

PLEASE CLICK ON THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SEAL
TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER'S REPORT DATED AUGUST 24, 2021](#)

[CONFIDENTIAL REPORT PROVIDED TO THE BOARD BY COUNTY COUNSEL ON OCTOBER 26, 2021](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE DIRECTOR OF HEALTH SERVICES' REPORT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2021](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2021](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT DATED JANUARY 21, 2022](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT DATED MAY 20, 2022](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT DATED APRIL 26, 2023](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE DIRECTOR OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT'S REPORT DATED JUNE 21, 2023](#)



ADOLFO GONZALES
Chief Probation Officer

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES PROBATION DEPARTMENT

9150 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY – DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242
(562) 940-2501



August 24, 2021

TO: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

FROM: Adolfo Gonzales 
Chief Probation Officer

SUBJECT: **YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: FULFILLING LOS ANGELES
COUNTY'S COMMITMENT TO A NEW YOUTH JUSTICE MODEL
(Agenda Item #33, July 13, 2021)**

On July 13, 2021, on motion of Supervisors Sheila Kuehl and Holly J. Mitchell, the Board of Supervisors (Board) approved a motion that included five numbered components directed at reaffirming its commitment to a new youth justice model. This response addresses the motion's component number four which directs the Probation Department (Probation or Department), in consultation with the Chief Executive Office, to report back to the Board in 45 days with:

4. A comprehensive list of funding streams that are connected to its Juvenile Operations, and a detailed description of the funding source, requirements, and existing commitments tied to said funding streams.
 - a. To the extent a particular funding stream is committed to staff positions, the list should detail:
 - How many staff positions are paid for with the identified funding streams,
 - The percentage of the source, and amount, used to fund staff positions, utilizing allocation and expenditure data from, at a minimum, the last three fiscal years as a reference,
 - Whether the identified positions are allocated to the field, institutions, or a different function, and
 - Whether the identified positions were filled or unfilled as of June 28, 2021.

- b. To the extent a particular funding stream is committed to services obtained from other departments (such as DMH or DHS), the list should detail:
- How much was paid to such other departments in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, and how much is budgeted for 2021-22.

Juvenile Funding Streams

Attachment I (refer to item 4, above) is a list of funding streams for juvenile operations accompanied by the source, requirements, and commitments.

Attachment II (refer to item 4.a, above) lists for each juvenile budget unit (Institutions, Field, Special Services) budgeted major expenditure categories and revenue source information for three consecutive fiscal years. The revenue information is accompanied by the approximate number of staff positions utilizing this revenue. The number of staff positions cannot be precisely determined because some revenue is provided as a general subsidy for operations, some revenue sources cross budget unit boundaries, and some revenue arrives as a reimbursement based on individual employee time studies. Examples are provided below of challenges linking revenue to specific positions.

Attachment II also indicates by budget unit the number of filled, unfilled, and total staff positions for each of the three fiscal years requested. The inquiry about filled and unfilled is as of August 16, 2021, which is the closest snapshot date captured by the County's records.

Attachment III (refer to item 4.b, above) provides amounts expended to other departments in Fiscal Years 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, and how much is budgeted for 2021-22. The majority of these expenditures are funded with net County cost.

Linking Revenue to Positions

Context is important with respect to interpreting staff position counts linked to funding sources because funding can be function-specific or service-specific, but is not always position-specific. A lack of this context can lead to an incorrect conclusion that a funding source offsets 100% of a staff position(s). Two examples illustrate the funding-to-position specificity or lack thereof:

- Juvenile Probation Funding (JPF) – JPF is provided as an allocation based on juvenile hall population ratios among California counties. The amount of this funding is not tied to a specific staff position count. For purposes of responsiveness to the Board's motion, the attached calculates the number of full-time equivalent position that could be purchased by JPF. The reality is JPF funds a portion of every juvenile hall staff and funds other operating costs. It is also important to note that positions supported by JPF generally are subject to youth staffing ratio mandates.

- Title IV-E – Title IV-E is a reimbursement funding tied to a claiming process based on the number of hours respective Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) provide to clients for specific qualifying service categories. DPOs complete a Title IV-E time study which corresponds to a portion of each DPO's hours recorded on their County timecard. Thus, Title IV-E funds a portion of many DPOs and that portion varies from staff-to-staff depending on the specific services each DPO delivers on any given day. Much like JPF funding, Title IV-E can lead to an incorrect assumption it funds 100% of any specific position.

If you have questions or need additional information, please let me know or your staff may contact Robert Smythe at (562) 940-2516.

c: Fesia Davenport, Chief Executive Officer

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JUVENILE FUNDING SOURCES

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZING STATUTE	FUNDING SOURCE	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET
Youth Offender Block Grant (YOBG)	Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 1951(b); allocations from the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) shall be used to enhance the capacity of county probation, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other county departments to provide appropriate rehabilitative and supervision services to youthful offenders. Counties, in expending the YOBG allocation, shall provide all necessary services related to the custody and parole of those offenders subject to the YOBG legislation, i.e., those who can no longer be committed to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice. The YOBG program provides state funding for counties to deliver custody and care (i.e., appropriate rehabilitative and supervisory services) to youthful offenders who previously would have been committed to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Division of Juvenile Justice.	Welfare & Institutions Code Section 1950-56; 1960-62 Government Code Section 30025-30029.12:	Sales Tax Revenue	\$ 28,366,000
Juvenile Reentry Grant (JRG)	The Juvenile Reentry Grant (JRG) provides funding to address local supervision of youthful offenders discharged from the custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Division of Juvenile Facilities. Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Sections 1980 et seq., authorizes counties to receive annual allocations from the Juvenile Reentry Fund and specifies these funds "shall be expended exclusively to address local program needs for persons discharged from the custody of the Division of Juvenile Facilities. County probation departments, in expending the JRG allocation, shall provide evidence-based supervision and detention practices and rehabilitative services to persons who are subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court who were committed to and discharged from the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Facilities. "Evidence-based" refers to supervision and detention policies, procedures, programs, and practices demonstrated by scientific research to reduce recidivism among individuals on probation or under post release supervision."	Assembly Bill 1628 (Chapter 729 of the Statutes of 2010) Welfare and Institutions Code: 1980 – 1985 California Government Codes: Government Code Sections 30025-30029.12 and 30025 (f)(15) Government Code Sections 30061-30063	Sales Tax Revenue	\$ 1,870,000
Juvenile Probation Funding (JPF)	Juvenile Probation Funding was created by Assembly Bill 139 (AB 139), Chapter 74 to provide a continuum of family focused services, in a community-based setting, to address the full spectrum of youth and family needs, including services provided in county-operated residential care facilities. The funds may be used to serve children who are habitual truants, runaways, at risk of being wards of the court under Section 601 or 602, or under juvenile court supervision or supervision of the probation department.	Assembly Bill No. AB 139- Budget Trailer Bill, Chapter 74, Statutes of 2005 Welfare and Institutions Code Section 18220(c), 18221	Vehicle License Fees	\$ 60,941,000

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JUVENILE FUNDING SOURCES

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZING STATUTE	FUNDING SOURCE	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET
Juvenile Probation Camp Funding (JPCF)	Juvenile Probation Camp Funding allocation amounts are based upon average daily population count of occupied beds at the juvenile camps and ranches not to exceed the established rated maximum capacity as determined by the Board of State and Community Corrections.	Welfare and Institutions Code Section 18220.1(c), 18221	Vehicle License Fees	\$ 7,500,000
Title IV-E Program	Title IV-E provides reimbursement for portions of Maintenance and Administrative costs incurred by public agencies for working with children in foster care or at imminent risk of foster care. The program is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Administration for Children and Families - Children's Bureau. The program funds are passed through from the State of California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). The Probation Department prepares and submits the quarterly claims to DCFS who submits the combined claim to CDSS.	Social Security Act	Claim Based	\$ 23,260,000
Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA)	Local Governmental Agencies participating in the California Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (CMAA) program are eligible to receive federal reimbursement for the cost of performing administrative activities that directly support efforts to identify and enroll potential eligible individuals into Medical. Through the CMAA program, Department of Health Care Services and individual county agencies promote access to health care for clients in the county public health system, minimize health care costs and long-term health care needs for at risk populations, and coordinate client health care needs with other health care providers. CMAA activities include, but are not limited to, conducting Medi-Cal outreach, facilitating Medi-Cal eligibility determinations, Medi-Cal program planning, and Medi-Cal contract administration. The Probation Department claims Medi-Cal outreach activities to the program.	Welfare and Institutions Code § 14132.47	Claim Based	\$ 1,538,000

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JUVENILE FUNDING SOURCES

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZING STATUTE	FUNDING SOURCE	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET
Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA)	The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 [Assembly Bill No. AB 1913, Chapter 353, Statutes of 2000] to provide a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth. JJCPA involves a partnership between the State of California, the counties, and various community-based organizations to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council determines where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; and community-based organizations play a critical role in delivering services. The State Controller's Office distributes the appropriated JJCPA funds to counties based on population.	Assembly Bill No. AB 1913- Local law enforcement funding. Chapter 353, Statutes of 2000 Assembly Bill No. AB 1998- Juveniles: data collection. Chapter 880, Statutes of 2016 California Government Codes: Chapter 6.3-Local Revenue Fund 2011 (Sections 30025-30029.12) Chapter 6.7-Supplemental Local Law Enforcement Funding (Sections 30061-30063)	Vehicle License Fees	\$ 5,322,000
Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG)	The Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG) was established to provide county-based custody, care, and supervision of youth who are realigned from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) or who would have otherwise been eligible for commitment to the division. The bill would appropriate moneys from the General Fund in specific amounts for these purposes, as specified. The bill would specify how those funds would be allocated to the counties based on specific criteria. The bill would commence on July 1, 2021 and prohibit further commitment to the DJJ, except as specified, and would require that all wards committed to the division until the ward is discharged, released, or transferred.	Senate Bill 823, Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review. Juvenile Justice Realignment: Office of Youth and Community Restoration	State General Fund	\$ 8,299,000

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JUVENILE OPERATIONS
EXPENDITURES AND FUNDING SOURCES
FISCAL YEARS 2019-20 TO 2021-22

	JUVENILE INSTITUTION SERVICES					JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES					JUVENILE SPECIAL SERVICES				
	FY 2019-20 ADJUSTED BUDGET	FY 2020-21 ADJUSTED BUDGET	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET	POTENTIAL LAYOFFS	PERCENT OF 2021- 22 FUNDING SOURCES TO EXPENDITURES	FY 2019-20 ADJUSTED BUDGET	FY 2020-21 ADJUSTED BUDGET	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET	POTENTIAL LAYOFFS	PERCENT OF 2021-22 FUNDING SOURCES TO EXPENDITURES	FY 2019-20 ADJUSTED BUDGET	FY 2020-21 ADJUSTED BUDGET	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET	POTENTIAL LAYOFFS	PERCENT OF 2021-22 FUNDING SOURCES TO EXPENDITURES
Expenditures															
Salaries and Employee Benefits	\$ 310,717,000	\$ 311,597,000	\$ 314,941,000			\$ 49,008,000	\$ 46,945,000	\$ 49,654,000			\$ 91,610,000	\$ 93,769,000	\$ 97,423,000		
Services and Supplies	101,819,000	87,416,000	94,786,000			3,551,000	3,689,000	4,512,000			13,406,000	9,802,000	7,760,000		
Other Charges	192,000	1,047,000	280,000			1,789,000	1,792,000	2,539,000				4,000	-		
Capital Assets - Equipment	273,000	273,000	273,000			116,000	116,000	116,000				-	-		
Intrafund Transfers	(432,000)	(432,000)	(432,000)			(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)			(1,455,000)	(1,455,000)	(1,455,000)		
Total Expenditures	\$ 412,569,000	\$ 399,901,000	\$ 409,848,000			\$ 54,458,000	\$ 52,536,000	\$ 56,815,000			\$ 103,561,000	\$ 102,120,000	\$ 103,728,000		
Revenue															
Rents and Concessions	\$ 128,000	\$ 128,000	\$ 128,000	1	0%										
State - Title IV-E											\$ 5,612,000	\$ 5,612,000	\$ 5,612,000	32	5%
State - School Lunch Program	300,000	300,000	300,000	2	0%										
State - Schiff Cardenas J											2,207,000	2,207,000			
Realignment - Youth Offender Block Grant (YOBG)	26,399,000	26,399,000	26,399,000	140	6%						1,967,000	1,967,000	1,967,000	11	2%
Realignment - Juvenile Reentry Grant (JRG)											1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000	11	2%
Realignment - Juvenile Probation Funding (JPF)	41,804,000	41,804,000	41,966,000	222	10%						18,975,000	18,975,000	18,975,000	109	18%
Realignment - JPF Growth (One-Time)			2,527,000	12	1%						4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	23	4%
Realignment - Juvenile Probation Camp Funding (JPCF)	9,918,000	9,918,000	7,500,000	40	2%										
Federal - Title IV-E	2,757,000	2,757,000	2,757,000	15	1%	4,912,000	4,912,000	4,912,000	31	9%	9,979,000	9,979,000	9,979,000	58	10%
Federal - Medical Administrative Activities (MAA)	1,538,000	1,538,000	1,538,000	8	0%										
Federal - Grants	232,000					93,000	93,000	93,000	1	0%	205,000	205,000	205,000	1	0%
Institutional Care and Services	190,000	190,000	190,000	1	0%						216,000	216,000	216,000	1	0%
Reimbursement of Charges	49,000	49,000	49,000	0	0%						393,000	393,000	393,000	2	0%
Contract Services											1,320,000	1,320,000	1,320,000	8	1%
Miscellaneous	2,000	2,000	2,000	0	0%						150,000				
Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund (One-Time)	6,430,000														
Operating Transfers In - JJCPA											5,322,000	5,322,000	5,322,000	31	5%
Operating Transfers In - JJRBG			8,299,000	0	2%										
Total Revenue	\$ 89,747,000	\$ 83,085,000	\$ 91,655,000			\$ 5,005,000	\$ 5,005,000	\$ 5,005,000			\$ 52,244,000	\$ 52,094,000	\$ 49,887,000		
Net County Cost	\$ 322,822,000	\$ 316,816,000	\$ 318,193,000	1,683	78%	\$ 49,453,000	\$ 47,531,000	\$ 51,810,000	330	91%	\$ 51,317,000	\$ 50,026,000	\$ 53,841,000	310	52%
Total Budgeted Positions	2,509	2,256	2,124			405	362	362			640	596	597		
Positions Filled	2,205	1,987	1,791			327	329	332			560	543	546		
Positions Vacant	304	269	333			78	33	30			80	53	51		

