is down.

- From November to December 2023 property crimes and all retail theft down 48%
- Burglary down 26%
- Stolen vehicles down 17%
- Property crime down 40%
- Violent crime down 30%

Strategies used for organized retail theft

- Blitz Operations – A plain clothes SFPD officer working with Loss Prevention Officer to make retail theft arrest.
- Citywide plain clothes operations and utilizing a bait car (rental car) leaving a suit case or purse in the vehicle with a tracking device; tracking the suspect to make an arrest.
- Utilize spike strips to safely flatten tires of suspect vehicles to avoid a high speed pursuit.
- High Visibility Parole in hotspots based on crime data
- Mayor Breed approved use of the city's \$17.3 million state grant to reduce retail theft to fund new camera automated license plate readers.

Reentry Council

Note Public Safety Strategies vary from each district. SFPD is committed to reducing crime in all ten districts not only the Tenderloin district.

SFPD strategies doesn't focus on enforcement only.

- SFPD work closely with community-based providers to enhance prevention in their community.
- DMACC (Drug Market Agency Coordination Center) collaboration approach with SFSD, DPH, Community-based providers, and other partners to provide wrap-around services to those using narcotics. Unique to the DMAAC are the Narcotics unit, 1150 Health Safety Code, FRET Unit

James Caldwell, SF Mayor's Office

Mr. Caldwell shared an update from the San Francisco Public Safety Committee collaborative efforts with DCYF, SBIP, and other CBOs in combining efforts.

- Addressing violence in public schools in SF and across the Bay Area as needed
- Creating a School Outreach Team to assess high-risk students and provide follow-up services
- Collaborate with Violence Prevention Teams to provide mental health and other resources.
- New Interdepartmental meetings to collect data to understand the need and building community CBO training efforts for the Frontline Citywide Collaborative.

10. State Policy (discussion only).

Conversation about collaboration with community-based providers

11. Public Comment on any items on today's agenda, or other business within the purview of the Reentry Council (discussion only).

There was no public comment

12. Adjournment.

The Chair asked the Council for a motion to adjourn

Jabari Jackson made the motion to adjourn

Paul Miyamoto, Sheriff Seconded the motion.

Victoria Westbrook conducted a roll call vote. The motion carried.

Meeting Adjourned

Direct Action Subcommittee

Reentry Council of the City & County of San Francisco

Roster of Members

Richard Beal (Chair)

Member of the Reentry Community
richardb@thclinic.org

Freda Randolph Glenn

freda.randolph@sfgov.org

Destiny Pletsch

Destiny.Pletsch@usw.salvationarmy.org

Emmeline Sun

emmeline.sun@ucsf.edu

Thompson Tran

Thompson.Tran@usw.salvationarmy.org

Joshua Short

Member of the Reentry Community
phattchancecommunity.josh@gmail.com

Jay Sutter

Member of the Reentry Community
jsutter@sfgoodwill.org

Mike Paisley

mike.pasley@bhpmss.org

Rachel Kinnon

Rachel.kinnon@sfppl.org

Victoria Westbrook

Member of the Reentry Community
victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org

CheRonn Ford

Cheronn.ford@sfgov.org

Michael Aldana

michael.aldana@sfgov.org

*For more information, contact
Victoria Westbrook, Reentry Division
Director, at victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org
or
(415) 930-2202 or visit
[https://www.sf.gov/departments/direct-
action-subcommittee](https://www.sf.gov/departments/direct-action-subcommittee)*

Subcommittee on Legislation, Policy & Practices

Reentry Council of the City & County of San Francisco

Roster of Members

Bobby Jones-Hanley (Chair)
Member of the Reentry Community
bobby.jones@croporg.org

Tara Agnese
tara.agnese@sfgov.org

Melanie Kushnir
MKushnir@sftc.org

Linda Connelly
lconnelly@successfulreentry.com

Melanie Kim
melanie.kim@sfgov.org

Carolyn Goosen
carolyn.goossen@sfgov.org

Danielle McVay
danielle.McVay@gmail.com

Indiana Barrenechea
indiana.barrenechea@ifrsf.org

Jay Fraser
jay.fraser@sfgov.org

Joe Calderon
Member of the Reentry Community
josephcalderon@urban-alchemy.us

Alek Hartwick
alek.hartwick@sfgov.org

Kristin Scott-Calip
kristin.scott-calip@sfgov.org

Ranon Ross
ranon.ross@sfgov.org

Katrina Baptiste
katrina.baptiste@sfgov.org

Victoria Westbrook
Member of the Reentry Community
victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org

CheRonn Ford
Cheronn.ford@sfgov.org

Joe Cordova
joseph.cordova@sfgov.org

*For more information, please contact
Victoria Westbrook, Reentry Division Director
@victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org or
(415) 930-2202 or visit
<https://www.sf.gov/departments/legislation-policy-practices-subcommittee>.*

Women 1st Subcommittee

Reentry Council of the City & County of San Francisco

Roster of Members

Juthaporn Chaloeicheep (Chair)

Member of the Reentry Community
chaloeicheepj@gmail.com

Alisea Wesley-Clark

Member of the Reentry Community
aclark@westside-health.org

Angie Wilson

Member of the Reentry Community
angela.wilson@sfgov.org

Rebecca Jackson

Member of the Reentry Community
rjackson@cjcf.org

Shannon Wise

Member of the Reentry Community
shannonwise2000@yahoo.com

Linda Hurshman

Member of the Reentry Community
lhurshman@sfgoodwill.org

Deana Farole

deana.farole@sfgov.org

Danielle McVay

danielle.McVay@gmail.com

Shalee Battle

Sharleebattle2021@gmail.com

Dakota Rose Austin

Member of the Reentry Community
dakotaroseaustin80@gmail.com

Alexa Erinquez

enriquezale96@outlook.com

Victoria Westbrook

Member of the Reentry Community
victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org

