

**PROBATION DEPARTMENT
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**



Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission

May 28, 2019

5:15pm – 7:15pm

455 County Center – Room 405

Redwood City, CA 94063

AGENDA

Public comment will be accommodated under Item II for items not on the agenda. The Commission requests that members of the public, who wish to comment on items on the agenda, submit a request to the Chair prior to the start of the meeting so that they may be recognized at the appropriate time.

Hon. Susan Etezadi
Presiding Juvenile
Court Judge, Superior
Court

Judith Holiber
Deputy County
Counsel

Commissioners

Michele Gustafson
Chair

Rebecca Flores
Co-Vice Chair

Sonoo Thadaney
Co-Vice Chair

Antoinette Barrack

Daniel Casillas

Christine Ford

Valerie Gibbs

Clara MacAvoy

Susan Swope

Debora Telleria

Melissa Wilson

Douglas Winter

I. Administrative Business (5:15-5:20)

- a. Call to Order
- b. Roll Call and Establish Quorum
- c. Introductions
- d. Agenda Review
- e. Approval of Minutes of April 30, 2019
- f. Status of prospective commissioner applications
- g. Presentation by County Manager's Office Regarding Juvenile Fees -- to June meeting

II. Oral Communications (5:20-5:25)

This item provides an opportunity for public comment on items not on the agenda (Time limit – two (2) minutes per person). There will be opportunity for public comment on agenda items as they are considered.

III. 2019 Inspections (5:25-5:35)

IV. Update on Phoenix Program (5:35-5:55)

- a. Report from Probation
- b. Report from Private Defender Program
- c. Report from County Office of Education
- d. Report from Court

V. Vote on Letter to Board Regarding Juvenile Hall Alternatives (5:55-6:05)

VI. Court Liaison (Telleria) and Court Remarks and Discussion (Judge Etezadi, Judge Jakubowski) (6:05-6:15)

VII. Private Defender Program Remarks and Discussion (Halpern) (6:15-6:20)

VIII. County Office of Education Remarks and Discussion (Littrell) (6:20-6:25)

IX. Youth Commission Update (Nori) (6:25-6:30)

- X. Probation (Hori, DiMauro) (6:30-6:45)**
 - a. Current population of facilities, number of out-of-custody youth supervised by Probation, and number and location (out of county/state) of youth placed out of home.
 - b. Group Homes in San Mateo County (where can Probation place youth in SMC?).
 - c. Update on data available for reporting.
 - d. Update on institutions/probation staffing.
 - e. Probation Liaison Report (Wilson, Barrack)

- XI. 2019 Projects Updates (6:45-7:05)**
 - a. Youth Court
 - b. Parent Guide + User Test
 - c. Other Open or Proposed Projects

- XII. Commissioner Comments/Announcements (7:05-time permitting)**
 - a. Court and Community Schools Advisory Committee (Gibbs)
 - b. CCCS Update (Wilson)
 - c. Next BSCC Statewide Conference Call: May 31, 2019 from 10am-noon
 - d. CCPCA Conference & Training: August 27-30, 2019, South Lake Tahoe
 - e. Legislative update (Gustafson)

- XIII. Adjournment**

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 5:15 – 7:15 p.m.
Location: 455 County Center, 4th Floor, Room 405, Redwood City

MEETINGS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES. INDIVIDUALS WHO NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE OR A DISABILITY-RELATED MODIFICATION OR ACCOMMODATION (INCLUDING AUXILIARY AIDS OR SERVICES) TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, OR WHO HAVE A DISABILITY AND WISH TO REQUEST AN ALTERNATIVE FORMAT FOR THE AGENDA, MEETING NOTICE, AGENDA PACKET OR OTHER WRITINGS THAT MAY BE DISTRIBUTED AT THE MEETING, SHOULD CONTACT SECRETARY TONY BURCHYNS (650) 312-8878 AT LEAST 72 HOURS BEFORE THE MEETING AS NOTIFICATION IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNTY TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING AND THE MATERIALS RELATED TO IT. ATTENDEES TO THIS MEETING ARE REMINDED THAT OTHER ATTENDEES MAY BE SENSITIVE TO VARIOUS CHEMICAL BASED PRODUCTS.