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JUVENILE OPERATIONS
SERVICES PROVIDED BY OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
FISCAL YEARS 2018-19 TO 2021-22

ATTACHMENT III

	JUVENILE INSTITUTION SERVICES					JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES					JUVENILE SPECIAL SERVICES				
SERVICES FROM OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS (OCD) (1)	FY 2018-19 ACTUALS	FY 2019-20 ACTUALS	FY 2020-21 ACTUALS	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2021-22 FUNDING SOURCE	FY 2018-19 ACTUALS	FY 2019-20 ACTUALS	FY 2020-21 ACTUALS	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2021-22 FUNDING SOURCE	FY 2018-19 ACTUALS	FY 2019-20 ACTUALS (2)	FY 2020-21 ACTUALS	FY 2021-22 ADOPTED BUDGET	FY 2021-22 FUNDING SOURCE
Agricultural Commissioner	\$ 179,448	\$ 192,846	\$ 210,061	\$ 25,000	NCC										
Arts Commission											1,927,323				
Auditor-Controller	69,135	67,550	37,355	30,000	NCC						17,033	22,938	8,191		
Chief Executive Office	48,218	58,003	75,402	86,000	NCC	1,160	87,553	121,352	100,000	NCC	42,620				
Consumer Affairs											5,154	3,394	4,996	5,000	NCC/Title IV-E
Department of Children and Family Services											357,500	469,394	386,996	420,000	NCC/Title IV-E
Department of Health Services (DHS)															
Juvenile Court Health Services	27,955,665	27,933,000	27,834,040	28,177,000	NCC						4,775				
LAC+USC Power Plant	1,052,988	1,137,711	1,097,950	486,000	NCC										
ARC Housing Program											63,731	335,000	112,001	335,000	JRG
DHS - Subtotal	\$ 29,008,653	\$ 29,070,711	\$ 28,931,990	\$ 28,663,000		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 68,506	\$ 335,000	\$ 112,001	\$ 335,000	
Department of Human Services (DHR)	\$ 68,152	\$ 60,058	\$ 53,348			\$ 180,976	\$ 95,486								
Department of Mental Health	16,341,352	16,286,671	16,846,814	20,567,000	NCC/YOBG						5,579,919				
Department of Public Health	104,595	8,295	11,299	800,000	NCC						1,033,206	1,026,394	774,688	258,000	NCC/Title IV-E
Department of Public Works	114,003	207,494	123,935	70,000	NCC										
Department of Social Services											300,097	58,011		63,000	NCC/Title IV-E
District Attorney											398,272				
Internal Service Department (ISD)															
Administrative Services								25,000			650,000				
Alterations and Improvements	5,239,967	7,969,377	3,362,147	3,162,000	NCC	87,468	56,793	38,026	59,000	NCC	-		3,838	75,000	NCC
Auto Mileage	262,421	333,042	166,334	199,000	NCC	45,459	46,715	33,049	78,000	NCC	356,737	325,358	212,669	266,000	NCC
Auto Service	646,752	799,433	806,763	341,000	NCC	41,343	58,653	21,961	6,000	NCC	167,344	199,205	38,214	212,000	NCC
Building Maintenance			754,356			22,493	75,461	97,125	12,000	NCC				9,000	NCC
Building Systems	189,006	136,075	252,352	114,000	NCC							4,900			
County Telephone	1,244,125	1,238,158	1,166,013	1,023,000	NCC	109,000	51,708	38,089	109,000	NCC	34,234	71,863	25,138	40,000	NCC
Custodial	1,269,393	3,260,024	5,696,121	282,000	NCC	456,811	371,784	383,990	231,000	NCC		2,504			
Data Communications		483	179,036			12,672	14,124	19,502	60,000	NCC	6,666	7,116	19,323		
Grounds Maintenance	115,992	993,850	704,623	20,000	NCC	14,201	29,362	32,808	5,000	NCC					
Mail and Messenger Services	101,234	83,093	64,401	82,000	NCC	85,762	82,230	78,984	61,000	NCC	24,698	35,526	23,980	25,000	NCC
Network Infrastructure/IT Services	17,158	15,516	16,212	67,000	NCC	1,947	2,451	9,308				8,618			
Purchasing Services	76,585	86,518	48,315	90,000	NCC	20,663	5,402	2,760	1,000	NCC	13,732	5,463	15,831	20,000	NCC
Telephone Systems	150,688	143,330	47,706	145,000	NCC	46,362	50,689	67,503	53,000	NCC	22,938	14,256	23,116	24,000	NCC
Utilities	5,473,033	6,045,152	6,355,787	5,086,000	NCC	343,000	370,013	342,588	595,000	NCC			-	1,000	NCC
ISD - Subtotal	\$ 14,786,355	\$ 21,104,050	\$ 19,620,165	\$ 10,611,000		\$ 1,287,181	\$ 1,215,385	\$ 1,190,693	\$ 1,270,000		\$ 1,276,349	\$ 674,809	\$ 362,109	\$ 672,000	
Parks and Recreation											\$ 1,652,499				
Public Defender						10,833	10,833	10,833	11,000	NCC	530,252				
Public Library	321,934	250,647	268,365	186,000	NCC						800,672				
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk							56,765	4,507	1,000	NCC					
Sheriff's Department	9,455,916	10,350,817	8,004,544	7,313,000	NCC	568,060	807,115	745,092			460,829	23,579	41,193	70,000	NCC
Superior Court											1,315,810	104,285	102,176	120,000	NCC
Workforce Dev., Aging and Community Services		12,995									867,480				
Total Services from OCD's	\$ 70,497,762	\$ 77,670,138	\$ 74,183,278	\$ 68,351,000		\$ 2,048,210	\$ 2,273,137	\$ 2,072,477	\$ 1,382,000		\$ 16,633,520	\$ 2,717,805	\$ 1,792,351	\$ 1,943,000	

Notes:

1) Some department-wide services provided by OCD's are centrally budgeted under the Support Services Budget Unit and not included in the above (e.g., Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, DHR, etc.).

2) Beginning in FY 2019-20, JJCPA funds were transferred from Probation's operating budget to a Special Revenue Fund to allow for greater accountability and transparency.

*Confidential report
provided to the Board*

October 5, 2021

**Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors**

Hilda L. Solis
First District


Holly J. Mitchell
Second District

Sheila Kuehl
Third District

Janice Hahn
Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Fifth District

TO: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

FROM: Christina R. Ghaly, M.D. 
Director

SUBJECT: **YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: FULFILLING LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S COMMITMENT'S TO A NEW YOUTH JUSTICE MODEL (ITEM NO. 33, JULY 13, 2021)**

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.
Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.
Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs

Nina J. Park, M.D.
Chief Deputy Director, Population Health

Elizabeth M. Jacobi, J.D.
Administrative Deputy

On [July 13, 2021](#), the Board of Supervisors (Board) passed the “Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR): Fulfilling Los Angeles County's (LA County) Commitment to A New Youth Justice Model” motion (Item No. 33) directing the Chief Executive Office (CEO), in consultation with the Chief Probation Officer, the Research and Design Consultant Team, and the Office of Diversion and Re-entry's (ODR) Division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) to provide updates in the next YJR quarterly report. YDD directives include:

- 1) The status of establishing a Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group (YJ-TAG), including the following details:
 - a) Composition structure, and meeting schedule of the YJ-TAG
 - b) Resources that have been identified, and any funding gaps, to meet the needs of the YJ-TAG
- 2) The status of establishing a transition-planning team, including retaining two consultant teams—one with operational expertise and one with research expertise to support implementation of YJR, as well as a description of any related unmet funding needs.

Background

On November 24, 2020, the Board adopted the core values of the [YJR Report](#) and committed to transitioning LA County's youth justice system to this care-first model by 2025, pending resolution of the necessary legal, budgetary, and legislative issues. YDD and CEO have since provided updates on funding needed to support the first phase of YJR, including both continued collaborative planning and initial operationalization. This report includes updates to the above directives and is submitted as a companion document to the CEO YJR Quarterly Report.

313 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 912
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: (213) 288-8050
Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

*“To advance the health of our
patients and our communities by
providing extraordinary care”*



Update 1: Status of Establishing a YJ-TAG

The YJ-TAG, now under the name Youth Justice Advisory Group (YJAG or Advisory Group), was convened virtually on Thursday, July 29th, 2021, for its official launch meeting. The Advisory Group structure includes membership that reflects the membership of last year's Youth Justice Work Group, including representatives of all youth-serving LA County Departments, community-based and advocacy organizations, and youth leaders. The YJAG is convened by YDD and the Burns Institute.

The Advisory Group will meet every six to eight weeks, with the next full YJAG meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 17, 2021, 12:00-2:00 pm. The majority of the work of the YJAG will occur in small, focused working groups tasked with answering specific research and design questions and developing concrete proposals to support priority elements of the YJR model. There are seven initial workgroups:

1. Department of Youth Development Structure and Oversight
2. Contracts and Grants
3. Research and Data
4. Expansion of Youth Development and Diversion Network
5. Physical Spaces and Secure County Facilities
6. Collaborative Decision-Making
7. Reentry Services

Each workgroup is composed of approximately 15-25 members, including a balance of LA County, community, and youth representatives. You can find the Workgroup Descriptions in Appendix 1, the Workgroup Facilitators and Meeting Schedules in Appendix 2, and the participants' workgroup assignments in Appendix 3.

An initial \$2,975,000.00 has been identified to support YJR's collaborative planning, including both the facilitation of the YJAG by the Research and Design Consultant Team and additional research, design, and capacity-building projects needed to support the work and vision of the YJAG. YDD, the CEO, the Center for Strategic Partnerships, and the Research and Design Consultant Team are working closely with the Youth Justice Funders Collaborative convened in 2020 to identify any gaps and opportunities for philanthropic collaboration. The consultant team and YJAG participants have identified a need to fund a communications campaign to bring wider community awareness to the YJR efforts underway. This opportunity will be presented to the philanthropic community for financial support.

Update 2: Status of Establishing a Transition-Planning Team

In June 2021, YDD was able to contract with the W. Haywood Burns Institute and local partners as a Research and Design Consultant Team to make up part of the expected transition planning team. This Research and Design Consultant Team was first funded through resources available in YDD's existing budget and then funded to continue for the remainder of the Fiscal Year by the funding identified by the CEO in June 2021.

The CEO is continuing to work towards identifying the appropriate scope and cost for an Operational Consultant Team that will improve coordination with the Research and Design Consultant Team and the work of the YJAG. The CEO continues to explore the role of an Operational Consultant Team and will provide an update in its next quarterly report. YDD remains committed to supporting the CEO in this however possible, since bringing on this consultant will be a very important part of the YJR planning work.

Next Steps

YDD will continue to help convene the YJAG and participate in its workgroups, participate in regular planning meetings with the consultants and CEO, and help provide quarterly YJR updates. Additionally, YDD is actively underway in expanding its diversion work to future cohorts, with a goal of reaching countywide expansion per phase 1 of YJR.

If you have any questions, you may contact me or your staff may contact Refugio Valle, Director of the Division of YDD, by email at rvalle3@dhs.lacounty.gov.

CRG:pe

Appendices

c: Chief Executive Office
County Counsel
Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
Probation

Appendix 1

WORKGROUP DESCRIPTIONS

1. Department of Youth Development: Organizational Structure and Oversight

This workgroup will propose the infrastructure, capacity and oversight needs of a new Department of Youth Development (DYD) to effectively assume the functions of juvenile probation. It will also propose plans for phasing in and sequencing the creation and expansion of the new department, while phasing out functions of juvenile probation. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- What staffing structure, functions, trainings, and positions does a DYD need in phases over time?
- What oversight should exist for the DYD and how should that oversight structure interact with current oversight structures?
- What are the legal issues that need to be overcome to create and sustain DYD?
- What funding and funding sources are needed to effectively create and sustain DYD?