Da'vonna Smith

davonna.smith@sfgov.org

Brea Darnell

brea.darnell@sfgov.org

*For more information, please contact
Victoria Westbrook, Reentry Division
Director at victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org or
(415) 930-2202 or visit
<https://www.sf.gov/departments/women-1st-subcommittee>*

Reentry Council

of the City & County of San Francisco

Roster of Members

Co-Chairs

Cristel Tullock

Chief Adult Probation Officer

Adult Probation Department
City & County of San Francisco
850 Bryant Street, 2nd floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Cristel.tullock@sfgov.org

Executive Assistant: La Shaun Williams

lashaun.r.williams@sfgov.org

(415) 553-1687

Alternate: Assistant Chief Tommie Baines

tommie.baines@sfgov.org

Brooke Jenkins

District Attorney

Office of the District Attorney
City & County of San Francisco
350 Rhode Island Street
North Building, Suite 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103

districtattorney@sfgov.org

Confidential Assistant: Lee-Ann Collins

lee-ann.collins@sfgov.org

(415) 553-1742

Alternate: Edward McCaffrey

edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org

Paul Miyamoto

Sheriff

Sheriff's Office
City & County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 456
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

sheriff@sfgov.org

Alternate: Assistant Sheriff Tanzaneka Carter

tanzaneka.carter@sfgov.org

Manohar Raju

Public Defender

Office of the Public Defender
City & County of San Francisco
555 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

manohar.raju@sfgov.org

(415) 553-1677

Executive Assistant: Judy Liu

judy.liu@sfgov.org

(415) 553-1677

Alternate: Carolyn Goosen

Carolyn.Goossen@sfgov.org

Honorable London Breed

Mayor of San Francisco

City & County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Alternate: James Caldwell

james.caldwell@sfgov.org

Jabari Jackson

Board Appointee (Seat 4)

jrj41510@gmail.com

Reentry Council

of the City & County of San Francisco

Other Members

Catherine Stefani
Supervisor, District 2

Board of Supervisors
City Hall

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689

Catherine.stefani@sfgov.org

William Scott

Chief

Police Department

City & County of San Francisco
1245 Third St.

San Francisco, CA 94158

William.scott@sfgov.org

Executive Assistant: Rowena Carr

Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org

(415) 837-7000

Alternate: Cmdr. Peter Walsh

peter.walsh@sfgov.org

Katy Miller

Chief Juvenile Probation Officer

Juvenile Probation Department

City & County of San Francisco

375 Woodside Avenue, Room 243

San Francisco, CA 94127

Executive Secretary: Sheryl Cowan

Sheryl.cowan@sfgov.org

(415) 753-7556

Antonio Napoleon

Mayoral Appointee

ANapoleon@westside-health.org

Allen Harven

Mayoral Appointee

allenharven42@gmail.com

Tatiana Lewis

Mayoral Appointee

tatiana@prisonerswithchildren.org

Mark Culkins

Court Administrator

Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

mculkins@sftc.org

Jusef Nathan

Board Appointee (Seat 1)

jusefnathansf@gmail.com

Joanna Hernandez

Board Appointee (Seat 2)

joannah@sfpreatrial.org

Linda Hurshman

Board Appointee (Seat 3)

lhurshman@sfgoodwill.org

David Mauroff

Representing San Francisco Pretrial

Diversion Project

Board Appointee (Seat 6)

davidm@sfpreatrial.org

Cynthia Nagendra

Deputy Director for Planning, Performance & Strategy

Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing

cynthia.nagendra1@sfgov.org

Kate Sofis

Director of Office of Economic and Workforce Development

City & County of San Francisco

Alternate: Tajuana Gray

tajuana.gray@sfgov.org

Alternate 2: Ken Nim

ken.nim@sfgov.org

Reentry Council

of the City & County of San Francisco

Chris Carrubba-Katz
Chief U.S. Probation Officer
Northern District of California
U.S. Probation Office, U.S. District Court
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
chris_carrubba-katz@canp.uscourts.gov
Alternate: Jennifer James
Assistant Deputy Chief
jennifer_james@canp.uscourts.gov

Dr. Grant Colfax
Department of Public Health
City & County of San Francisco
1380 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alternate: Angelica Almeida
angelica.almeida@sfdph.org
2nd Alternate: Robin Candler
robin.candler@sfgov.org

Karen Roye
Director
Department of Child Support Services
City & County of San Francisco
617 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
karen.roye@sfgov.org
Executive Assistant: Laurina Marcic
laurina.marcic@sfgov.org
Alternate: Freda Randolph Glenn
freda.randolph@sfgov.org

Trent Rhorer
Executive Director
Human Services Agency
City & County of San Francisco
170 Otis Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
trent.rhorer@sfgov.org
Alternate: Susie Smith
susie.smith@sfgov.org

Maria Su
Director
Department of Children, Youth & Their
Families
City & County of San Francisco
1390 Market Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94102
maria@dcyf.org
Executive Assistant: Rebecca Corteza
Rebecca.Corteza@dcyf.org
Alternate: Jasmine Dawson
Jasmine.dawson@sfgov.org

Onyanga Dean
District Administrator
Division of Parole Operations
California Department of Corrections &
Rehabilitation
1727 Mission St.
San Francisco, CA 94102
onyanga.dean@cdcr.ca.gov
Alternate: Peter Tram
Peter.tram@cdcr.ca.gov

Staff
Victoria Westbrook
*Reentry Policy Planner/
Women's Gender Responsive Coordinator*
Adult Probation Department
Community Assessment & Services Center
564 6th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org
(415) 930-2200

For more information about the
Reentry Council of the City and
Council of San Francisco, please
visit www.sfgov.org/reentry



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 1186

Asm Bonta, Asm District 18, Democrat

Realizing Equity while Promoting Accountability and Impactful Relief (REPAIR) Act

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 1186 modifies and enhances California's current youth restitution system, so it may effectively provide survivors with more equitable, timely, and stable compensation.