If you wish to speak to the Committee, please fill out a speaker's slip. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Committee and included in the official record, please hand it to the County Manager who will distribute the information to the committee members.



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission
222 Paul Scannell Drive • San Mateo, CA 94402

Minutes of the Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Commission

April 30, 2019

5:15-7:15 pm

455 County Center, 4th Floor, Room 405, Redwood City

MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Chair Michele Gustafson; Co-Vice Chair Rebecca Flores; Co-Vice Chair Sonoo Thadaney; Susan Swope; Doug Winter; Christine Ford; Melissa Wilson; Toni Barrack; Valerie Gibbs; Daniel Casillas; Clara MacAvoy;

Commissioners Absent: Debora Telleria

Probation Staff Present: Deputy Chief Probation Officer Rich Hori; Institution Services Director Jody DiMauro; Deputy Probation Officer Mignon Page-Broughton; Administrative Secretary Tony Burchyns

Additional Attendees:

Judge Susan Etezadi – Juvenile Court
Rebecca Baum – DA's Office

Arely Cardenes – Fresh Lifelines for Youth
Tara Ford – Stanford Youth & Education Law
Project

Elisabeth Ocampo – Project Rebound
Bill Silverfarb – Supervisor Canepa's Office

Judith Holiber – County Counsel's Office
Sgt. Kimber Joyce – San Mateo Police Dept.

I. Administrative Business:

- a. Call to Order: Chair Gustafson called meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.
- b. Roll Call and Establish Quorum: A quorum was established at 5:15 pm.
- c. Introductions
- d. Agenda Review: **Approved** as distributed.
- e. Approval of Minutes of March 26, 2019: **Approved** as distributed.
- f. Approval of Minutes of April 6, 2019: **Approved** as distributed.

II. Oral Communications:

None

III. 2019 Inspections

The Commission sought input from the Court and the Probation Department about whether the Commission should continue to inspect group homes. Chair Gustafson mentioned it was her understanding Your House South did not seek nor receive Short-Term Residential Treatment Program status. DCPO Rich Hori said he believed the Probation Department was no longer placing youth at Your House South. Judge Etezadi expressed on behalf of the Court that if a juvenile is placed in a group home because of a court order, then that group home should be inspected. She added if a group home was no longer providing a viable placement option because of its licensing status, then an inspection may not be necessary. Gustafson asked DCPO Hori if he could provide later a list of group homes in San Mateo

County in which the Probation Department is placing youth. DCPO Hori said he would follow up.

Gustafson said there are still some slots open on this year's inspection teams and she encouraged Commissioners to sign up if they hadn't already.

IV. Presentation by San Mateo Police Department Diversion Program

Sgt. Kimber Joyce of the San Mateo Police Department gave a presentation on SMPD's juvenile diversion program. The program targets youth ages 11 through 17 that have committed minor offenses. SMPD works collaboratively with the Probation Department, the San Mateo Police Activities League, and other service providers to run the program. Deputy Probation Officer Mignon Page-Broughton spoke on behalf of the Probation Department about the program's success in keeping some youth in the community out of the juvenile justice system. Sgt. Joyce said the program includes biweekly classes, monthly community service, counseling sessions, school and homework check-ins, and a weekly MDT "Youth Talk." It also includes an individualized program path for each youth, as well as three- and six-month post-program check-ins. The program typically services 15 to 20 youth at any given time.

V. Consideration of JJDPC Applications

At the April 30, 2019 JJDPC meeting, JJDPC applicant Paul Bocanegra told the Commission he is on parole for a first-degree, gang-related homicide he committed in Santa Clara County at the age of 17. Since the last meeting, Mr. Bocanegra allowed his parole officer to provide further information to the Commission regarding his parole status and the specific offense for which he was convicted.