2. DYD: Contracts and Grants

This workgroup will address the core need for a department to grant and contract effectively and efficiently with partners, including especially community-based organizations. It will make proposals to improve the process and equity in contracting and granting funds, including through sole source and bidding mechanisms, for the variety of relevant services needed for YJR. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- How should DYD structure its resource allocation through contracts and grants to further YJR?
- How can overall LA County processes change to increase the effectiveness, equitable access, and expediency of contracting and granting?

3. Research and Data Infrastructure

This workgroup will propose the research and data infrastructure for YJR, as well as the data needed to develop implementation plans. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- What data collection, sharing and assessment systems should a DYD have?
- What metrics should be used in evaluating DYD and YJR overall?
- What data are needed for this next phase of design, for instance about youth populations (e.g., girls, dual status youth, etc.), or probation operations and staffing, or probation and other budgets?

4. Youth Development Network: Expansion of YDD

This workgroup will propose plans for the expansion of YDD as the initial investment in and building block of the full DYD. It will build on the existing work of YDD, ensuring that the first phase of YJR implementation connects to, strengthens and expands YDD's current diversion work towards ending similar functions of probation. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- What structural changes need to occur to strengthen, expand and then integrate YDD into the DYD infrastructure?
- Specifically, how can referral, capacity-building and service delivery all be strengthened in YDD's current work as it seeks to expand?
- What's the structure and necessary partnerships to integrate schools in diversion and the development of YJR?

5. Designing Spaces: Security County Facilities

Building on prior work, this workgroup will propose further implementation steps that reimagine and redesign secure LA County facilities and step-down options serving as a continuum of alternatives to the state Division of Juvenile Justice prisons, ensuring that approaches in such settings are consistent with YJR and the overall commitment to shrink the youth justice population and system. This work is part of several discrete projects that will also occur to reimagine and redesign spaces like community-based youth centers and safe or secure healing centers serving as alternatives to halls and camps. Beyond the physical design of a secure facility, the workgroup will consider transformative staffing and programming to ensure a facility is both secure and healing-oriented. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- How should a facility be physically designed to align with the intent and vision of YJR?
- How can staffing, decision-making and programming be transformed at such a facility consistent with YJR? How can such transformations be implemented under current legal frameworks?
- What are the funding and allocation resources necessary to repurpose and/or build such alternatives?
- What do step-down options look like that are consistent with YJR?

6. Service Delivery Models: Collaborative Decision-making

This workgroup will build on prior recommendations to promote collaborative decision-making towards greater coordination and effectiveness in each youth's case as well as at the systems level. Its work will propose how to integrate Youth Empowerment and Support (YES) teams throughout justice system decision-making, considering the existence, strengths and challenges of multi-disciplinary teams at several points in the system already and prioritizing ways to pilot and implement YES teams (e.g. building YES teams into reentry planning in secure facilities and into diversion efforts in the community). At the systems level, the workgroup will propose how agencies and

entities can better collaborate to improve outcomes. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- What are the concerns and challenges with the YES Team concept that need to be addressed in collaboration with local partners?
- What is the composition of the YES Teams? For instance, who is and should be engaged in diversion and reentry decision-making?
- What is the structure of collaborative decision-making and maintenance? For instance, who holds and what are the levers of accountability to ensure collaboration amongst all justice partners in the planning of YJR?
- How does the Youth Development Network plug into YES Teams?
- What are further strategies for justice system collaboration, for instance, with the District Attorney?
- What infrastructure and funding are necessary to support the YES teams?
- What are current funding sources and potential funding sources to support YES teams?

7. Service Delivery Models: Reentry and Support for Currently Incarcerated Youth

This workgroup will focus on improving conditions and service delivery of young people currently in the halls and camps, while Safe and Secure Healing Centers take time to implement and LA County maintains its commitment to continuing to decrease detention populations overall. Its work will overlap with efforts to ensure secure facilities and step-down placements are consistent with the values of YJR, including efforts to integrate credible messengers into halls and camps, and shoring up reentry supports and networks to reduce recidivism and strengthen youth development outcomes. Preliminary questions it should answer include:

- How do we improve support for young people currently in the halls and camps?
- How can the LA County best implement non-probation related credible messengers?
- What is the current landscape of services available that can be immediately funded to provide reentry services that support continuity of care and are within the scope of YJR?
- How do we integrate and build on YDD and Probation's collaborative previous recommendations to maintain the decreased population of incarcerated youth before YJR is fully implemented?

Appendix 2

Workgroups Facilitators and Meeting Schedule

- Department of Youth Development (DYD): Organizational Structure and Oversight
 - Facilitators: Taylor Schooley (CEO), Patricia Soung (Consultant), Samantha Mellerson (Burns Institute), Gloria Gonzalez (Youth Justice Coalition)
 - 1st Workgroup meeting: August 9, 3-4:30 pm
 - Regular workgroup meetings: every other Wednesday, 3-4:30pm, starting August 25
- DYD: Contracts and Grants
 - Facilitators: Tshaka Barrows (Burns Institute), Raquel Mariscal (Burns Institute), David Turner (Brothers, Sons, Selves Coalition)
 - Next workgroup meeting: September 10th, 2021 from 10am-12pm
- Research and Data Infrastructure
 - Facilitators: Taylor Schooley (CEO), Laura Ridolfi (Burns Institute), Clarence Ford (Burns Institute), Danielle Dupuy (Million Dollar Hoods - UCLA)
 - First workgroup meeting: August 23, 2:30-5:00pm
- Youth Development Network: Expansion of YDD
 - Facilitators: Tracy Benson (Burns Institute), David Turner (Brothers, Sons, Selves Coalition), Sandra Sosa (Burns Institute), Mariana Mendoza (YDD), Vanessa Petti (The California Conference For Equality And Justice - YDD)
 - Regular workgroup meetings: every other Wednesday, 10am-12pm, starting August 18
- Designing Spaces: Security County Facilities
 - Facilitators: Laura Ridolfi (Burns Institute), Patricia Soung (Burns Institute Consultant), Clinton Lacey (Burns Institute), Kent Mendoza (Anti-Recidivism Coalition)
 - 1st Workgroup meeting: August 10, 10-11:30 am PST
 - Regular workgroup meetings: every other Monday, 3-4:30 PST starting August 23
- Service Delivery Models: Collaborative Decision-making
 - Facilitators: Raquel Mariscal (Burns Institute), Michael Finley (Burns Institute), Maureen Pacheco (Juvenile Division of the Alternate Public Defenders Office in Los Angeles), Gloria Gonzalez (Youth Justice Coalition)
 - 1st Workgroup meeting: August 12m 2:00-3:30, PST

- Regular workgroup meetings: Wednesday, 12:00pm - 1:30pm beginning August 18.
- Service Delivery Models: Reentry and Support for Currently Incarcerated Youth
 - Facilitators: Airtio Morales (Burns Institute), Kent Mendoza (Anti-Recidivism Coalition), Clinton Lacey (Consultant - Credible Messenger Mentoring Movement)
 - Regular workgroup meetings: Fridays from 11am-1pm

Appendix 3

Workgroup 1: DYD Structure + Oversight	
Jimmy Wu, InsideOUT Writers	Sonia Martinez, CLC, MSW, CARE unit
Kruti Parekh, LAYUP	Michael Massa
Lupita Carballo, YJC	Kayla Torrence, Youth
AJ Young, BOS	Kapri Wiggins, Youth
Regina Goree, DCFS	Kamryn Wiggins, Youth
Jewel Forbes, LACOE	
Julia Vest, Probation	
Robert Hernandez, USC	
Luis J. Rodriguez, Public Defender	
Bernadette Gholami, Public Counsel	
Rebecca Renard-Wilson, Arts and Culture	
Carizma Brown, Homeboy Industries	
Megan Castillo, La Defensa / BLM	
Wendy Wang, Hathaway Sycamores	
Minsun Meeker, OCP	
Alain Datcher, Youth Commission	
Tom McKenzie, Arts and Culture	
Jennifer Ochoa-Garcia, Probation Oversight Commission	
Jacob, YJC	
Praveen Kambam, DMH	
Myles Meshack, CEO	
Rudy Mata, ARC	
Ali Haezaert, CCEJ	
Michelle Newell, ODR	
Myisha Jones, New Horizons Concierge/ Forensic Rehab	

Workgroup 2: Contracts + Grants
Meia Johnson, Arts and Culture
Yana Simone, New Earth
Elida Ledesma, AHJN
Wendelyn Julien, POC
Lizzie Cohen, CEO CSP
Paulette Dunn-Sanders, Stopping Pressure on Teens
Jared O'Brien, YJC
Lisa Small, Liberty Hill Foundation
Clara Keane, ARC
Oscar Benitez, Third Sector
Refugio Valle, YDD
Yvonne Anderson, GCRCLA
Celia Harris, YDD
Romel O'Brian, Youth
George O'Brian, Youth
Tristan Flowers, Youth

Workgroup 3: Research + Data
Garrett Barr, AHJN
Sahar Moheize, YDD
Denise Herz, Cal State LA
Jacquelyn McCroskey, USC
Shelby King, BOS
Marquel Reid, Brotherhood Crusade
Diana Greer, Coalition for Engaged Education
Matthew Agustin, Arts and Culture
Betty Fang, CDF-CA
Dr. Maria León, REYSE Collaboratory
Demar Traylor, Psychology major at CSUN/ Project Rebound @CSUN community outreach coordinator
Tatiana, BHAC
Andrea Eastman, USC
Demis Moran, ARC
Sampda Kedia, PD
Christine Bazak, CLC, dual status attorney
Jessica Morales, Tarzana Treatment Centers

Workgroup 4: Expansion of YDD	
Miguel Casar, UCLA	Donna Jamshidnejad, CCEJ
Alexia Cina, ARC	Aditi Sherikar, CDF-CA
Christian Flagg, Community Coaliton	Vanessa Petti
Sandra Rodriguez, Impact Justice	Daniela Vega
Elizabeth Lopez, GRYD	Isabel Daniels, CLC, CARE/Dual Status Attorney
Olivia Shields, UPI	
Vivian Wong, Loyola Law School	
Schoene Mahmood, LMU	
Edith Macias, AHJN	
Leah Gasser-Ordaz, UCLA Law	
Aditi Sherikar, CDF	
Debra Werbel, Public Defender	
Jeremy Bocel, ARC	
Nicole Brown, UPI	
Irina Contreras, Arts and Culture	
Latia Suttle, Community Coalition	
Bernadette Medina Gholami, Public Counsel	
Michael Angelo Aranda, CCEJ	
Emilio Zapién, YJC	
Rocket Garcia, Tia Chucha's Centro Cultural	
Stephen Updyke, Tarzana Treatment Centers, Inc.	
Oscar Canales, ARC	
Jessica Ellis, CYS	

Workgroup 5: Physical Spaces	
Elisabeth Nails, Arts and Culture	GUESTS:
Varden Phan, ARC	Deanna Van Buren, Designing Justice, Designing Spaces
Liz Braunstein, Public Defender	Garrett Jacobs, Designing Justice, Designing Spaces
Cris Mercurio, Public Defender	
Carmelita Ramirez-Sanchez, Boyle Heights Arts	
zoe rawson, AHJN	
Mora Greer, AHJN	
Erica Reynoso, Probation Oversight Commission	
Jared , YJC	
Ezekiel Nishiyama, ARC	
Mike Jiminez, CCPOA	
Stephen Walker, fBYLP/CCPOA	
Stacy Nuñez, Center for Juvenile Law & Policy, Youth Justice Education Clinic	
Susana Juarez, APD	
Evie Sun, Youth Justice Education Clinic, Loyola Law School	
Josh Green, Urban Peace Institute	
Sophia Cristo, ARC	
Casey Massimino, Green Arrow CoLab	
Eli Marcus, ARC	
Adriana Mendez	
Ronaldo Villeda, ARC	
Sylvia Guan	
Milinda Kakani, CDF	

Workgroup 6: Collaborative Decision-Making	
Maureen Pacheco, Alternate Public Defender	Jasmine Rivas
Jenna Kress, Impact Justice	Keving Rivas
Denise Grande, Arts and Culture	Lorenzo Rivas
Bex Montes, CCEJ	Samantha Lopez
Barbara Duey, CLC	Ronnie Dunmore
Veronica Norwood, DCFS	Jade Harvey
Ruth Cusick, Collective for Liberatory Lawyering	Terry Kim
Janet Ramirez, Flintridge Center	James "Blue" Marks
Alisa Blair, District Attorney	Myisha Jones, New Horizons Concierge/ Forensic Rehab
Joseph Maizlish	Gregg Johnson, Arts and Culture
Olivia Shields, UPI	Regina Goree, MSW, DCFS
Brooke Harris, Center on Juvenile Law and Policy/Loyola Law School	
ALEXIS REYES, Centinela Youth Services	
Cameron, AHJN	
Barbara Fant, AHJN	
Elizabeth Norris-Walczak, DPH Substance Abuse Prevention and Control	
Wendy Betancourt, Probation Department	
Eduardo Mundo, formerly Probation Department	
Terry Robinson, YDD	
Sarah Lucero, Youth Justice Education Clinic, Loyola Law School	
Kruti Parekh, LAYUP	