Background/Analysis

California's current youth restitution system is not working. It fails to live up to its goals of ensuring victims receive what they need, when they need it, to heal and move forward. Instead, it harms both survivors and young people. Each year, California counties order restitution from thousands of young people to be paid to crime survivors based on the loss suffered or harm endured. However, minors are functionally indigent as they are too young to work, have academic obligations, and are legally restricted from establishing any earning capacity. As such, minors ordered to pay restitution and their parents, who are held jointly and severally liable, are often unable to pay these orders. Research shows only 21% of the ordered youth restitution is collected each year. The young people that cycle through the juvenile legal system are mostly Black and brown, and mostly come from low-income families.

This system not only fails to adequately compensate survivors, it is actively causing further harm in the communities where survivors live. Because most young people cannot pay their orders, survivors typically receive delayed or no compensation for the harm or losses endured. Reliance on revenue from youth and their families is such an inconsistent revenue source, one study found that as few as 4% of survivors received any form of restitution payment. Furthermore, since victims and survivors often live in the same communities, the stress of having to pay an unattainable debt impacts a community as a whole. In order to avoid debt, a young person or their family is often forced to forego basic necessities in order to pay. This type of concentrated toxic stress further marginalizes Black and brown neighborhoods.

This inability to pay restitution results in the accumulation of insurmountable debt and lasting harm for young people and their families. Debt from restitution never expires and cannot be discharged in bankruptcy proceedings. Many young people who are ordered to pay restitution enter adulthood with a debt that threatens their economic security.

Finally, collecting restitution is costly and inefficient for counties. Counties waste millions on collection efforts, spending an estimated \$0.66 to collect each dollar, while recovering only 21% of overall restitution ordered to young people.

Challenge

While California's youth restitution system is intended to help survivors address economic loss, it relies on the discretion of a court system tainted by racial bias to procure resources that young people simply do not have. This ineffective costly system harms young people and their families, while failing to address the needs of survivors. The current system also fails to center community healing.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1186, the Realizing Equity while Promoting Accountability and Impactful Relief (REPAIR) Act removes the statutory authority of courts to order restitution to youth and their families, alleviating the harm done to young people and their families by California's current youth restitution system. To hold youth accountable, adequately address harm, and facilitate healing, young people will instead participate in restorative justice programs, community service or other employment, skill-building or mental health programs. AB 1186 will also ensure survivors now receive adequate and timely compensation for economic loss incurred by seeking compensation through California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB).

Departments Impacted & Why

Public Defender's Office, District Attorney's Office

Fiscal Impact

The CalVCB reports one-time costs of \$1.8 million which consist of consultant fees and Project Approval Life Cycle costs through the Department of Technology, in order to create a new database in order to process restitution orders in a timely manner, and annual, ongoing costs of \$2.7 million 6.0 permanent positions, \$200,000 for annual server and storage costs, and \$14,000 for an annual licensing contract (Restitution Fund, General Fund).

The Restitution Fund is the source of CalVCB reimbursements. It operated under a structural deficiency for a number of years. Although revenue has remained consistent, expenditures have outpaced revenues since FY 2015-16. The 2023-24 budget includes \$39.5 million ongoing General Fund (GF) allocation to backfill declining fine and fee revenues in the Restitution Fund and allow the California Victim Compensation Board to continue operating at its current funding level. This bill would require additional funding from the GF in order to maintain existing obligations and cover the costs of juvenile restitution orders.

Budget Trailer bill AB 160 (2022) expanded various payments under the victim compensation program to qualifying applicants. However, those provisions of AB 160 were made contingent upon General Fund moneys over the multiyear forecasts beginning in 2024 - 25 being available to support ongoing augmentations and actions, and subject to an appropriation being made to backfill the Restitution Fund to support the actions.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

Debt Free Justice California (Sponsor)
ACLU Cal Action
All of Us or None - Legal Services of Prisoners with Children
Anti-Recidivism Coalition
Attorney General Rob Bonta
Californians for Safety and Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice

Ceres Policy Research
Children's Defense Fund-California
City and County of San Francisco
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
San Francisco Financial Justice Project
San Francisco Public Defender's Office
Young Women's Freedom Center

Oppose

California District Attorneys Association



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 1877
Asm, Jackson, Asm District 60, Democrat
Juveniles: Sealing Records

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 1877 mandates the automatic sealing of all records of a minor upon reaching 18 years of age, conditional upon their lack of conviction for a felony or a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, and upon the court's satisfaction with their rehabilitation.

Background/Analysis

In recent years, California has enacted crucial legislation enabling the sealing of criminal records for millions and facilitating pathways to employment, education, and housing. The California Department of Justice has expunged over 11 million arrest and conviction records, showcasing the state's proactive stance.

California has joined other states such as New York, New Jersey, and Michigan in their efforts to seal the juvenile records of millions. As observed by the United States Department of Justice, San Jose State University, and Californians for Safety and Justice, sealing records provides pathways for millions of Californians to stable housing, employment, and education.

While California is providing millions of people relief, a significant number of California's minors continue to face challenges navigating the process for sealing their criminal records.

Challenge

California's minors are not always provided a clear path to having their records sealed and are often left unaware or unable to enter adulthood with a clean slate.

Current law provides our minors with fragmented pathways to clear their criminal records. For example, in certain cases, minors can expect automatic record sealing, and be required to petition a probation department or the court to have their records sealed.