Commissioner Ford expressed concern that Mr. Bocanegra's application to join the Commission is premature due to the nature of the offense, the recency of his release, and the fact that he is on parole. Ford said parole is a period in which a formerly incarcerated offender is being monitored until he can demonstrate he can abide by laws, that he no longer presents a danger to the community, and that he has been rehabilitated. Ford said she views the period of parole as a "test time" and she believes the Commission should defer Mr. Bocanegra's application until he completes his period of parole. Ford also said she thinks it is concerning that Mr. Bocanegra would not be able to fulfill some of the duties of the Commission because he would not be allowed to enter the Juvenile Hall or girls camp, according to Chief Probation Officer John Keene.

Chair Gustafson said Mr. Bocanegra has a life parole term, according to his parole agent. However, he has a discharge review scheduled in September 2024.

Commissioner Swope asked when Mr. Bocanegra was paroled from prison. Gustafson said he was released on parole last year.

Co-Vice Chair Thadaney said Mr. Bocanegra does not have any conditions of parole prohibiting contact with juveniles, according to his parole agent. She also said Mr. Bocanegra has been granted passes to travel to Salinas State Prison, Mule Creek State Prison, and Sierra Conservations Corps State Prison, and all three State Prisons have granted gate clearances for Mr. Bocanegra to be a guest speaker. Thadaney said she thinks our justice system is based on

reform, and if you are released it is because the system believes you have reformed. Given County Counsel's advice that Mr. Bocanegra's conditions of parole don't bar him from serving on the Commission, Thadaney said she respectfully disagrees with Commissioner Ford's viewpoint.

Commissioner Winter said even though Mr. Bocanegra wouldn't be allowed to enter the county's youth detention facilities, he could still bring valuable insights to the JJDPC's annual inspection process. He added Mr. Bocanegra seems passionate about his work with at-risk youth and could be an asset to the Commission.

Commissioner Swope said Mr. Bocanegra's actions since being released on parole indicate he's passionate about helping others avoid the problems he created for himself. She said her only concern is that Mr. Bocanegra would not be able to participate in the JJDPC's juvenile detention facility inspections.

Juvenile Hall Director Jody DiMauro confirmed Chief Keene has indicated Mr. Bocanegra would not be allowed to enter the Juvenile Hall and Camp Kemp while on parole. Thadaney inquired if the chief could legally bar someone from entering these facilities. Chair Gustafson said while the Commission did not have an official legal opinion on the matter, she believes it is at the discretion of the facility to permit or prohibit a person from entering the facility.

Commissioner Casillas said the fact that Mr. Bocanegra applied for and was granted a transfer to reside in San Mateo County speaks to his desire to explore a new path and access opportunities he might not have in the community in which he offended.

Co-Vice Chair Flores and Commissioner MacAvoy both expressed concern that rejecting Mr. Bocanegra's application would go against what the Commission advocates for, which is giving juvenile offenders a second chance. He should not continue to be judged by something he did more than 20 years ago as a juvenile.

Co-Vice Chair Thadaney added she believes Mr. Bocanegra would bring a valuable lens as a formerly incarcerated person who now works with at-risk youth.

M:/Swope, S:/Thadaney: **Approved** by the following vote to accept Mr. Bocanegra as a Commissioner:

Ayes: 9 – Gustafson, Flores, Thadaney, Swope, Winter, Wilson, Barrack, Gibbs, Casillas and MacAvoy.

Nays: 1 – Ford.

Commissioner Wilson voiced her support of Monroe Labouisse's application to join the Commission, citing his professional experience and volunteer work as a Court Appointed Special Advocate in San Mateo County.

M:/Wilson, S:/Swope: **Approved** unanimously to accept Mr. Labouisse as a Commissioner.

VI. Update on Phoenix Reentry Program

DCPO Hori said the Phoenix Reentry Program at the Juvenile Hall is still in the planning stages. The first step is to define which youth would be suitable for the program and to work with the Courts to establish a review calendar for youth participating in the program. Another step is to finetune which reentry programs and services will be available to youth and families both during and after the youth's period of incarceration. Hori said the Department will engage stakeholders as the planning process moves forward. He said the Department hopes to complete the planning phase in about 60 days.