Workgroup 7: Reentry	
Roberta Shintani, Coalition for Engaged Education	Kenzo Sohoue, ARC
Alicia Velasco, SEA	Edin Madrid, ARC
David Woo, Homeboy Industries	Arturo Quiros, Street Poets
Kriss Goss-Marr, Impact Justice	Mia Foreman, YDD
Samantha Camacho, YJEC	Jaryn Saritzky, CLC, CARE/Dual Status attorney
Casey Massimino, Green Arrow CoLab	Eric Alvarez, Peacebuilder @ Maya Angelo High School
Mainor Xuncax, AHJN	
Leanne Drogin, Looking Ahead/Think Together	
Julian Haris, AHJN	
Alejandro, Brothers, Sons, Selves	
Margarita Gonzalez, DCFS - Juvenile Court Services	
Deborah Kanter, Consultant	
Erica Montelongo, YJC	
Edgar Jimenez, The Boyle Heights Arts Conservatory	
Myisha Jones, New Horizons Concierge/Forensic Rehab	
Jennifer Kaufman, Probation Department	
Angelique Evans, Young Women Freedom Center	
Jan Levine, Retired judge, former member of LA County Probation Comm	
Raymundo Zacarias, Coalition for Engaged Education	
Cindy Galvan, Youth Justice Education Clinic, Loyola Law School	



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

FESIA A. DAVENPORT
Chief Executive Officer

October 5, 2021

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

JANICE HAHN
Fourth District

KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: A NEW MODEL FOR YOUTH JUSTICE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ITEM NO. 19, AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 24, 2020) AND FULFILLING LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S COMMITMENT TO A NEW YOUTH JUSTICE MODEL (ITEM NO. 33, AGENDA OF JULY 13, 2021)

On July 13, 2021, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in collaboration with the Chief Probation Officer (CPO), the Director of the Office of Diversion and Reentry through the Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) Unit, the Director of Personnel, and County Counsel, to include the following updates in the next Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) Report:

1. A comprehensive list of functions, duties, or activities currently carried out by the Probation Department (Probation) that are not statutorily required to be performed by sworn peace officers or other Probation staff, including any school or home-based activity Probation is currently engaged in, as well as any therapeutic services that are currently being provided directly by sworn personnel;
2. An update on the analysis and conceptual framework called for in Directive 4(d) of Board Order No. 19 of the November 24, 2020 motion, with an additional focus on strategies that can be used to ensure that Probation's footprint does not grow in a manner that might hinder or delay the transition to a Department of Youth Development (DYD); and
3. A detailed update on the legislative strategy that will be implemented to pursue the legislative changes that are necessary to move forward with the YJR model, with a focus on legislative changes correlating to the phased implementation set forth in the October 2020 YJR Report.

This report provides updates on the directives listed above. We should also note that information related to the progress of YJR is also being reported elsewhere, including the response provided by County Counsel to the Board on their legal analysis of the YJR recommendations, a comprehensive list of [youth justice related funding streams](#) by Probation and a recommendation for the creation of a YJR Development Fund by CEO in the Supplemental Budget Recommendations.

CEO Actions on Board Directives

Update on Directive 1

The existing Government Code requires that certain duties related to youth who are wards of the court be performed solely by the CPO. These duties relate to the care and custody of wards of the court, from initial contact with Probation through post-disposition, and are detailed in Government Code section 27771.

The functions, duties, activities, and programs that are not statutorily in the CPO's sole discretion, but are nevertheless currently performed by the CPO include diversion and prevention program activities that serve young people who are not wards of the court such as Probation's Citation Diversion Program. After looking at the applicable law, it is our belief that only diversion or prevention efforts can be transitioned out of Probation without legislative changes.

As such, the CEO, in consultation with YDD, Probation and County Counsel, will provide in our next report a plan and timetable for transitioning those functions out of Probation into YDD or the new Department of Youth Development (DYD).

Update on Directive 2

In 2016, the CEO's office worked with Probation to assess staffing needs at Probation's halls and camps. The assessment was driven by the decline of youth in Probation's custody and the need to right-size staffing levels commensurate with the number of youth in Probation's custody. Those assessments resulted in a staffing formula and a tool which could be used to regularly assess, adjust, and ultimately right-size staffing levels in light of the declining population. This formula informed plans to close juvenile camps and halls and decisions about staff transfers staff associated with those closures. The formula included operational factors such as appropriate staffing ratios between staff and youth, accounted for employees on leave or who called in sick, and was tailored to each youth-serving facility. After the formula was operationalized, Probation ultimately assumed responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of and use of the tool to guide staffing decisions related to the halls and camps.

As we work to identify resources for the new DYD, the staffing formula needs to be updated and the formula consistently applied. The current CPO has committed to working with the CEO's office to update the formula based on current data – including giving CEO staff access to necessary Probation staff, facilities, and all necessary data. Last month, the CEO's office identified staff who will engage in the work needed to update the formula. We will work with Probation to update the formula and then apply the formula to each Probation facility as needed. After updating the formula and assessing needs, the CEO's office can make recommendations to the Board regarding staffing ratios, and staff reassessments. The CEO's Supplemental Budget Board Letter contains a recommendation to place a hiring freeze on Probation's Juvenile Operations Division while we assess staffing levels and to control the footprint of the division with an eye towards transitioning resources to the DYD over time and as allowed by law.

Update on Directive 3

As described above, Government Code section 27771 outlines functions that are currently assigned to the Chief Probation Officer and section 27773 outlines restrictions on consolidation or integration of Probation roles and responsibilities.

There are two basic approaches to seek needed legislative changes:

1. Request a waiver for the County only that would allow a new entity/department to carry out functions that are currently and exclusive vested in the Chief Probation Officer and staff of the Probation Department; or
2. Request a statewide change in the law that would remove the exclusive authority the Chief Probation officer over youth in the justice system.

Regardless of the approach pursued, successful legislative advocacy will require the County to move from concept to specifics in the form of clearly articulated, desired changes – i.e., concrete asks. The concrete asks must be clear descriptions of each ground level change envisioned for, among other things, the functions of the DYD, and the responsibilities and authority of the staff of the DYD, to name a few.

For purposes of developing a legislative strategy, we need to start with the end in mind. What specific legislative changes do we need and will we seek in order to stand-up the DYD – a new organizational entity within County government? This question has been answered at the conceptual level. We can ascertain from prior reports what the mission of the DYD will be. However, more specificity is required. It is well settled in the area of organizational design that form follows function – in ideal cases. To that end, the essential next step is to start with the foundation of the DYD – i.e., those staff who will be entrusted

to work with youth serviced by the DYD. For purposes of this memo and ease of reference we will refer to these staff as Youth Development Workers.

The position description for the Youth Development Worker should not be developed with the existing legal constraints in mind. Rather, the description should be written by identifying what is needed. For example: What will a worker be required or empowered to do on a day-to-day basis when interacting with the youth, their families, and support network? What tools and data access should the Youth Development Worker be provided in order to accomplish his or her job? What are the desired levels of education, training, prior experience, and which competencies will be needed to perform this job well? Once the needs have been clearly articulated, County Counsel can conduct a duty-by-duty analysis of which requirements require legislative changes. This sets the stage to advance the legislative advocacy work. For those desired skill sets requiring a change in the law, the legislative team can then develop the legislative proposal (i.e., language that can be included in a legislative enactment) and further recommend which approach would be most beneficial to the DYD and which approach will most likely succeed. The developed legislative proposal would then need to be socialized with partners, other counties (potentially) and of course the State Legislature.

Proceeding in this manner has collateral benefits in that it will drive other steps necessary to develop the organizational model for the DYD. Once we have a well vetted position description of the duties, responsibilities, training, experience, and core competencies of the Youth Development Worker, the CEO Compensation and Classification units, using the Civil Service Rules, can then start to build out (i.e., reverse engineer) the staffing structure for the DYD as a whole. The number of youth to be served will drive the number of Youth Development Workers needed. The number of Youth Development Workers needed will drive the number of supervisors and support staff needed. The number of supervisors will drive the number of managers needed, and so on.

Once we have a sense of the number of staff needed, we can assess and plan for the administrative staff needed to support the new department, e.g., budget, personnel, and employee relations staff. Knowing these specifics will then position us to determine the budget necessary to support the new department. This process lends the necessary specificity to the development of the DYD structure and budget rather than broad estimates.

Each Supervisor
October 5, 2021
Page 5

NEXT STEPS

This month, the CEO will convene a meeting of the Alternatives to Incarceration Office, the Youth Development and Diversion Office and their consultant, and representatives from the Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group to begin the work of developing the position description of the foundational worker of the DYD – i.e., the Youth Development Worker. This will enable the legislative team to develop a legislative strategy as well as advance the work to identify the staff type and resources needed for the DYD. We will report on the progress of this work in our next quarterly report.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me or your staff may contact Songhai Armstead, Executive Director of ATI Office , at (213) 974-1664 or sarmstead@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:TJM
SA:VH:TS:lac

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
 County Counsel
 Health Services
 Probation



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

FESIA A. DAVENPORT
Chief Executive Officer

January 21, 2022

To: Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

JANICE HAHN
Fourth District

KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: A NEW MODEL FOR YOUTH JUSTICE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ITEM NO. 19, AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 24, 2020) AND FULFILLING LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S COMMITMENT TO A NEW YOUTH JUSTICE MODEL (ITEM NO. 33, AGENDA OF JULY 13, 2021)

On November 24, 2020, the Board of Supervisors (Board) unanimously adopted the core values of Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) and committed to transitioning the County's youth justice system to the care-first model outlined in the October 2020 Youth Justice Reimagined report (Youth Justice Report) by 2025, pending resolution of the necessary legal, budgetary, and legislative issues, while supporting the continued planning and collaboration required to make the model, including a Department of Youth Development (DYD), a reality.

The County of Los Angeles (County) Chief Executive Office (CEO) was tasked with including the following elements in ongoing quarterly reporting, in partnership with the Division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD), County Counsel, Probation Department (Probation), and other relevant County departments, and the Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group (YJ-TAG):

1. A clear timeline and action plans for implementing the recommendations outlined in Phase 1 of the Youth Justice Report, including transitioning functions currently carried out by Probation's Juvenile Operations that can be transitioned to YDD or DYD, noting legal and legislative considerations;
2. A comprehensive legal and fiscal analysis of current laws, regulations, relevant settlement mandates, and funding restrictions that will need to be addressed to fully transition juvenile operations from Probation to the DYD as well as an action plan and legislative strategy to accomplish necessary changes;

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

3. Establishing a reserve fund that reflects a direct correlation between standing up a new DYD and the gradual wind-down of Probation's juvenile operations; and
4. An analysis of Probation's current workforce and class specifications and an initial concept for the transition of existing Juvenile Probation staff to avoid layoffs.

In response to the July 13, 2021 motion, CEO, County Counsel, Probation, and YDD provided updates on the creation of a YJR Trust and recommended hiring freeze on Probation's Juvenile Operations division; legal and legislative analysis; related youth justice funding streams; and the progress of the YJ-TAG and support for collaborative research, design, and capacity-building.

This report includes updates on the quarterly reporting directives listed above, including elements referenced in our October 5, 2021, quarterly update: A) a progress report related to the development of a position description for the foundational worker of the DYD; B) a proposed plan for ending Probation's Citation Diversion Program (CDP) and transitioning citations not eligible for diversion to the Court; and C) a timetable for launching the DYD and implementing other elements of the initial YJR model not requiring legislative change.

Update on Directive Nos. 1 and 4: Transition Timeline and Action Plan

See *Attachment I, Youth Justice Reimagined Phase 1 Recommendations*, for an overall summary of Phase 1 recommendations from the Youth Justice Report and current progress towards each recommendation.

A. New Youth Development Specialist Classification:

Between October and December 2021, the CEO convened a group of partners—including representatives from the YJ-TAG—to collaboratively design a description of the staff classification that will be the foundation of the staffing structure of the DYD: the Youth Development Specialist (YDS) classification. As described in the October 5, 2021 quarterly update, this proposed new classification will allow partners to build out the organizational structure and responsibilities of the first iteration of the DYD and inform next steps towards future phases and the full implementation of YJR, including necessary legislative strategy. See *Attachment II, Draft Specification for Foundational Department of Youth Development Youth Development Specialist Classification*, for a draft of the proposed YDS classification specification, reflecting the range of responsibilities and qualifications for the initial staff of the DYD. After appropriate legal and labor review, we anticipate submitting this proposed classification to your Board for consideration in April 2022.