California should ensure that all minors eligible to have their records sealed receive equal protection under the law and access relief, paving the way for a promising adulthood.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1877 aims to grant young individuals the opportunity to embark on their adult lives without the burden of their past criminal records. This bill will serve as a safety net for our youth, mandating courts to seal all juvenile criminal records for individuals not convicted of a felony or any misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, and if the court is satisfied with their rehabilitation.

Departments Impacted & Why

Juvenile Probation Department and Adult Probation Department

The bill necessitates that the probation departments notify individuals in writing regarding the sealing status of their records under the bill's provisions, including reasons for non-qualification.

Fiscal Impact

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

ACLU California Action
Alliance for Children's Rights California
Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Children's Defense Fund
CA Communities United for Restorative
Youth Justice Felony Murder Elimination
Project
Friends Committee on Legislation of
California Initiate Justice Initiate Justice
Action LA Defensa
Legal Service for Prisoners With Children
MILPA Collective
Oakland Privacy
Pacific Juvenile Defender Center
Rubicon Programs Santa Cruz Barrios
Institutions
The W. Haywood Burns Institutions
Young Women's Freedom Center



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	Victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 1986

Asm, Bryan, Asm District 55, Democrat

Accountability and Transparency for Prison Book Bans

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 1986 requires the Office of Inspector General (OIG), which is an independent agency that oversees CDCR, to post CDCR's Centralized List of Disapproved Publications publicly. It will also require CDCR to remove a publication from its list if the OIG finds that there is insufficient evidence to ban a book. AB 1986 is a Black Caucus Reparations priority.

Background/Analysis

In the last couple of years the movement to ban books has spread across the country. In California, many school boards across the state have tried to ban books written by diverse authors of color who share stories of historically underrepresented communities. In 2023, Governor Newsom warned county and district superintendents that they would face an investigation by the Attorney General if they attempted to ban books from their classrooms. The American Library Association discovered that among the 87 challenged books, most of them centered on LGBTQ issues.

Similarly, prisons use book bans as a tool to limit access to education and impact nearly 2 million people in prisons and jails on any given day, nationally. In California, CDCR bans books they deem not to be in the penological interest of the state- and with great inconsistency. CDCR's process of what books, articles, and other pieces of information it bans is not public and they are not required to publicly post a list of their banned books.

In 2023, The California Reparations Task Force recommended addressing the issue of prison book bans in their report. They aim to address the censorship of African American creative works by examining whether written work, or publications featuring the stories or experiences of African American people should be removed from the list of banned books. They also recommended that CDCR provide criteria and justification for banning particular books and require evidence that a book ban is an effective means of accomplishing a legitimate stated purpose.

Challenge

Books are more than just sources of information and entertainment; they are bridges to other cultures and tools for empowerment and transformation that assist with rehabilitation. Access to

knowledge is essential to rehabilitation and it helps people reintegrate into society since more than 95% of incarcerated people eventually return home.

CDCR lacks transparency regarding their banned books list. CDCR is not required to publicize a list and it is difficult for people to know what books the department unilaterally has decided to ban. Through Public Records Act requests, The Marshall Project received some information on what books may be currently banned in California prisons as of January 2022. The state cannot continue to rely on a non-profit organization for updates on what books are banned.

Additionally, there is no transparency and accountability with CDCR's process to ban books. The books currently banned seem to be disproportionately written by Black authors, Latino artists, and activists are on the banned list. There are also educational books that include visual dictionaries and multiple atlases.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1986 will require the OIG to post the CDCR Centralized List of Disapproved Publications on its website. The posting will allow for transparency on what books CDCR has deemed necessary to ban for incarcerated individuals despite their literary value. AB 1986 also requires CDCR to remove a publication from its banned list if the OIG finds that there is insufficient evidence to ban the book in the first place. This will create accountability for CDCR's decision process. Together, these transparency and accountability measures on CDCR's process for banning books can prevent the erasure of Black authors and remove the limitations placed on educational and cultural books.

Departments Impacted & Why

No Departments Impacted.

Fiscal Impact

Fiscal Impact Unknown.

Support / Opposition

Support

Initiate Justice (Sponsor)
ACLU California Action
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
Asian Americans Advancing Justice
Black Women Organized for Political Action (BWOPA)
Books Beyond Bars at UCLA
Boundless Freedom Project
California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
California Black Power Network
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Public Defenders Association
Californians for Safety and Justice
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Chicago Books to Women in Prison
Children's Defense Fund
Communities United For Restorative Youth Justice
Courage California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Fair Chance Project
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Friend's Committee on Legislation of California
Grip Training Institute
Initiate Justice Action
La Defensa
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area
Legal Services for Prisoner With Children
Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership (LARRP)
Los Angeles County Democratic Party
Michelson Center for Public Policy
MILPA Collective
Oakland Privacy
PEN America
Prison FTIO
Root & Rebound
Rubicon Programs

Safe Return Project
San Francisco Public Defender
Santa Cruz Barrios Unidos
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
The Transformative In-Prison Workgroup
The Amelia Ann Adams Whole Life Center
Uncommon Law
UC Berkeley's Underground Scholars
Initiative (USI)
Young Women's Freedom Center



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2045
Asm Hoover, Asm District 7, Republican
Controlled Substances: Fentanyl Trafficking Penalties

Recommended Position

SPONSOR **SUPPORT** **SUPPORT if amended** **OPPOSE** **OTHER & Describe**

Summary

AB 2045 seeks to add an additional 2-year penalty on the sale of fentanyl within 1,000 feet of any public or private schools while minors are present, making the felony punishable by 5, 8, or 11 years in state prison. Furthermore, it will add fentanyl to the list of illicit drugs already covered by state law by adding a 2-year sentence enhancement for trafficking fentanyl on or near school grounds.