Commissioner MacAvoy asked if the female youth would be eligible for the program. Juvenile Hall Director Jody DiMauro said she envisions the program initially serving male youth because the female youth in custody still have the option of being placed at Camp Kemp, whereas the camp option no longer exists for the boys. However, DiMauro said that doesn't mean the Phoenix Reentry Program couldn't accommodate girls in the future as the program is built out. Meanwhile, she said the Department would find other ways to offer the new enhanced reentry services to the female youth in the facility.

Commissioner Wilson asked if the program would assess the needs of families, including help with basic economic needs, housing, et cetera. Director DiMauro said the evidence-based assessment they'd be using for post-dispositional youth will be multi-faceted, covering education, home environment, family relationships, and peer group associations. She added the Department will still be partnering with San Mateo County Behavior Health and Recovery Services to connect youth and families with mental health and substance abuse services.

Rick Halpern of the Private Defender Program said diverting kids from the justice system often produces positive outcomes. However, once kids are in the system, it can be very difficult to get them out, he said. He urged the Commission to focus its attention on programs and services that can help get youth out of the system once they're in it. Gustafson said it sounds like this is a challenge the Phoenix Reentry Program is poised to take on.

Commissioners MacAvoy and Swope suggested community service could be a good way to help incarcerated youth develop empathy and establish personal connections with adults as they transition back to their communities. Swope emphasized the need to provide opportunities for meaningful community service.

VII. Consideration of Proposal to Board Regarding Juvenile Hall Closure

The Commission discussed a proposal by Co-Vice Chair Thadaney and Commissioner Casillas to send a letter to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors urging them to convene a committee to 1) explore closing the Juvenile Hall over the next three to five years and 2) reinvest in alternatives to detention that would have a therapeutic and restorative focus.

Casillas talked about a strategic planning effort underway in King County, Washington to reduce and perhaps ultimately eliminate the use of secure detention for youth. Casillas said he would like to see San Mateo County explore a similar approach to juvenile justice reform.

The Commission reviewed a draft letter to the Board of Supervisors by prepared by Thadaney and Casillas, as well as a shortened version prepared by Commissioner Swope.

Tara Ford of the Youth and Education Law Project at Stanford University voiced her support of the idea of requesting the Board of Supervisors to convene a committee to look at improving support for vulnerable youth in San Mateo County.

Bill Silverfarb, legislative aide for Supervisor David Canepa, told the Commission Supervisor Canepa would be interested in pursuing the idea of convening a committee if it were Commission's will to do so.

Chair Gustafson proposed deferring any action on the matter to the next JJDPC meeting to allow more time to review the proposal.

Commissioner MacAvoy suggested modifying the language of the proposal since the idea of closing the juvenile hall may be perceived as too radical. MacAvoy said she agrees there are disparities in the juvenile justice system that favor affluent youth. She also said she would have hesitations around specific suggestions such as reopening Camp Glenwood because disadvantaged families may have difficulty accessing the remote facility.

Commissioner Wilson said she backs the draft letter as prepared by Thadaney and Casillas. Wilson asked Silverfarb if he would consider preparing a short summary of the letter. Silverfarb said he would be willing to do so.

Commissioner Ford asked for clarification on whether the proposal would seek to close juvenile hall or look at issues surrounding reformatory justice. Ford said she thinks the juvenile hall serves a purpose because some crimes are enormous dangers to the community. Chair Gustafson agreed with Ford's desire for clarity on the core intention of the proposal.

Commissioner Swope raised the issue of the financial cost of running the Juvenile Hall considering declining youth incarceration rates in the County and across the state. She referenced a 2016 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury report that questioned the cost of operating the juvenile hall. Swope added one of her concerns about the possibility of Bay Area counties closing juvenile halls would be what to do with the small percentage of youth who are dangerous and cannot be allowed out on the street.