By April 2022, CEO ATI will finalize the proposed initial organizational structure of the DYD in collaboration with Classification and Compensation, Human Relations, YDD, and the YJ-TAG. This draft organizational structure will reflect the number and type of staff needed to accomplish the DYD's first phase responsibilities, including DYD

leadership and staff in the areas of youth development and capacity-building, diversion and restorative practices, research, policy, youth and community engagement, contracts and grants, and other administrative support.

B. Proposed Plan for Probation's Citation Diversion Program:

As stated in the previous quarterly update, the Probation's CDP is not a statutory responsibility of the Chief Probation Officer. We are evaluating the feasibility of transitioning approximately \$2.2 million in ongoing funding from the CDP to the YJR Trust Fund to support the launch of DYD. We will work with our partners in labor regarding the potential impacts to the positions in CDP.

Pursuing this option will require collaboration with Probation and the Superior Court to support the transition and ensure pending CDP cases and CDP-related driver's license holds are dismissed and to transition vehicle code citations for youth to the Superior Court. Additionally, YDD will need to institutionalize a meaningful process for youth to contest alleged citations or arrests to ensure due process rights for youth referred to community-based diversion. Cost savings generated by ending CDP should be allocated to the YJR Trust Fund.

C. Timeline and Action Steps for Launching the DYD and Advancing YJR:

The following high-level action steps are needed to meet the goal of establishing the DYD beginning July 1, 2022:

1. Build on the YDS classification specification to refine the initial organizational structure of the DYD, in consultation with the YJ-TAG and other partners.
2. Review the YJ-TAG's 2021 proposals once they are available and coordinate with the Research & Design Consultant Team to operationalize key elements; identify any gaps that need addressing to develop necessary legislative strategy; and prioritize further areas of research, design, and implementation.
3. Work with the Department of Health Services' Office of Diversion & Reentry and YDD to ensure YDD responsibilities, resources, and staff are prepared to transition to the DYD effective July 1, 2022.
4. Work with Probation to establish pathways to transition qualifying staff and reallocate any cost savings to the DYD or the YJR Trust Fund, including funds no longer allocated to CDP. See Attachment IV, *Summary of Staff Ratio Analysis Process*, for a summary of the Staff Ratio Analysis process.
5. Begin outreach and recruitment for DYD leadership and initial staff with a target to make initial hires including, but not limited to, a Director or Interim Director by July 1, 2022.
6. Identify any additional funding needed beyond YJR Trust Fund and identify plans to allocate to DYD during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-23 budgeting cycle.

Each Supervisor
January 21, 2022
Page 4

See Attachment III, *Summary of Timeline for Youth Justice Reimagined Implementation, January-December 2022*, for a more detailed timetable for launching the DYD and implementing additional functions not requiring legislative change.

Update on Directive No. 2: Legislative Strategy

Once the YJ-TAG shares their updated proposal outlining the collaborative's vision for functions transitioned from Juvenile Probation (e.g., investigation, community supervision, detention), we will work with County Counsel, in consultation with the YJ-TAG, to develop legislative strategy by August 2022. See *Attachment V, Youth Justice Reimagined Legislative Update*, for an update on our current legislative efforts.

Update on Directive No. 3: Reserve Fund and FY 2021-22 Investment

Through the Supplemental Budgeting process, the Board approved \$27.4 million to establish the YJR Trust Fund. This Fund builds on a \$43.6 million allocation committed through the FY 2021-22 budgeting process and provides sustainable funding to YDD's for mentoring, housing, jobs, arts, diversion programs, and other services for youth. In total, these investments reflect an initial \$71 million investment in YJR identified in FY 2021-22.

NEXT STEPS

The CEO will continue to work with relevant partners and the YJ-TAG to provide quarterly YJR updates on the action steps and key elements included here.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me or Songhai Armstead, Executive Director of ATI, at (213) 974-1664 or sarmstead@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:SA
VH:TS:lac

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel

Youth Justice Reimagined Phase 1 Recommendations January 2022

The 2020 Youth Justice Work Group Report included the following recommendations for Phase 1 of Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR), focused on establishing infrastructure and initial administrative, program, and planning capacity to bring YJR to life.

Summary of Phase 1 Recommendations from YJR Report	Summary of Progress To-Date
<p>1. Establish the Department of Youth Development (DYD), including new staff classifications to provide leadership for the YJR model, coordinate investments in youth development and capacity-building needed to equitably reduce justice system involvement for youth, and assume responsibility for the phased transition of Juvenile Probation functions over time.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial \$71 million investment in YJR identified in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-22, including a \$43.6 million investment in youth diversion and development supports and a new \$27.4 million YJR Trust Fund. New classification specification developed for the foundational DYD position. Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group (YJ-TAG) DYD Infrastructure/Oversight workgroup conducting initial research/design to inform the structure and approach of the DYD.
<p>2. With the goal of transitioning Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) to DYD as soon as possible, begin planning to expand YDD and allocate initial funding to the countywide expansion of community-based alternatives to suspension, expulsion, citation, and arrest to replace the functions of Probation Department's (Probation) Citation Diversion Program (CDP), Early Intervention and Prevention diversion, and school-based programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YDD is in the process of completing a solicitation for the expansion of youth diversion and development services. YDD and Probation have also been in discussions regarding referring a subsection of Citation Diversion Program youth to YDD. CEO is evaluating the feasibility of transitioning \$2.2 million in funding from CDP to the YJR Trust Fund and will engage labor on impacts to the CDP staff.
<p>3. First YDD and then DYD facilitate ongoing collaborative planning to address unanswered questions and areas prioritized for future exploration to support the next phases of YJR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YDD is supporting the Research & Design Consultant team, led by the W. Haywood Burns Institute and local experts including system-impacted young people, who facilitate the collaborative YJ-TAG. Further updates will be included in YDD's next report-back.
<p>4. First YDD and then DYD work with Probation to establish and implement an improved process for detention decision-making, including the elimination of deficit-based tools and the development of a clear protocol to prevent detention for bench warrants, technical violations, misdemeanors, and offenses that should be referred diversion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Research & Design Consultant Team has established workgroups focused on collaborative decision-making and support for youth at the point of detention. Further updates will be included in YDD's next report-back.
<p>5. Begin collaborative planning to enhance and expand reentry support for youth in juvenile halls and camps, working with Probation and other key stakeholders to increase access to Community Based Organizations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Research & Design Consultant Team has established a Reentry workgroup. Further updates will be included in YDD's next report-back.

Summary of Phase 1 Recommendations from YJR Report	Summary of Progress To-Date
<p>6. Create a labor support and transition planning process engaging both community, Probation, and other County representatives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Research & Design Consultant Team has established a Just Transition workgroup. • Further updates will be included in YDD's next report-back.
<p>7. Develop a framework for ensuring accountability to youth, families, and communities, including measures of success, active oversight, and participatory decision-making processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Research & Design Consultant team has established a DYD Infrastructure and Oversight workgroup. • Further updates will be included in YDD's next report-back.
<p>8. Adopt legislative and local policy changes needed to enable the transfer of Juvenile Probation's functions to a new health and development-focused department.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Counsel and CEO's Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations coordinated a presentation to YJ-TAG and responded to the YJ-TAG's questions about the steps needed to advance a meaningful legislative strategy. • Once the YJ-TAG shares updated proposals on necessary elements, CEO will engage all relevant partners to develop and pursue a legislative strategy.

**Draft Specification for Foundational Department of Youth Development Youth
Development Specialist Classification
January 2022**

Between October and December 2021, the County of Los Angeles (County) Chief Executive Office (CEO) Alternatives to Incarceration Office (CEO ATI) and Classification and Compensation division convened a small focused group of partners including representatives from the Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group to collaboratively design a classification specification for a foundational position of the Department of Youth Development.

Youth Development Specialist DRAFT Classification Description

Definition:

Provides coordination and collaborative project management for a wide range of youth development services, opportunities and support—from prevention and early intervention to engagement and support for youth and their families involved in the justice system—so that all youth in Los Angeles County have access to youth development.

Class Standards:

Positions allocable to this class are responsible for coordinating and facilitating service delivery; information-sharing, communication, and collaboration among relevant community partners; and interdepartmental collaboration with County partners; providing youth development services, opportunities, and supports to youth on their behalf through connections from schools, child welfare, community organizations, youth and community centers, law enforcement agencies, and other partners within a young person's network. Youth Development Specialists may provide direct services to youth by connecting them with community-based services and other services as appropriate, supporting youth participating in collaborative programs or policy planning, and by participating as members of multi-disciplinary teams engaging in crisis response.

Youth Development Specialists are expected to have in-depth knowledge of core principles of youth development. Positions in this class are also expected to have familiarity with federal and State laws pertaining to youth justice and diversion, as well as the Department's policies, regulations, and procedures, and to work creatively and independently, referring only the most complex cases to a supervisor. Youth Development Specialists must demonstrate knowledge in youth development, equity and anti-racism, restorative justice, conflict de-escalation, trauma-informed crisis response, other healing-centered and cultural practices, and relevant policy and legislation impacting youth in Los Angeles County.

Examples of Duties:

Develops and coordinates training, capacity-building support, shared learning, and co-designed policy and protocols with community-based organizations (CBOs), individuals with lived experience, and collaborative Youth Empowerment and Support (YES) Teams.

Facilitates and manages resources and support for CBOs serving as youth development hubs, as well as engaging contractors and partners, in assessing opportunities for improvement and capacity-building in program and policy planning, implementation, and oversight.

Develops culturally responsive and equity-centered spaces and relationships with youth, community groups, and other stakeholders to receive and communicate information, including collaborative research, planning, and decision-making, as well as coordinate resources or services.

Partners with young people, their families, and other partners in a young person's network to support equitable rehabilitative engagement and advocacy for youth.

Works to enhance youth-centered, care-first service delivery and system navigation, accountability, and improvement with youth justice system partners, including the County's Office of Public Defender, Alternate Public Defender, District Attorney, and Probation Department.

Interacts directly with youth to provide support to those participating in collaborative program or policy planning, youth and community led oversight committees, and other leadership development and engagement activities.

Engages, supports, and cultivates youth through leadership development, training, shared learning, and partnership opportunities.

Coordinates multi-disciplinary YES Teams or similar multi-disciplinary groups in order to connect youth to supportive services such as 24-hour crisis response at Youth and Community Centers, Safe and Secure Healing Centers, or as liaisons to the court.

Engages youth, community, and systems in service delivery, systems navigation, and systems accountability and improvement; coordinates or makes referrals for out-of-home placements and Safe and Secure Healing Centers, ensuring youth have access to step-down possibilities to transition safely away from supervision and confinement.

Connects youth with arts, culture, recreation, health, education, and other services related to youth development based on a young person's individual strengths and needs.

Provides relationship-based contract and project management to facilitate capacity-building, shared learning, and cooperation with relevant agencies, institutions, and CBOs.

Monitors, evaluates, and facilitates learning and capacity-building among service providers to ensure consistency and flexibility, and overall effectiveness of the program.

Conducts outreach, engagement, and storytelling to increase awareness of DYD programs and priorities and to uplift youth narratives and successes to a wide range of audiences, including County partners, youth, and communities.

Develops and maintains collaborative and cooperative working relationships with various city, county, social, legal, court, and law enforcement entities, and educational institutions and school officials and staff to facilitate service delivery, information sharing, communication, and collaboration to advance a youth development framework.

Composes, prepares, and processes a variety of correspondence, reports, data, forms, and other documents; establishes and oversees accurate and efficient program and case management records, including confidential and sensitive files subject to various legal requirements.

Participates and increases access for youth, families, and other partners to training, workshops, and learning opportunities relevant to youth development, restorative justice, conflict de-escalation, anti-racism, healing-centered practices, creative and cultural practices, and more.

Engages in reflection and analysis of gaps and opportunities, including receiving feedback from youth and families to inform active and ongoing improvement.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES AND QUALIFICATION STANDARDS:

GENERAL COMPETENCIES:

Knowledge:

Youth Development – Knowledge of principles and practices related to adolescent brain development, youth leadership development, and program/policy development and oversight.

Restorative and Transformative Justice – Knowledge of principles and practical applications of restorative and transformative justice, alternatives to punitive approaches, conflict de-escalation, and trauma-informed crisis response.

Care coordination and systems navigation – Knowledge of resources available for the care and development of youth, including knowledge of existing youth-serving systems

and laws impacting young people, as well as programs and opportunities available through CBOs and public agency partners.

Trauma-informed/healing-centered practice – Recognition and response to signs, symptoms, and risks of trauma to better support the needs of youth who have experienced Adverse Childhood Experiences and toxic stress, including holistic healing practices.

Social Justice and Equity – Understanding of research and practices to advance social justice, equity, and systems transformation, emergent strategy, and future building.

Anti-racism and anti-racist practices – Knowledge of practices actively opposing systemic racism and that promote changes to policies, behaviors, and beliefs that perpetuate racist ideas and actions.

Skills:

Collaboration and network building – Includes planning, scheduling, organizing, prioritizing, and monitoring work activities among several contributing groups to achieve established goals.

Youth, family, and community engagement – Includes appropriate communication, active-listening, and empathy when in contact with a young person, their family, and support networks.

Systems navigation – Includes coordination, advocacy, and moving with urgency and initiative to identify challenges or barriers, problem-solve, develop, and implement a meaningful and responsive plan.