Background/Analysis

Health and Safety Code § 11353 makes it a crime for any adult to solicit, induce, encourage or intimidate a minor to commit a drug crime. This offense is a felony punishable by 3, 6, or 9 years in state prison. Current law also states that for offenses of solicitation, encouraging or intimidating a minor to commit a drug crime involving heroin, cocaine, etc., and occurring upon, or within 1,000 feet of any public or private school while minors are present, the defendant is subject to a 2-year enhancement. Finally, for an adult who commits specified drug trafficking offenses upon the grounds of, or within 1,000 feet of, a public or private school while school children are present, shall receive an additional punishment of 3, 4, or 5 years. If the offense involves a minor who is at least four years younger than an adult defendant, an additional enhancement of 3, 4, or 5 years (subject to realignment) applies.

Challenge

Drug-Free Zone laws like AB 2045 have been promoted as attempts to keep dangerous drug activity away from children but research has demonstrated they have no deterrent effect on drug sales near schools and instead fuel racial disparities.

The premise behind drug-free zone laws is that drug trafficking near schools poses a danger to children. In order to protect children from drug activity, protected zones are established around the places where children are most likely to be present. Individuals caught using or selling drugs within the protected zone face substantially higher penalties than others who engage in the same conduct outside the zone.

The application of this drug-free school zone law is problematic for several reasons:

- Because protected areas are clustered within urban, high-density population areas, the zones disproportionately affect people of color and economically disadvantaged citizens.
- It results in enhanced penalties for drug offenses that are a substantial distance from a school, that do not involve school children in the offense, or take place outside of school hours.
- Seven in 10 drug-free zone incidents occurred when school was not in session, and less than one percent involved sales to youth.
- The fact that sales in 80 percent of the drug cases studied occurred in school zones reflected the density of schools in high-poverty/high-drug-dealing areas.
- Of the incidents that took place in school zones, however, 71 percent occurred when school was not in session – on weekends, at night, or during the summer. Furthermore, less than one percent of the incidents in the sample involved dealing to minors.

AB 2045 would negatively impact criminal justice reform efforts and only serve to increase California's prison population.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2045 seeks to add an additional 2-year penalty on the sale of fentanyl occurring upon, or within 1,000 feet of any public or private school while minors are present.

Departments Impacted & Why

District Attorney's Office;

Fiscal Impact

By increasing the penalties for a crime, this bill would create a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

As of January 23, 2024 it costs a record high \$132,860 per year to incarcerate someone in California.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

N/A

OPPOSE

N/A



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2055
Asm Reyes, Asm District 50, Democrat
Criminal Procedure: Expungement of Records

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would require the Judicial Council of California to submit a report to the Legislature detailing the rate of expungements granted to individuals who successfully participated in the California Conservation program as incarcerated hand crew members.

Background/Analysis

The California Conservation Camp Program was initiated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to provide incarcerated individuals with the opportunity to work on meaningful projects throughout the state. These projects include clearing firebreaks, restoring historical structures, maintaining parks, sand bagging and flood protection, reforestation and clearing fallen trees and debris.

However, despite their time working as a part of the California Conservation Camp Program and providing critical services to the state of California, many who participated in this program struggled to find permanent and stable employment once released from custody. This was in part due to the significant barriers in place for individuals with prior convictions.

In response, AB 2147 (Reyes, 2020) was introduced and signed into law. The bill allowed an individual who successfully participated as an incarcerated hand crew member under the California Conservation Camp Program to apply for an expungement upon release from custody. AB 2147 set a pathway for many individuals who served our state as hand crew members to seek meaningful employment, reintegration, and true rehabilitation.

Since this landmark piece of legislation passed, the rate of expungements granted to these individuals is unclear. Without this information, the Legislature cannot determine the effectiveness of the intent of AB 2147 or the opportunities being provided to previously incarcerated hand crew members.

Challenge

In 2020, AB 2147 was signed into law to provide individuals with the opportunity to apply for an expungement once they were released from custody and had participated in the Conservation Camp Program. AB 2147 was a step in the right direction in providing individuals with a pathway towards rehabilitation and integration. Since its passage, the opportunity for meaningful employment has been granted, now it is time to review the data of the rate of the expungements granted.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2055 will require the collection of data and help ensure that there is appropriate follow through on the effectiveness of previous legislation.

Departments Impacted & Why

Superior Courts: This bill would require, beginning May 1, 2027, and every other year thereafter, each superior court to report to the Judicial Council specified data regarding petitions seeking relief pursuant to the above-described provisions. The bill would require the Judicial Council to report the statewide data regarding these petitions beginning June 1, 2027, and every other year thereafter. The bill would repeal these provisions on January 1, 2037.

Public Defender's Office

Fiscal Impact

Costs (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) to the superior courts and Judicial Council, likely in the low millions of dollars annually. For an identical bill last year, Judicial Council reported it does not currently collect the data needed to fulfill this bill's requirements. For other data collection and reporting projects, Judicial Council estimated implementation costs of approximately \$2 million and over \$3 million in ongoing costs for data validation and storage. Judicial Council will incur additional workload costs to compile and publish the required report every two years.

Increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a need for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The Governor's 2024-25 budget proposes \$83.1 million ongoing from the General Fund to backfill declining revenue to the Trial Court Trust Fund. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, the General Fund faces a structural deficit in the tens of billions of dollars over the next several fiscal years.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

ACLU California Action
Anti-Recidivism Coalition (ARC)
California Public Defender Association
Initiate Justice
Initiate Justice Action



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	Victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

AB 2354
Asm Bonta, Asm District 18, Democrat
Justice for Survivors

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

AB 2354 ensures that all survivors of violence can petition the court to vacate or remove a sentence resulting from their abuse and victimization.

Background/Analysis

California law (Penal code §236.14 and Penal code §236.15) excludes certain victims of violence from post-conviction legal remedies. This disproportionately harms Black and Brown women, youth, immigrants, refugees, and queer and transgender Californians due to biases in our legal system, denying them a chance to rebuild their lives because they are more likely to be criminalized and aggressively charged.