Vice Co-Chair Thadaney agreed the issue is complex. She said she would like the proposed committee to study the issue and make well-informed, evidence-based recommendations.

Commissioner Wilson said a proposal in San Francisco County to close San Francisco's juvenile hall includes a provision to maintain a smaller locked facility for dangerous youth offenders.

Commissioner Barrack said she supports the concept of the proposal but thinks the wording should be changed.

Gustafson said she would like the proposal to reflect a desire for radical reform and reference movements in other counties toward reducing or eliminating youth incarceration.

Thadaney said she would draft a revised letter and share it with the Commission prior to the next JJDPC meeting. Ford asked if commissioners could forward suggestions to Thadaney.

Thadaney said suggestions should be forwarded to her a timely manner, so she could incorporate them into the letter.

Deputy County Counsel Judith Holiber said if the Commission votes to send the final letter to the Board of Supervisors, it would need to make sure the letter, the draft, and all the suggestions that are proposed are part of the Board packet for the meeting.

VIII. County Office of Education Remarks and Discussion

No report.

IX. Private Defender Program and Remarks

No report.

X. Court Remarks and Discussion

Presiding Juvenile Court Judge Etezadi said Commissioner Telleria had attended the Court's monthly meeting with the Probation Department, the DA's Office and the Private Defender's Office.

Judge Etezadi swore in Co-Vice Chair for Sonoo Thadaney for her second term.

XI. Youth Commission Update

No report.

XII. Probation Updates

Juvenile Hall Director Jody DiMauro reported the following juvenile detention statistics:

- 6 girls at Camp Kemp and 6 GEP girls attending school at Kemp.
- 66 youths at Juvenile Hall (55 boys, 11 girls; average age 16.7 years)
 - 69.7 percent Hispanic or Latino.
 - 10.6 percent black
 - 7.6 percent white
 - 6.1 percent Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - 3 percent other race
 - 1.5 percent Asian
 - 1.5 percent Native American

Deputy Chief Probation Officer Rich Hori reported there are 12 youth currently in general placement.

In response to a question that came up at the last JJDPC meeting, DCPO Hori said the Juvenile Services Division currently has 35 deputy probation officers and 8 managers. The division supervises 291 cases – a number which has declined significantly in the last five months.

DCPO Hori announced he will be transferring to the Institution Services Division effective May 5, 2019. The Department will backfill his position in Juvenile Services with rotating work-out-of-class deputy chief assignments held by different directors.

XIII. Project Updates

Deferred to next meeting

XIV. Commissioner Comments/Announcements

Commissioner Wilson said she will be sending an email out to the Commission with information from the recent Community Collaboration for Children's Success meeting.

Commissioner Casillas announced there will be a screening of the "From Incarceration to Education" documentary at College of San Mateo from 6 to 8 p.m. on May 1, 2019.

Commissioner Winter announced Marin County YMCA's youth court is holding a summit from 2:30 to 5 p.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2019. He said he would email the details to the Commission.

Meeting adjourned 7:30 p.m.

Dear San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

It is the mission of the San Mateo County Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Commission (JJDP) to be a public conscience in the interest of juveniles. The Commission is dedicated to delinquency prevention and the promotion of respect for the human dignity of all minors who come under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court. We, the JJDP, write to you in our role as your community-collaborators for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in San Mateo County.

San Francisco is considering closing its juvenile hall in the next 3-to-5 years.^[2] Our own juvenile hall, which has a capacity of 178, has typically held 50-60 youth in custody over the last few years. The County's Grand Jury has expressed concern that the cost per youth in the present circumstances is unsustainable.

Research shows, in spite of the best intentions and caring and diligent work by the front line, that our national criminal legal system is burdened with historical racial and gender discrimination and continues to criminalize poverty and mental health issues. We believe it is time for a local adoption of the national discussion about evolving juvenile incarceration toward twenty-first century, evidence-based solutions. In light of this research, and in the face of our County's budget realities, **we urge you to convene a committee to actively study alternative methods for providing rehabilitative services to youth and alternative uses to the County's current facility.** This offers the opportunity for a multi-county partnership to consider other approaches that would be more effective in dealing with juvenile criminality while keeping our communities safe.