Abilities:

Oral Comprehension and Active Listening – The ability to listen to and understand information and ideas presented through spoken words and sentences.

Oral Expression – The ability to communicate information and ideas in speaking so others will understand.

Responsiveness – The ability to identify and address barriers to efficiently and effectively solve problems.

Relationship-Building – The ability to build trust and communication to build strong, supportive, and generative relationships.

Conflict Resolution – The ability to identify and address tension or conflict through facilitation, mediation, or other healing-centered practices.

Written Expression – The ability to communicate information and ideas in writing so others will understand.

Reasoning and Problem-Solving – The ability to apply the rules of logic when synthesizing a variety of information to identify a problem or reach a workable decision, resolution, or recommendation.

Information Ordering – The ability to arrange things or actions in a certain order or pattern according to a specific rule or set of rules (e.g., patterns of numbers, letters, words, pictures, mathematical operations).

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS:

TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE:

Option 1:

Two years of experience working directly with youth in service-oriented environments for care coordination, case management, or mentorship, including CBOs, schools, healing centers, public agencies, secure placement facilities or locked institutions, and philanthropic or academic centers with a focus on youth or community investment.

Option 2:

One year of experience in youth development-oriented collaborative project management or coordination of service delivery from community-based providers involving youth development programs, youth diversion programs or other partnerships with justice or education partners.

Option 3:

One year of experience managing youth diversion programs at the level of Assistant Staff Analyst, Health.

LICENSE:

A valid California Class C Driver License or the ability to utilize an alternative method of transportation when needed to carry out job-related essential functions.

PHYSICAL CLASS:

2 - Light.

Positions within this class require light physical effort that may include occasional light lifting up to a 10-pound limit and some bending, stooping, or squatting. Considerable ambulation may be involved.

SPECIALTY REQUIREMENTS:

In accordance with TITLE 5 – PERSONNEL, APPENDIX 1 (Civil Service Rule 11/03) of the Los Angeles County Code, specialty requirements may be used for some positions that require special experience, skills, and/or training.

Lived Experience: Individuals with histories of contact with the youth justice and/or child welfare systems working as Youth Development Specialists can make a unique contribution to the responsiveness and effectiveness of service delivery for these populations. The inclusion of a Youth Development Specialist with lived experience demonstrates the capacity of the County to reach a historically unaddressed population, which significantly enhances community education and sector capacity building.

Summary of Timeline for Youth Justice Reimagined Implementation, January–December 2022

Action Steps in 2022		Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
1	YJ-TAG and YDD report Year 1 proposals and updates.												
2	Engage YJ-TAG in the review of initial proposals and confirmation of the DYD's Phase 1 responsibilities and organizational structure.												
3	Work with CEO classifications team and key partners to finalize DYD staff structure and receive feedback from the YJ-TAG.												
4	Informed by YJ-TAG proposals, identify gaps that need to be filled to develop the legislative strategy needed to fully implement YJR.												
5	Work with CEO Legislative Affairs, County Counsel, and YJ-TAG to develop and vet legislative proposal(s).												
6	Work with CEO Staff Ratio Analysis team, Probation, and YJ-TAG representative to identify and develop a plan to transition cost savings to the YJR Trust Fund or the DYD.												
7	Work with DHS ODR YDD to identify and implement steps needed to loan or transition YDD staff, resources, and responsibilities to DYD starting July 1, 2022.												
8	Post initial job bulletins and begin outreach and recruitment for DYD staff, including for the DYD Director.												
9	Identify the review team and begin application review and interviews for initial DYD staff.												
10	Identify and hire an interim DYD Director.												
11	Officially launch DYD with YJR Trust Fund, YDD structure transitioned, and initial staff hired.												
12	Continue hiring and training for DYD staff.												
13	Identify additional funding needed beyond YJR Trust Fund and identify plans to allocate to DYD during FY 2022-2023 budgeting cycle.												

DHS: Department of Health Services
DYD: Department of Youth Development

ODR: Office of Diversion and Reentry
YJR: Youth Justice Reimagined

YDD: Youth Diversion and Development
YJ-TAG: Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group

Attachment IV

Summary of Staff Ratio Analysis Process

Step 1: December 2021 - Work with Probation to determine the number of Juvenile Camps and personnel needed to care for and serve those in camp.

Step 2: Spring 2022 - Work with Probation to determine the Juvenile Hall Housing Modules and personnel needed to care for and serve those in the halls.

Step 3: Summer 2022 - Work with Probation to review Juvenile Field Operations and staffing to determine the personnel needed to serve their clients.

Step 4: Fall 2022 - Develop recommendations for right-sizing the Juvenile Camps, Halls, and Field Operations.

Step 5: Fall 2022 - Work with Probation to review Adult Field Operations and staffing to determine the personnel needed to serve their clients. Adult operations are included in the review to help determine what, if any, promotional and/or transfer opportunities exist for staff that could be displaced by changes to Juvenile operations.

Step 6: Winter 2022 - Develop recommendations for right-sizing Adult Field Operations.

Step 7: Assist Probation with restructuring their organization.

Step 8: Throughout the process, identify and make recommendations to address barriers to implementing right-sizing efforts and adopting a sustainable process for the implementation of ongoing adjustments as populations and case counts continue to shift.

Attachment V

Youth Justice Reimagined Legislative Update January 2022

The County of Los Angeles (County) Chief Executive Office's (CEO) Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations (CEO-LAIR) and Alternatives to Incarceration (CEO-ATI) and the Department of Health Service's Youth Diversion and Development Office (YDD), in partnership with the Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group (YJ-TAG), are collaborating on the initial stages of developing a legislative proposal and strategy to realize the Board's goals of the Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) efforts.

Initial Program Design and Policy Development

The *Youth Justice Reimagined Report* by W. Haywood Burns Institute recommends establishing a new Department of Youth Development (DYD) as the vehicle for YJR. There are various elements of this goal that County departments and YJ-TAG are discussing and/or will require deliberation, including what the responsibilities and duties of the Chief Probation Officer to DYD will be. This includes how to create youth community centers, how to expand alternatives to detention, how to advance the continuum of reentry services, how to establish the Youth Empowerment and Support Teams, and how to transfer existing funding streams from the Probation Department to DYD. The decisions and ideas that come out of these conversations will be critical to shifting from concept to identifying the operational and fiscal needs, as well as potential legislative changes needed to achieve the YJR vision.

Relevant Statutes

Some of the California statutes that will require further analysis are: 1) the responsibilities of the Chief Probation Officer in Government Code; 2) the definition of "Juvenile Halls" in the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC); 3) the prohibition for the Office of the Chief Probation Officer to consolidate with any other office in Government Code; and 4) confidentiality and protection of juvenile case file information in the WIC. In addition, analysis of existing federal and State funding streams to ensure the County maintains eligibility to receive the same funding without interruption is crucial to supporting the DYD.

Legislative Considerations

CEO-LAIR reports that a legislative strategy will need to account for the State's legislative timelines and the political landscape to ensure adequate planning and preparation is conducted to position the County to launch an effective legislative and/or budgetary advocacy campaign. Based on the structure of the new DYD, CEO-LAIR will recommend whether to pursue: 1) policy proposals and/or related budget companion requests; 2) a multi-year approach; 3) legislation that contains mandated requirements, or alternatively, permissive authority for local governments or solely the County; among other considerations. Additionally, as referenced in the last report-back to the Board, the County will need to consider which legislative approach to pursue given that many of the Probation Department's responsibilities and authorities are codified in various intersecting California codes. CEO-LAIR, CEO-ATI, and CEO-YDD will continue to coordinate on these various efforts and will continue to keep the YJ-TAG partners apprised of developments.

Preliminary Advocacy and Education

As County departments and YJ-TAG continue their work to develop the infrastructure and design of the DYD, CEO-LAIR will continue laying the foundation for advocacy by arranging meetings and briefings in which the County can educate legislative members about the progress of this work.



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

FESIA A. DAVENPORT
Chief Executive Officer

May 20, 2022

To: Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

JANICE HAHN
Fourth District

KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: A NEW MODEL FOR YOUTH JUSTICE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ITEM NO. 19, AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 24, 2020) AND FULFILLING LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S COMMITMENT TO A NEW YOUTH JUSTICE MODEL (ITEM NO. 33, AGENDA OF JULY 13, 2021)

On November 24, 2020, the Board of Supervisors (Board) unanimously adopted the core values of Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) and committed to transitioning the County's youth justice system to the care-first model outlined in the October 2020 Youth Justice Reimagined report (Youth Justice Report) by 2025, pending resolution of the necessary legal, budgetary, and legislative issues, while supporting the continued planning and collaboration required to make the model, including a Department of Youth Development (DYD), a reality.

The County of Los Angeles (County) Chief Executive Office (CEO) was tasked with including the following elements in ongoing quarterly reporting, in partnership with the Division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD), County Counsel, Probation Department (Probation), and other relevant County departments, and the Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group (YJ-TAG):

1. A clear timeline and action plans for implementing the recommendations outlined in Phase 1 of the Youth Justice Report, including transitioning functions currently carried out by Probation's Juvenile Operations that can be transitioned to YDD or DYD, noting legal and legislative considerations;
2. A comprehensive legal and fiscal analysis of current laws, regulations, relevant settlement mandates, and funding restrictions that will need to be addressed to fully transition juvenile operations from Probation to the DYD as well as an action plan and legislative strategy to accomplish necessary changes;
3. Establishing a reserve fund that reflects a direct correlation between standing up a new DYD and the gradual wind-down of Probation's juvenile operations; and
4. An analysis of Probation's current workforce and class specifications and an initial concept for the transition of existing Juvenile Probation staff to avoid layoffs.

This report includes updates on the quarterly reporting Directive Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Update on Directive Nos. 1 and 4: Transition Timeline and Action Plan

A. Timeline and Action Steps for Launching the DYD and Advancing YJR:

As described in the January 2022 update, the CEO worked closely with YJ-TAG representatives to collaboratively design a description of the journey-level classification that will be the foundation of the staffing structure of the DYD: the Youth Development Specialist (YDS), which your Board approved on April 15, 2022. The CEO Alternatives to Incarceration (ATI) Office has continued to work with the CEO's Classification and Compensation team and subject matter experts to draft proposed classification specifications to create additional levels in the Youth Development classification series, including a Youth Development Manager, Youth Development Supervisor, and entry-level Youth Development Ambassador. Careful consideration is being given to ensure those with lived experience have the opportunity to fill these positions. We anticipate submitting these proposed classifications to your Board for consideration in June 2022.

The CEO remains on track to launch the DYD by July 1, 2022; see the Attachment for the detailed timeline included in the January 2022 update. CEO ATI has worked with the CEO's Classification and Compensation team, the Auditor-Controller, and others to finalize the initial organizational and staffing structures for the DYD and establish the DYD Chart of Accounts. The Department of Human Resources is working with stakeholders to conduct a job analysis and develop recruitment materials for the classified positions included in the DYD's initial organizational structure.

The remaining high-level next steps include:

1. Working with the Department of Health Services' Office of Diversion and Reentry and YDD to identify appropriate YDD responsibilities, resources, positions, and staff that will be phased into DYD;
2. Working with the Department of Human Resources to begin outreach and recruitment for DYD leadership and staff to make initial hires;
3. Reviewing the YJ-TAG's updated implementation proposals, including recommendations on elements that may inform the scope of DYD's first years;
4. Evaluating funding needs beyond the \$27.4 million in the YJR Trust Fund; and
5. Working with County Counsel, CEO's Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations (CEO-LAIR), and YJ-TAG representatives to develop a legislative strategy.

B. Update on Juvenile Probation Staff Ratio Analysis:

CEO continues to move forward with the Staff Ratio Analysis process outlined in the January 2022 update. We anticipate including a more detailed update on the findings, recommendations, and results (including, but not limited to, any cost savings identified as a result of right sizing Juvenile Camp, Hall, and Field units) in the next quarterly update.

Each Supervisor
May 20, 2022
Page 3

C. Update on Probation's Citation Diversion Program (CDP):

In order to close Probation's CDP, the Superior Court rescinded the authority of the CDP hearing officer effective April 30, 2022. Probation has been working closely with the Court to ensure that citations are dismissed and working with YDD to refer to community-based diversion and development services and other community-based providers as appropriate. Additionally, Probation is working with the State of California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on a process that will expedite the dismissal of an estimated 32,000 DMV holds and/or suspensions/delays associated with the dismissal of CDP citations. The CEO and Probation continue to meet regularly to discuss progress and identify opportunities to transition ongoing funds no longer allocated to CDP to the DYD or YJR Trust Fund.

Update on Directive No. 2: Legislative Strategy

In March 2022, CEO, County Counsel, CEO-LAIR, YDD, and YJ-TAG representatives began meeting regularly to discuss key questions and establish a clear plan to develop legislative strategy by September 2022. The parties have begun to lay the groundwork for a legislative strategy and will continue to meet monthly to build out the plan. We anticipate sharing more detail in our next quarterly update.