Every Californian deserves the opportunity to live a life free of trauma and violence, and to receive protection, healing, and care when they are victims of violence.

In California, 34% of women will experience intimate partner violence in their lifetimes. Gender-based violence – including intimate partner violence, human trafficking, and sexual violence – impacts all communities, but Black, Brown, immigrant, Indigenous, queer, and transgender individuals are disproportionately impacted. In fact, more than 80% of American Indian and Alaska Native women experience violence in their lifetime, while Black women are almost three times more likely than white women to die at the hands of a current or ex-partner.

Despite these sobering statistics, survivors are often arrested and punished for protecting their or their family's lives. Too often, victims and survivors of violence encounter barriers to healing because their trauma is used against them, ignored, or not accounted for during legal proceedings. As a result, 90% of human trafficking victims are criminalized while they are trafficked. Immigrant and refugee survivors face the additional threat of detention and deportation when they seek help or are funneled into the criminal legal system.

Vacatur can provide a form of relief for survivors who carry records created as a result of their abuse. Vacatur is a process that allows survivors to petition the court for the records to be cleared. Vacatur is especially important for immigrant and refugee communities, because often vacatur is the only legal remedy that can remove the immigration consequences of a conviction and prevent deportation and permanent separation from their families.

Challenge

The criminalization and penalization of victims by California's legal system and the current inability to vacate criminal convictions blocks opportunities for healing and leaves survivors without access to crucial resources like housing, employment, education, and financial independence, thus subjecting them to continued cycles of violence, homelessness, and poverty.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 2354 ensures that all survivors of violence can petition the court to vacate or remove a sentence resulting from their abuse and victimization. This important legislation would recognize the trauma and coercion many survivors face, offering a path to justice by recognizing their victimization and clearing those charges and convictions from their records. It empowers survivors to rebuild their lives without the burden of a record tied to their abuse. For immigrant and refugee survivors, vacatur is often the only form of relief that can remove the immigration consequences of a conviction and prevent deportation and permanent separation from their families and homes. In a 2023 National Survivor Study conducted by the Polaris Institute, of the survivors who reported having a criminal record, 69% reported that their record prevented them getting or keeping a job, 59% reported their record affected their ability to get good, safe housing, and 63% reported that it affected their ability to receive education, training or a professional license.

Departments Impacted & Why

Superior Court, Adult Probation, Sheriff's Office, Police Department, District Attorney's Office, Public Defenders Office

If the court issues an order pursuant to this section, the court shall also order all of the following agencies to seal and destroy their records:

- (A) Any law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense.
- (B) The Department of Justice.
- (C) Any law enforcement agency that arrested the petitioner.
- (D) Any law enforcement agency that participated in the arrest of the petitioner.
- (E) Any law enforcement agency that has taken action or maintains records related to or because of the offense, including, but not limited to, a department of probation, rehabilitation, corrections, or parole.

Fiscal Impact

Unknown at this time.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

California Coalition for Women Prisoners (co-sponsor)
California Partnership to End Domestic Violence (co-sponsor)
Californians for Safety and Justice (co-sponsor)
Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking (Cast LA) (co-sponsor)

Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice (co-sponsor)
Felony Murder Elimination Project (co-sponsor)
Free to Thrive (co-sponsor)
National Center for Youth Law (co-sponsor)
Rainbow Services, Ltd. (co-sponsor)
San Francisco Public Defender's Office (co-sponsor)

Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition (co-sponsor)
Survived & Punished (co-sponsor)
Immigrant Legal Resource Center (co-sponsor)
Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice (co-sponsor)



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	Victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 987
Sen Menjivar, Sen District 20, Democrat
Independent Pretrial Services

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 987 would expand the definition of "criminal justice agencies" to include pretrial release departments, allowing an independent agency to establish an independent pretrial division capable of offering a wide array of client services, along with the traditional aspects of a pretrial operation.

Background/Analysis

Pretrial services programs are used in the early stages of the criminal case process, offering the court alternatives by improving the breadth and quality of information about defendants – including their housing and employment situation, relationships with family, and other ties to the community – and by providing services to address identified needs California's Courts have acknowledged the importance of independent pretrial agencies to ensure the independence of operations needed to manage screenings and recommendations for pretrial release.

There are currently two independent pretrial agencies in the state – in Santa Clara County and Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County's "Care First, Jail Last" model seeks to scale alternatives to incarceration and expand diversion so care and services are provided first, and jail is a last resort. These agencies, however, do not currently have the statutory authority to offer full pretrial services.

Challenge

Existing law only allows pretrial work to be completed by Probation departments, the Courts, or other existing "criminal justice agencies" and does not allow for an independent pretrial agency. The law defines "criminal justice agencies" as agencies that perform activities that relate to the apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, incarceration, or correction of criminal offenders. As a result, independent pretrial agencies like Los Angeles County's Justice, Care and Opportunities Department (JCOD) does not qualify under "criminal justice agencies," which precludes it from accessing criminal history information and implementing a single all-inclusive independent pretrial operation. Failure to expand the definition of "criminal justice agencies" may result in two agencies operating in the pretrial space, which may preclude them from cooperating on issues involving a client's criminal history.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This proposal would allow for an independent pretrial services agency to carry out an all-inclusive pretrial program including client services. This measure would:

- *Expand the definition of “criminal justice agencies” to include pretrial agencies that implement pretrial services and programs;*
- *Allow State and local law enforcement partners to share criminal history background with County’s pretrial agency and authorize JCOD to access criminal history information to complete background checks*

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

Unknown at this time.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

*Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
(Sponsor)
Amity Foundation
California Public Defenders Association
Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership
(LARRP)
Oakland Privacy*

*Somos Familia Valle
Tarzana Treatment Centers, Inc.*

Oppose

*Los Angeles County Deputy Probation
Officers’ Union, AFSCME Local 685*



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	Victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 1001
Asm Skinner, Asm District 9, Democrat
Death Penalty: Intellectual Disabilities

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Existing state law and rulings by the US Supreme Court have deemed the execution of a person who is intellectually disabled as cruel and unusual punishment. Intellectual disability is defined as someone who has below average intelligence and whose life skills, before adulthood, demonstrate difficulty in thinking and understanding that impacts conceptual, social, and practical skills.