Proposal

We urge the Board to consider creating a committee to explore what should be done about our juvenile hall over the next 3-to-5 years, looking at other options that would provide comprehensive, therapeutic treatment in keeping with budget realities and current best practices around youth incarceration.

This committee should represent the wide range of stakeholders. It should explore alternatives to incarceration, and develop a thoughtful, comprehensive plan. In our opinion, these stakeholders include (but are not limited to) previously incarcerated youth and their families, Juvenile court judges, juvenile probation officers, non-profit service providers, pre-K through 12 educators, job retraining experts, Health and Human Services colleagues, law enforcement, and mental and pediatric health experts.

In our opinion, the proposed Committee's goal would be to chart a plan for our County that is informed by recent published research and literature, learnings from other counties' experiences, and collaborate with our neighbors in order to achieve:

1. better short-term and long-term outcomes for incarcerated juveniles and the community at large,

2. financial savings for the County, and
3. respect for the dignity of minors, anchored in the ideals towards which our community aspires.

We, the JJDPC, are open to collaborating with and/or advising the County Board of Supervisors on this initiative.

We look forward to working with you – why lag when we can lead?

Respectfully,

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission
San Mateo County

Spearheaded by Sonoo Thadaney Israni, sonoot@stanford.edu & Daniel Casillas dannycasillasocampo@gmail.com

Background

Why Now?

A March 2019 San Francisco Examiner article^[3] reported: “Juvenile halls built for a rise in crime are now nearly deserted but spending on them remains stunningly high.” This prompted three members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to “draft legislation that would close the facility, which has 150 beds but typically has fewer than 50 youths held inside, by the end of 2021.”^[4] “Supervisors Shamann Walton, Hillary Ronen and Matt Haney authored the legislation, and Supervisors Gordon Mar, Aaron Peskin and Sandra Lee Fewer have signed on as co-sponsors.”^[5] “The city’s public defender’s office and District Attorney George Gascón have both come out in support of the measure. “For too long, we have been placing our young people in large, institutional detention facilities that run counter to everything we have come to know about positive youth development and trauma. I believe that the days of big juvenile halls should be behind us and I am eager to start this important conversation,” said District Attorney George Gascón.”^[5]

Our own current Youth Services Center (YSC) was built in 2006 to house 180 youth; however the average number of youths incarcerated for the last year has been 50-60. The reduction of the average occupancy reflects, in part, new thinking about the effectiveness of detention versus alternatives to detention for juveniles

This moment thus presents a unique opportunity for our County to work with our San Francisco and possibly other neighbors by sharing committee findings, and then leveraging that shared research to draft legislation appropriate for each County. For example, San Mateo County has a unique resource in what used to be Camp Glenwood which could potentially be re-developed, informed by the committee’s research, as a shared, multi-county resource to produce better outcomes for all of our youth. At the very least, the committee’s findings would help inform the planned Project Phoenix.

Incorporating 21st Century Research

A comprehensive study of diversion programs, compared to juvenile detention in 69 out of 83 counties in Michigan found lower costs and reduced recidivism associated with diversion programs. Youth in pre-arrest diversion programs are 2.5 times less likely to reoffend.

The progress made in King County, WA^[6] (the greater Seattle area) informs our proposal. King County is similar to San Mateo County in that there are pockets of immense wealth and privilege, due to tech titans and innovation (Microsoft, Amazon, Boeing, etc.) as well as disheartening poverty and racial differences leading to inequality in income, crime, educational opportunities, and health outcomes. King County, like many other counties around the country (including San Mateo and our Bay Area neighbors) is experiencing decreased occupancy in expensive juvenile detention facilities associated with harmful outcomes.