Update on Directive No. 3: Reserve Fund and FY 2021-22 Investment

We anticipate sharing more detail about possible funding requests based on findings related to the termination of the CDP and any cost savings identified in relation to the Staff Ratio Analysis process, in our next quarterly update.

NEXT STEPS

The CEO will continue to work with relevant partners and the YJ-TAG to provide quarterly YJR updates on the action steps and key elements included here.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me or Songhai Armstead, Executive Director of ATI, at (213) 974-1664 or sarmstead@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:SA
VH:TS:lac

Attachment

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
 County Counsel
 Health Services
 Probation

Summary of Timeline for Youth Justice Reimagined Implementation, January–December 2022

Action Steps in 2022		January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1	YJ-TAG and YDD report Year 1 proposals and updates.												
2	Engage YJ-TAG in the review of initial proposals and confirmation of the DYD's Phase 1 responsibilities and organizational structure.												
3	Work with the CEO's Classification and Compensation team and key partners to finalize DYD staff structure and receive feedback from the YJ-TAG.												
4	Informed by YJ-TAG proposals, identify gaps that need to be filled to develop the legislative strategy needed to fully implement YJR.												
5	Work with the CEO's Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations, County Counsel, and YJ-TAG to begin developing recommended legislative proposals for future legislative sessions.												
6	Review the analysis and findings of the CEO's Staff Ratio Team to identify possible Probation cost savings.												
7	Work with DHS to implement steps needed to transition YDD staff, resources, and responsibilities to DYD starting July 1, 2022.												
8	Post initial job bulletins and begin outreach and recruitment for DYD staff, including for the DYD Director.												
9	Begin application review and interviews for DYD leadership.												
10	Start process to hire a DYD Director or Interim.												
11	Officially launch DYD, including the YJR Trust Fund, YDD structure, and initial DYD staff.												
12	Continue hiring and training for DYD staff.												
13	Assess departmental funding needs and develop funding justifications for future budget cycles.												

DHS: Department of Health Services
 DYD: Department of Youth Development

ODR: Office of Diversion and Reentry
 YJR: Youth Justice Reimagined

YDD: Youth Diversion and Development
 YJ-TAG: Youth Justice Transition Advisory Group



**Chief
Executive
Office.**

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Fesia A. Davenport

April 26, 2023

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport
Chief Executive Officer

for FAD

**YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: A NEW MODEL FOR YOUTH JUSTICE IN
LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ITEM NO. 19, AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 24, 2020);
FULFILLING LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S COMMITMENT TO A NEW YOUTH
JUSTICE MODEL (ITEM NO. 33, AGENDA OF JULY 13, 2021); AND CARE
FIRST, JAILS LAST: HOLDING THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT
ACCOUNTABLE AND ADVANCING YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED
(ITEM NO. 6, AGENDA OF MARCH 21, 2023)**

This memorandum provides a comprehensive staffing analysis of the Probation Department's (Probation) juvenile halls, camps, and field operations. The attached analysis, supports the Board of Supervisors (Board) adoption of the core values of Youth Justice Reimagined on [November 24, 2020](#), and the commitment to transition the County of Los Angeles (County) youth justice system to a care-first model by 2025, pending resolution of necessary legal, budgetary, and legislative issues, and is responsive to motions the Board adopted on [July 13, 2021](#) and [March 21, 2023](#).¹

During the time my office was conducting this staffing analysis, the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), which has regulatory jurisdiction over Probation's juvenile facilities, conducted an inspection that found Probation's

¹ The Board's March 21, 2023, motion titled "Care First, Jails Last: Holding the Probation Department Accountable and Advancing Youth Justice Reimagined" directed the Chief Executive Office (CEO) and other departments to respond to a range of directives related to Probation Department operations and the transition to Youth Justice Reimagining. This memorandum responds to directive 3.a. of the motion, requiring CEO to complete our Probation juvenile services staffing analysis. We will address other motion directives under separate cover.



facilities were unsuitable to house pre-disposition youth. At a hearing conducted by the BSCC on April 12, 2023, the BSCC Board inquired about this staffing analysis and wanted to know how it can help Probation address staffing issues. My office explained that this work has been underway for some time and is separate but related to the BSCC request. The work is separate in that the analysis was primarily undertaken as a budgetary analysis, wholly unrelated to suitability findings of Probation's juvenile halls. The work is related in the sense that the staffing ratios determined herein can and should be used by Probation to make operational decisions about where to assign staff, how many staff to assign to provide our youth the care they deserve, and to address BSCC concerns. These staff assignments will accompany a "whole-of-County" approach to help Probation resolve BSCC non-compliance issues.

The following overarching themes, assumptions, and caveats help orient your Board to the findings of the staffing analysis:

- The staffing analysis is intended to budgetarily "right size" Probation's juvenile operations to support the transition to Youth Justice Reimagined. The goal of the analysis is to determine whether there is "excess" funding and staff to reallocate to other non-carceral County programs.
- The staffing analysis concludes that Probation has more budgeted items than it needs to safely run the halls, camps, and field operations.
- This conclusion must be viewed in light of the realities facing Probation's operations. Probation's vacancies and other issues like staff callouts and personnel on light duty (i.e., unable to supervise youth) have often resulted in a lack of actual personnel available to adequately staff its juvenile halls. Therefore, even though Probation has more budgeted items than it needs, Probation does not have more actual staff than it needs (a point we illustrate in more detail below). Probation must continue to hire personnel to staff its operations, using the staffing analysis developed herein and while remaining within budget.
- The conclusions of the staffing analysis are point-in-time only. This means that as Probation's operational needs evolve, so will their staffing needs. Probation should use the staffing ratios underlying the staffing analysis to calculate adequate staffing for its changing operational landscape.

Probation is under a Board-mandated hiring freeze which allows Probation to hire. Under the freeze, Probation is allowed to hire after submitting a request to my office. (See section "Probation Can Hire Under the Hiring Freeze" of this memo which discusses the 150 staff Probation has been allowed to hire).

The Staffing Analysis Is Intended to "Right Size" Probation's Juvenile Operations to Support a Transition to Youth Justice Reimagined While Ensuring Sufficient Staffing Levels To Support Youth that Remain in Probation's Care

The staffing analysis is intended to help the Board "right size" Probation's juvenile operations to support a transition to Youth Justice Reimagined. A care-first youth justice model requires, among other things, that the County reduce the number of youths in carceral settings and transition resources freed up by a lower youth census in juvenile halls and camps to preventative and restorative services and programming administered by the County's new Department of Youth Development (DYD).

On [June 28, 2021](#), my office reported that we would conduct a comprehensive analysis of Probation staffing levels (filled and unfilled positions) to confirm the number of staff assigned to halls, camps, and field operations; determine the number of staff needed to appropriately supervise the declining youth population; and identify the steps needed to right-size staffing levels. This analysis would help determine whether excess funding or staffing resources could be transferred to DYD to support care-first programming.

On [July 13, 2021](#), the Board adopted a motion reaffirming its commitment to Youth Justice Reimagined, and directed the CEO, Chief Probation Officer, and other stakeholders to evaluate Probation's staffing, functions, duties, activities, programs, and funding sources to better understand what must remain within Probation based on State law and other factors and what may transfer to DYD.

In our report filed on [October 5, 2021](#), we updated the Board on our Juvenile Services staffing analysis. We explained that Probation had undergone a similar "right-sizing" in 2016 driven by the decline of youth in Probation's custody. The 2016 assessment resulted in a staffing formula and a tool to assess and adjust staffing levels as populations fluctuate. This work culminated in a May 22, 2017 Board report entitled *Probation Juvenile Camps and Staffing*, which helped guide various Probation camp consolidations and led to a similar collaborative effort to study Probation's halls and the ultimate closure of Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall.

We also explained that the staffing formula and tools developed in 2017 needed to be updated to reflect operational and legislative changes; including, but not limited to, the transfer of Secure Youth Treatment Facility youth from the State Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) to the County. In addition, the study was expanded to include Probation's Juvenile Field, Placement, and Special bureaus, which provide wraparound and supportive services, to support the Board's continued efforts to implement Youth Justice Reimagined. After updating the formula and assessing needs, we would then make recommendations to the Board regarding staffing ratios

and the ultimate “right-sizing” of the Probation’s juvenile halls, camps, and field operations.

Although Probation Has More Budgeted Positions than It Needs to Safely Operate Its Halls, Camps, and Field Operations, Probation Must Fill Its Vacancies to Ensure Safe and Supportive Operations

With the above purposes in mind, the analysis:

- (1) Calculates appropriate staffing ratios based on applicable laws and regulations (including estimates for special staffing ratios like one-to-one staffing for high-needs youth) and assumptions about the number of youths in halls and camps, and applies a “relief factor” developed in 2016 and updated in 2023 to account for vacations, callouts, and employee leaves, to determine the optimal number of staff Probation needs to operate the juvenile halls and camps.
- (2) Identifies the number of halls and camps needed to care for the youth in Probation’s care based both on Probation’s existing operations and makes some assumptions about which facility consolidations could be implemented to maximize existing staffing levels. For example, the analysis recommends consolidating the adjoining Camps Paige and Afflerbaugh, which would allow Probation to maximize staff resources by reducing its facility footprint. Other assumptions are clearly stated in the attached staffing analysis.²
- (3) Determines the number of budgeted items currently available to staff the juvenile halls and camps.
- (4) Identifies excess budgeted positions – i.e., any budgeted position that is over-and-above the number of staff identified in the staffing analysis.

Based on these assumptions and the resulting analysis, we conclude that Probation has more budgeted positions than it needs to operate its halls, camps, and field operations. However, Probation also has a high volume of vacant positions that, in many cases, exceed the number of excess budgeted positions – this means that Probation has a current net deficit of personnel available to staff its facilities and operations, as displayed in the table below.

² The staffing analysis also assumes that Campus Kilpatrick is not in use pending the resolution of the lack of staff sleeping quarters necessary to accommodate a 56-hour schedule as specified in Probation’s Memorandum of Understanding with labor. This assumption is not intended as a recommendation. At the time we conducted the staffing analysis of Probation’s camps, only a small number of youth were at Campus Kilpatrick. Probation has since transferred about 15 to 20 DJJ Youth to Campus Kilpatrick. These youth remain there with approximately 39 staff to support current operations. Probation can use the staffing ratios from this staffing analysis to calculate its staffing numbers to account for Campus Kilpatrick’s current operations.

Juvenile Institutions & Field Reviews (Item Summary)

Operation	Budget vs Need & Vacancies				
	Budgeted	Required	Excess vs (Need)	Vacant	Items Needed Filled
1 Juvenile Halls	1,249	1,194	55	388	333
2 Juvenile Camps*	551	359	192	124	0
3 Juvenile Field Option 1** (Higher Caseload Ratios for 4 case types)	759	715	44	99	55
4 Juvenile Field Option 2** (Lower Caseload Ratios for 4 case types)	759	754	5	99	94

*Assumes Probation closes two of five existing camps, including one of either Camp Paige or Camp Afflerbaugh, which are adjoining.

**Field Operations include two staffing options (Higher & Lower Caseload Ratios)
 Changes to facilities assumption noted above will impact the staffing numbers.

The analysis shows that Probation has 1,249 budgeted staff in the juvenile halls, while our analysis reflects that the more appropriate number is 1,194. This results in Probation having 55 more budgeted positions than needed even though they have 388 vacancies. This apparent disconnect is explained by remembering that although the Department may have funding for a certain number of positions, that does not mean that all the positions are filled – which is the case here. Therefore, the actual number of vacancies that Probation needs to fill is 333 vacant positions (388 budgeted vacant positions – 55 excess budgeted positions).

As demonstrated above, after “right-sizing” Probation’s budgeted staff pursuant to the staffing analysis, Probation can potentially redirect up to 68 (192 excess budgeted positions less 124 budgeted vacant positions) staff from the juvenile camps to other operations. The difference in Juvenile Field caseload ratios (Higher vs Lower) is a request associated with various factors including, among other things, enhanced County services requirements and the expansive geographic footprint of the County. In addition to redirecting staff from the camps, Probation must continue to increase the number of staff available to appropriately staff its operations.

The Point-in-Time Staffing Analysis Can Be Adapted to Probation's Dynamic Staffing Needs

The staffing analysis is a point-in-time analysis and is built upon certain operational assumptions. Probation's operations are dynamic causing its staffing needs to fluctuate over time. Fluctuations can be driven by changes in the youth census, increases or decreases in the number of youth requiring special staffing ratios (e.g., one-to-one), closing or opening facilities, changes in applicable laws and regulations impacting staffing ratios or changes in the services provided or functions provided by Probation.

Given the foregoing, the staffing analysis is a point-in-time analysis, it serves as a "directionally correct" assessment of staffing needs. The analysis will need to be refreshed as operational changes are made (see examples above) either because the operational changes differ from the assumptions the analysis is built upon, or were not considered when the analysis was completed.

For example, the State continues to transfer DJJ Youth from State facilities to the County. The growth of the DJJ Youth population will require the increased use of the Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) series and the decreased use of the DSO series, as the DPO series is used to supervise post-adjudicated youth.