SB 1001 would provide important safeguards to California's existing law to help prevent the execution of those who are intellectually disabled. Specifically, SB 1001 would retain the requirement that a person's intellectual disability had to be present when they were young, e.g.; during their developmental period, but would not require the disability to have been formally diagnosed during that time period.

Background/Analysis

In *Atkins v. Virginia* (2002), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the execution of intellectually disabled individuals violates the Eight Amendment's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishments. In 2003, California codified this prohibition in SB 3 (Burton), and in 2020, AB 2512 (Stone) updated and modernized the statute to adopt current clinical standards for diagnosing intellectual disability.

However, these prior bills did not adequately account for the fact that some people with legally defined intellectual disabilities were not able to be formally diagnosed while they were young and in their developmental period.

Challenge

Research demonstrates that many people with intellectual disabilities do not receive proper diagnosis in childhood. Only 41% of adults with intellectual or developmental disabilities are currently served through the disability system in the United States. Intellectually disabled individuals evade diagnosis for many reasons. Families lacking health care coverage or living in areas without

clinics or specialists who can administer the necessary tests for such a diagnosis may not have had the means or ability to determine their child's intellectual disability.

Schools also vary in what testing and services may be available, leaving many children undiagnosed and untested. These socio-economic and other barriers can prevent the determination of an intellectual disability during a person's developmental stage. This does not mean that a person is not intellectually disabled, it only means the person was not able to obtain such a diagnosis before adulthood.

Solution/Recommended Proposal.

SB 1001 will help ensure that California is not executing people who meet the legal definition of being intellectually disabled by:

- Allowing someone to show, through evidence, such as medical evaluation, diagnosis and testing, and testimony that they were intellectually disabled before the end of their developmental period;
- Codifying court rules to clarify the procedures used when the prosecutor seeks additional testing of the individual;

Departments Impacted & Why

N/A

Fiscal Impact

N/A

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

California Anti-Death Penalty Coalition (source)
8th Amendment Project
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
Amnesty International USA
California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Catholic Conference
California Innocence Coalition
California Public Defenders Association
Californians for Safety and Justice
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
Death Penalty Focus
Disability Rights California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Faith in Action East Bay
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Full Picture Justice
Grip Training Institute
Initiate Justice
Initiate Justice Action
LA Defensa
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area
Legal Services for Prisoner with Children
Nextgen California

*Santa Cruz Barrios Unidos
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California, a Project of Tides Advocacy
The Transformative In-prison Workgroup
Uncommon Law
University of San Francisco School of Law, Racial Justice Clinic
Young Women's Freedom Center*

OPPOSITION

California District Attorneys Association



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 1005
Sen Ashby, Sen District 8, Democrat
Youth Courts

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 1005 gives statutory authority for minors, with referral from a probation officer and consent of the minor's parent, to waive traditional juvenile court system hearing and sentencing procedures and experience a court of fellow minors.

Background/Analysis

Youth courts are a type of diversion program where a minor accused of committing a certain offense can opt-into an alternative court-like setting where youth volunteers play a variety of roles in the judicial process – such as district attorney, public defender, bailiff, or juror. Generally, juveniles charged with minor violations such as shoplifting, vandalism, truancy, or disorderly conduct are eligible for youth courts.

Many youth court programs already exist throughout the state and range in structure, with the earliest programs in California dating back to the mid-1980s. All programs are under the supervision of a judge.

These programs keep low-level youth offenders out of the formal juvenile justice system, allowing more resources directed toward youth with serious offenses. Individual research conducted on youth court programs across the nation found outcomes at least as positive as other diversionary alternatives, and some that were superior to other alternatives.

Recent studies show that youth court participation produces the following benefits for all involved: accountability, timeliness, cost savings, civic engagement, youth influence youth, and prevention.

Youth courts provide young people with avenues for positive development and personal success, and youth volunteers learn from each other while also gaining a deeper understanding of the legal system.

Challenge

Existing law provides probation departments with broad authority and options for alternative types of supervision for minors. However, there is currently no specific statutory authority for youth courts.

Without such statutory authority, jurisdictions hesitate to develop or promote youth courts, which are important components of a restorative justice system. This lack of clear statutory guidance may cause confusion for the courts, and keep jurisdictions from utilizing cost saving measures, as many youth court programs are primarily funded through non-public resources and community-based organizations.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

SB 1005 grants probation departments the statutory authority to maintain and operate youth courts, or contract with community-based organizations or private or public agencies, to implement youth courts. The most serious crimes are excluded from eligibility for these programs. SB 1005 does not change the probation department's discretion with case referral, may potentially reduce costs to the state, and has been a successfully implemented restorative justice program in a few courts across California.