After observing this decrease, King County conducted research and found that there is little relationship between youth incarceration and overall youth crime in the community. The use of youth detention decreased by 77 percent in King County between 1998 and 2017, while at the same time youth felony offenses decreased by 75 percent. But even as overall detention rates fell, disproportionality by race rose. In 1998, on an average day, 79 white youth and 109 youth of color were in detention; in 2017, 8 White youth and 38 youth of color were in detention. That is, youth of color went from 58 to 83 percent of incarcerated youths. The County also found that crime survivors prefer investments in programs for at-risk youth, community supervision, and accountability via means other than incarceration and isolation from the community.^[7] As a result of this research, King County has put forward a [Road Map to Zero Youth Detention](#).^[8]

King County's findings are in line with research that shows incarcerated youth are more likely to commit crimes than those without criminal legal system contact. **Neuroscience and developmental psychology research** shows that a normal part of adolescent brain development is to make risky choices for a period of time before reaching adulthood. It also shows that most youth have a better chance at a positive adulthood when they do not interact with the juvenile legal system. When members of affluent families experience adverse childhood experiences (ACEs)^[9] such as addiction or abuse, they can access support services and interventions such as counseling, medication, and legal support. Low-income families often lack this access to logistical and therapeutic supports when facing trauma. Untreated and unrecognized trauma, from parental separation and family violence, for example, can lead to behaviors that may result in arrest. Trauma rates as high as 84 percent have been found among arrested youth.^[10]

Experience has shown that that **wrap-around services** in communities are an effective, holistic, preventive intervention for communities and youth facing trauma. For example, a public school in Akron, Ohio, which received private funding from LeBron James for services saw impressive results over only three years: "The academic results are early, and at 240, the sample size of students is small, but the inaugural classes of third and fourth graders at I Promise posted extraordinary results in their first set of district assessments. Ninety percent met or exceeded individual growth goals in reading and math, outpacing their peers across the district."^[11]

By establishing a committee to advise on restorative alternatives to juvenile detention, San Mateo County can be a leader in the state of California. **A centerpiece of the California Endowment's Building Healthy Communities demonstration project is a policy shift to investing in schools rather than prisons for California youth.** The Endowment has committed \$1 billion and ten years to this project. Polling data shows this shift has broad and potentially growing support: "When first asked about youth prisons, 61% of respondents say they support the goal of total closure, and after hearing just a few facts about the system, that number immediately jumps to 68%. Such dramatic movement is unusual and indicates that

opposition to youth prisons runs very deep among Californians,” says Dave Metz, Principal at FM3 in California Endowment-funded research.^[12]

Our letter has benefited from input and support from members of the community, stakeholders, informed supporters. They could also be possible Committee members or advisors:

1. Sonoo Thadaney Israni, Co-Vice Chair, San Mateo County Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention Commission (JJDPCC)
2. Daniel Casillas, Commissioner, San Mateo JJDPCC
3. Elizabeth Calvin, Senior Advocate, Children's Rights Division, Human Rights Watch
4. Ryan Matlow, Ph.D., child clinical psychologist, Director of Community Research Programs for Stanford's Early Life Stress and Pediatric Anxiety Program. His clinical and research efforts focus on understanding and addressing the impact of stress, adversity, and trauma in children, families, and communities. In particular, Dr. Matlow seeks to apply current scientific knowledge of the neurobiological and developmental impact of stress and trauma in shaping interventions and systems of care.
5. Karen Grove, Housing Commissioner, City of Menlo Park
6. Kirsten Wysen, MHSA, Policy Analyst, 2018-2019 CASBS Fellow at Stanford University, Communities of Opportunity and Health Policy & Planning, Director's Office, Public Health-Seattle & King County
7. Carrie Cihak, Chief of Policy, King County & 2018-19 Research Affiliate, Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University
8. Gloria Principe, Human Rights Watch Bay Area Leader & County Resident
9. John O'Farrell, UNICEF Board Member & County Resident

Considerations (not comprehensive, but a list of what we've thought about aloud)

1. The funds that would be saved will need to include addressing critical issues, which are many and the above mentioned committee would need to address. These include the following considerations, but is in no way a complete list.
 1. ensuring easy family visits to the Coast by adding a regular family shuttle 4-6 times a day from Redwood City Train Station to Camp Glenwood, or other solutions such as subsidized Lyft rides (on demand, door to door, to ease the time burden) (and from the center of other partnering counties), or explore other innovative solutions offering coast-side access to more in the community;
 2. add more wrap-around, mental and physical health services; preventive services to our schools and community;
 3. **retraining for YSC personnel to ensure job safety, et al.**

Resource Materials:

1. Women's Foundation of California - <https://womensfoundca.org/>
2. <http://criticalresistance.org/resources/the-abolitionist-toolkit/>
3. Women's Foundation of CA and Race Gender Human Rights coalition event recap, with references to young women who run organizations related to incarceration of girls - and

are formerly incarcerated themselves <https://www.ebcf.org/event-recap-women-and-the-criminal-justice-system-session-1/>

4. GARE [1] [ST2] (Government Alliance for Racial Equity): <https://www.racialequityalliance.org/>[3] [4]
5. Flourish Agenda, <https://flourishagenda.com/>
6. Trauma Transformed, <https://traumatransformed.org/>
7. The Harvard Law Review April Journal Volume 132, April 2019, Number 6, Developments in the Law, <https://mailchi.mp/harvardlawreview/kpgpe5qba3-2637901?e=349e3383ea>
8. King County, Road Map to Zero Youth Detention, 2018:10, <https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/~media/depts/health/zero-youth-detention/documents/road-map-to-zero-youth-detention>.
9. https://www.prisonpolicy.org/scans/Prevalence_of_ACE.pdf
10. Human Impact Partners, *Reducing Youth Arrests Keeps Kids Healthy and Successful: A Health Analysis of Youth Arrest in Michigan*, June 2017, 5, https://humanimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/HIP_MichYouthArrests_2017.06.pdf.
11. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/12/education/lebron-james-school-ohio.html?emc=edit_th_190413&nl=todaysheadlines&nid=465947950413
12. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/17/magazine/prison-abolition-ruth-wilson-gilmore.html>
13. <https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/openforum/article/Open-Forum-Let-s-transform-juvenile-hall-into-13799575.php>

[1] https://www.huffpost.com/entry/san-francisco-close-juvenile-hall_n_5cad2096e4b0d6eb63c0ffb6

[2] <http://traumatransformed.org>.

[3] <https://projects.sfchronicle.com/2019/vanishing-violence/part-2/>

[4] <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/3-San-Francisco-supervisors-vow-to-close-juvenile-13707500.php?psid=gaXL>

[5] <https://sfbayview.com/2019/04/youth-and-sf-board-majority-back-shamann-waltons-proposal-to-close-juvenile-hall-because-all-you-learn-is-how-to-survive-in-prison/>

[6] <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/king-county-wa/>

[7] King County, Road Map to Zero Youth Detention, 2018:10, <https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/~media/depts/health/zero-youth-detention/documents/road-map-to-zero-youth-detention>.

[8] Materials provided by Kirsten Wyses, MHSA, Policy Analyst, 2018-2019 CASBS Fellow at Stanford University, Communities of Opportunity and Health Policy & Planning, Director's Office, Public Health-Seattle & King County

[9] https://www.prisonpolicy.org/scans/Prevalence_of_ACE.pdf

[10] Human Impact Partners, *Reducing Youth Arrests Keeps Kids Healthy and Successful: A Health Analysis of Youth Arrest in Michigan*, June 2017, 5, https://humanimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/HIP_MichYouthArrests_2017.06.pdf.

[11] https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/12/education/lebron-james-school-ohio.html?emc=edit_th_190413&nl=todaysheadlines&nid=465947950413

[12] The California Endowment, "Poll: Californians Support Closing Youth Prisons," August 9, 2017, <https://www.calendow.org/press-release/poll-californians-overwhelmingly-support-closing-youth-prisons>.