Departments Impacted & Why

Superior Court, Juvenile Probation, Public Defender's Office, District Attorney's Office

Fiscal Impact

Unknown at this time.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

California Judges Association

OPPOSITION

California District Attorneys Association



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	April 19, 2024
Submitting Department	Reentry Council
Contact Name	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Contact Email and Phone Number	victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org, 415-930-2202; alek.hartwick@sfgov.org, 628- 652-2341
SLC Meeting Presenter	Victoria Westbrook/Alek Hartwick
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

SB 1011
Sen Jones, Sen District 38, Republican
Compassionately Clearing Homeless Encampments

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB 1011 would prohibit homeless encampments near schools, open spaces, and major transit stops. This bill implements a 72-hour warning before an encampment is cleared, and requires enforcement officers to provide information about sleeping alternatives, homeless and mental health services, and/or homeless shelters in the area. The bill would also provide that a violation of the prohibition may be charged as a misdemeanor or an infraction, at the discretion of the prosecutor.

Background/Analysis

The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals prohibits a city, under the Constitution's ban on cruel and unusual punishment, from arresting or evicting homeless people from street camps or public property without offering them available shelter.

Both the federal government – through its Interagency Council on Homelessness – and the United Nations have recognized that criminalizing homelessness violates the constitutional and internationally recognized human rights of people who are homeless, including the right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. The federal government and the United Nations have called upon governments to cease enactment and enforcement of such laws.

SB1011 would require enforcement officers to provide information about sleeping alternatives but that does not mean sleeping alternatives are accessible and open within the 72-hour window before an encampment is cleared. Clearing encampments without providing adequate alternative housing or shelter options displaces unhoused populations rather than solving homelessness. SB1011 would leave the unhoused without access to shelter, belongings such as medicine, and necessary resources further deepening their vulnerability and suffering. Dispersing homeless encampments can scatter individuals into less visible or more isolated areas, making it harder for outreach workers to provide services and increasing risks to public health and safety. It can also disrupt the social networks and support systems that individuals have established within the encampments.

Laws like SB1011 do not reduce homelessness or crime. Instead, they increase incarceration rates and the financial indebtedness of people who are homeless. Moreover, the collateral consequences of these ordinances prolong homelessness by making it more difficult for people to secure needed housing, employment, benefits, and medical care.

Challenge

More than one in five people who are homeless in the United States live in California, and two-thirds of all people experiencing homelessness in California are unsheltered. Although homelessness exists statewide—exacerbated by decades of deep cuts to federal and state funding for affordable housing and by rising inequality—it is managed mostly at the local level. The state legislature has been slow to respond to this widespread problem, forcing municipal governments to address homelessness often with limited resources. While some local governments have invested in social services, shelters, and supportive housing, cities have also responded by enacting and enforcing a wide range of anti-homeless laws—municipal codes that target or disproportionately impact people experiencing homelessness.

Responding to the crisis of homelessness with criminal or civil penalties and the intent or effect of pushing people who are homeless out of public spaces and into courts and jails, or to impose on them unaffordable fines and fees, is inhumane and violates basic constitutional, civil, and human rights of people who are homeless. It is also costly and ineffective at achieving its purported goal of reducing homelessness.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

This bill will:

- *Prohibit encampments near schools, open spaces, or transit stops.*
- *Prohibit camping on sidewalks if a homeless shelter is available.*
- *Require a 72-hour warning before an encampment is cleared.*
- *Require enforcement officers to provide information about sleeping alternatives, homeless and mental health services, and/or homeless shelters in the area.*

Departments Impacted & Why

Police Department, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Department of Public Works

Fiscal Impact

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because the only costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT

Sen. Blakspear (Principle Coauthor)
Sen. Alvarado-Gil (Coauthor)
Sen. Dahle (Coauthor)
Sen. Dodd (Coauthor)

Sen. Grove (Coauthor)
Sen. Nyguyen (Coauthor)
Sen. Niello (Coauthor)
Sen. Ochoa (Coauthor)
Sen. Bogh (Coauthor)
Sen. Seyarto (Coauthor)
Sen. Wilk (Coauthor)
Asm. Alanis (Coauthor)
Asm. Dahle (Coauthor)
Asm. Davies (Coauthor)
Asm Essayli (Coauthor)
Asm Flora (Coauthor)
Asm. Gallagher (Coauthor)
Asm. J, Patterson (Coauthor)
Asm. Sanchez (Coauthor)

OPPOSE

SF Public Defenders Office
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights
Western Center on Law and Poverty

Reentry Council of the City and County of San Francisco

2024 Meeting Calendar

Council Meetings: 3rd Thursday of the first month of each quarter 1pm – 3pm

- January 18, 2024- Zoom Meeting
- April 18, 2024 - Room 305, City Hall
- July 18, 2024 - Room 305, City Hall
- October 17, 2024 - Room 305, City Hall

Subcommittee on Direct Action: Thursdays, 1:00pm – 3:00pm

- February 15, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- April 11, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- June 13, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- September 5, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- November 14, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227

Subcommittee on Legislation, Policy and Practices: Wednesdays, 2:00-4:00pm (Additional Meetings may be scheduled as needed)

- February 28, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- March 27, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- June 26, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227
- September 25, 2024 - CASC, 564 6th Street, Upstairs Conference Room 226/227

Women 1st Subcommittee: Mondays, 11am – 1pm

- February 26, 2024 - Women’s Resource Center, 930 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103
- April 15, 2024 – Women’s Resource Center, 930 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103
- June 24, 2024 – Women’s Resource Center, 930 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103
- August 26, 2024 – Women’s Resource Center, 930 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103
- October 14, 2024 – Women’s Resource Center, 930 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103

Slated Community Events supported and/or hosted by Reentry Council

- 2024 Recovery Summit at SF Main Library, 100 Larkin Street, Koret Auditorium Wednesday, April 24, 2024, 9:30am
- 4th Annual Recovery Day at Boeddeker Park (Jones St. & Eddy St.) – Friday, August 9, 2024, 12:00pm – 3:00pm
- 12th Annual Restorative Justice Reentry Conference and Resource Fair at Cathedral of St. Mary of the Assumption Event Center located at 1111 Gough St - Friday, September 6, 2024, 8:00am – 4:00pm