Should your Board determine to move transferrable services associated with non-statutorily obligated Probation functions, such as diversion and prevention efforts to DYD, we will work with Probation to ensure that such actions do not reduce Probation's budgeted items below what is required for safe operations. Also, your Board directed the CEO to analyze and report on the feasibility of transferring pretrial services from the Probation Department to the Justice, Care and Opportunities Department (JCOD). Once JCOD's organizational design of its related to a pre-trial services delivery model is finalized, we can work with Probation to determine the impacts on their staffing, including the possibility of transferring existing staff to perform other functions within the department. Again, we will use this staffing analysis to ensure that Probation's operations remain adequately budgeted and staffed.

The Staffing Analysis Supports Compliance with BSCC Regulations and Pending Suitability Determination

Although the staffing analysis was initially solely intended as a budgetary exercise to "right size" Probation's staffing of its juvenile operations, the analysis also supports Probation's efforts to come into compliance with BSCC regulations.

On January 13, 2023, the BSCC issued an Initial Inspection Report from an inspection of Probation's juvenile halls conducted between November 8, 2022 and

December 16, 2022. The inspection report cited various areas of noncompliance with applicable BSCC regulations, many of which pertained to a lack of sufficient staffing. Probation submitted a [corrective action plan](#) (CAP) on March 14, 2023, and [supplemented](#) its CAP on April 3, 2023, providing additional details about efforts to resolve all areas of noncompliance such as strategies to increase staffing levels at the halls. Probation also explained that this office was conducting this staffing analysis in part to "determine if the Department is operating more camps than needed given the current youth population statistics, and the appropriate per-officer caseload ratio for field offices and programs." Probation further explained that "if the CEO determines that the Department can consolidate camps and/or reduce the officer per caseload ratio, and may do so safely, any identified excess staff will be reassigned to the halls."

At the BSCC hearing on April 13, 2023, the BSCC Board granted Probation an additional 30 days to demonstrate material and actionable steps to implement the supplemental CAP, including any recommendations from the CEO's staffing analysis.

Probation will use the findings of the staffing analysis and underlying staffing ratios to increase staff levels in the juvenile halls in support of the supplemental CAP, in addition to efforts to increase staffing levels and come into compliance for all other violations noted by the BSCC.

Probation Can Hire Under the Hiring Freeze

The staffing analysis, which focuses on the right number of staff needed to operate Probation's juvenile facilities safely, is independent of Probation's efforts to fill existing budgeted vacancies at its juvenile halls. Probation must continue to hire to ensure enough staff are physically reporting to work.

Probation's Juvenile Institutions Services operations are currently under a Board-ordered hiring freeze. However, this does not mean that Probation is unable to hire necessary staff. To the contrary, Probation is hiring the staff needed to provide appropriate direct supervision of youth in its care.

My office and Probation are following a practice wherein Probation requests hiring authority from my office and CEO staff evaluates the request to ensure the proposed hiring is necessary to support Probation's operations. To date, my office has approved a request by Probation to hire its first cohort of staff – 150 new DSO's and/or Group Supervisor, Nights to fill vacant positions that provide direct supervision of youth in the halls. Probation is recruiting applicants and offering academies, with the scheduled plan to bring all 150 staff onboard by June 2023. We will work with Probation to authorize additional hires as needed to ensure appropriate staffing levels in the halls and camps.

Each Supervisor
April 26, 2023
Page 8

These hires do not impede a transition to Youth Justice Reimagined. As explained above, Probation needs to fill existing vacancies to meet the optimized staffing ratios in the attached analysis.

Should you have any questions, please contact me or René C. Phillips at (213) 974-1478 or rphillips@ceo.lacounty.gov, or Dean Aardema at (213) 893-2471 or daardema@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:MM:RCP
DA:AHW:MX:cc

Attachment

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
 County Counsel
 Human Resources
 Probation

Juvenile Staffing Analysis

BACKGROUND

2017 Staffing Analysis

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17, the Chief Executive Office (CEO), working with the Probation Department (Probation), studied Probation's juvenile camp (camps) staffing, operations and populations. This study culminated in a May 22, 2017 Board report entitled *Probation Juvenile Camps and Staffing*. This report helped guide various camp consolidations to adjust to the decreasing number of detained youth population, the LA/Small Group Model (LA Model), lower staffing ratios, and the reintroduction of Campus Kilpatrick (CVK) into Probation's inventory of facilities. The report also led to a similar collaborative effort to study Probation's juvenile halls (halls). No formal report detailing those findings was issued, but the results of the study were used to plan for and subsequently close Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH).

Changes Since 2017

Youth populations have decreased since the previous study, and fewer camps may be needed. Probation recognizes that the youth remaining in their care generally have higher level mental health and care needs. Probation aligns populations within specific facilities to provide the appropriate setting to address individualized youth care needs. For example, Probation has modified Dorothy Kirby Center's (DKC) population to adapt to emerging needs such as incoming female State Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) youth. Also, CVK's previous post-adjudicated population was relocated to other camps, and a pilot project was initiated for DJJ youth at CVK.

Coordination between Probation, the juvenile courts, and law enforcement, with the increased emphasis on community-based alternatives, has reduced population counts since the 2017 report. However, populations at the halls have grown by 7.5 percent and at the camps by 50 percent since July 2022. The hall growth is likely connected to the transfer of the DJJ youth population to the County of Los Angeles (County), but this transfer does not appear to be a significant reason for the growth seen at the camps. Reasons for the camps' population growth have not been identified by Probation.

Updated Staffing Analysis: Caveats and Disclaimers

In January 2022, the CEO and Probation initiated a second effort to study halls and camps staffing, operations, and populations. The scope of this review was expanded to include Probation's Juvenile Field Services, Placement Services and Special Services bureaus. The expanded study supports the Board of Supervisor's (Board) continued efforts to implement Youth Justice Reimagined while supporting Probation's ability to serve the youth in its care.

This staffing analysis serves as a guide for allocation of staffing resources based on the service needs of specified populations and the relative uniqueness of each youth detention facility. The analysis is subject to change as further clarity is obtained regarding dynamic conditions such as the number of operational camps, occupancy levels, staffing ratios, and treatment models. Conclusions about appropriate staff levels will depend on the number of housing units that are deemed necessary to ensure youth safety. Any changes or decisions made to these assumptions will alter the calculation and the conclusions presented. The CEO will provide the analysis and underlying staff ratio calculations to Probation so that the department can update staffing needs accordingly in response to regular and ongoing operational changes.

HALLS AND CAMPS: POPULATIONS SERVED, CAPACITY, AND INVENTORY

Probation operates two halls, four camps, and the DKC. The DKC is referred to in this report as a camp, although the facility is a level 14 placement. Juveniles are assigned to DKC by judicial order and have serious mental health needs. DKC and CVK are the only camps suitable for implementing all aspects of the LA Model, as these facilities include smaller housing units which are a key aspect of the family-like setting vital to the LA Model's service outcomes. The LA Model focuses on the idea of small groups, positive reinforcement, and the teaching and building of life skills in a therapeutic environment.

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) provides youth bed capacity ratings for each facility, but these ratings do not accurately reflect the County's move toward the LA Model, nor the operational practices Probation utilizes to ensure youth well-being. For example, Probation limits one juvenile per room at the halls instead of the prior practice of double-bunking youth. In addition, due to the reduction in the detained youth population, Probation no longer needs to utilize larger spaces as sleeping quarters for multiple youth.

The camp capacity numbers used in this report are largely consistent with the figures used in the 2017 report, except for DKC and CVK. These are summarized below:

- Camps Afflerbaugh, Paige, and Rockey each continue to have dorm-style sleeping quarters with capacity for 55 youth at each camp.
- DKC's capacity was reduced from 90 to 76, largely due to a State requirement of adding a second Hope Center, which resulted in the elimination of a housing unit.
- CVK's capacity was reduced from 120 to 80 to better accommodate youth and reduce overcrowding.

The revised capacity numbers for the halls are as follows:

- Central Juvenile Hall (CJH) has a sleeping capacity of 326 beds across 23 housing units, with an additional 47 beds reserved for Hope Centers, medical, and intake.
- Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH) has a sleeping capacity of 461 beds across 24 housing units, with an additional 90 beds reserved for Hope Centers, medical and intake.

Each housing unit is designated by Probation for specific attributes of youth based on relative needs and risks, as well as gender/gender identity, age, size, propensity to

engage in criminal or otherwise disruptive behavior, and other factors. There are also separation needs based upon gang rivalries, or as the result of court orders to separate individuals who participated in the same criminal incidents, events, or schemes. A housing unit may be operated at less than its rated capacity because of the separation of youth, or because some youth may be temporarily housed in a Hope Center or Medical Module while mental or physical health challenges are addressed. As such, a simple one-to-one correlation between maximum bed capacity in a housing unit and the number of youth requiring housing fails to accurately identify the appropriate number of housing units needed.

Probation's inventory of facilities includes several closed camps and LPJH. These facilities require physical assessments to identify needed refurbishments prior to consideration for re-opening, and may require pre-inspection and approval by the BSCC. All closed camps feature dorm-style housing units that are not conducive to full implementation of the LA Model.

STAFFING: YOUTH SERVED; LOCATION ASSIGNED; ASSUMPTIONS

Hall and camp operations fall under two Bureaus. The Detention Services Bureau (DSB) is responsible for the halls, which previously housed only pre-adjudicated youth. The Residential Treatment Services Bureau (RTSB) is responsible for the camps, which houses post-adjudicated youth who were ordered by the Court to a camp program. The distinction between the two Bureaus has been modified due to the assignment to the halls of post-adjudicated youth who previously resided with the DJJ.

The State is in the process of closing its DJJ operations and transferring the youth in DJJ facilities back to their respective counties. The County's DJJ population is now at BJNJH except for a small group who are at CVK. This transition represents a significant change to the findings of the 2017 staffing study, as DSB is now providing direct supervision to a post-adjudicated population who formerly would have been detained by DJJ.

Based on the relative age and post-adjudication status of DJJ youth, the staff classification items utilized to serve these youth have been changed from the Detention Services Officer (DSO) series to the Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) series. DPO was selected in-part because it was the classification previously used at Camp Onizuka. When it was in operation, Camp Onizuka was the facility where youth with significant behavioral problems outside of DKC were assigned.

Halls are generally staffed with a Senior Director, Directors, Assistant Directors, Supervising Detention Services Officers (SDSO), Senior DSO and DSO, Group Supervisor Nights (GSN), and clerical support. The CEO's revised study includes the DPO series in the staffing analysis and allocations due to the phase-out of oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray in addition to the incoming transfers of DJJ youth. Any staffing matrix for BJNJH will be for a point in time. The DPO series allocations will grow as the DJJ youth population expands. Conversely, the DSO series allocations are expected to fall. Programming for DJJ youth at BJNJH is the responsibility of RTSB.

Youth supervision at camps is provided by the DPO series; however, GSNs supervise youth during sleeping hours. LA Model camps require lower staffing ratios than their dorm-style counterparts due to the LA Model's small group/cottage configuration and more intensive treatment/programmatic regimen.

Each hall and camp staffing analysis assumes the facility is operating at capacity. Halls and camps have some discretion to open or close housing units/sleeping areas as youth population counts change and/or as separation needs arise.

Staffing Ratios: Requirements and Fundamental Components

The staffing ratios identified in the May 2017 report used the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) ratios of one staff for every eight youth (1:8) during waking hours, and one staff for every sixteen youth (1:16) during sleeping hours. These ratios represent the minimum direct supervision requirement. A lower ratio means that more staff are needed to supervise the same number of youth as compared to a higher ratio.

For purposes of this study, staffing ratios were adjusted only when a facility's configuration required something different. For example, DKC's cottages are based on a 10-bed configuration, so the waking hours direct supervision ratio was reduced to 1:5 (10-beds supervised by two staff). CVK's revised cottage configuration is based on an eight-bed configuration. This results in a waking hours direct supervision ratio of 1:4 (eight beds supervised by two staff). While CVK's eight-bed configuration meets the PREA 1:8 ratio, the ratio was lowered to reflect the Probation policy that no staff should be alone with youth. Similar ratio adjustments are made for the halls based on each housing unit's configuration. Supervision ratios are consistent with the applicable labor bargaining units' Memorandums of Understanding (MOU).

Relief Factor: The Basic Calculation

Youth sentenced to a hall or camp are there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Probation's youth supervision staff may be assigned to what are referred to as mandated posts. A mandated post specifies that someone meeting the qualifications of the assignment must work the post regardless of the day or time.

To help identify the number of personnel needed to staff a mandatory shift (AM, PM, or Nights) five or seven days a week, organizations forecast and estimate the number of additional staff that will likely be needed to fill behind existing staff when the existing staff take time off from work (e.g., vacation, illness) or are otherwise unavailable to work (e.g., training). The number of additional staff is included into the staffing formula and referred to as a "relief factor." The number of personnel needed for a particular post is calculated by first applying the applicable staffing ratio to the number of youth, and then further multiplying the resulting figure by the relief factor to determine the total number of items/employees needed to cover the post for a full year. Relief factors are not unique to public safety duties and are particularly applicable to 24/7 operations such as nursing, elder care facilities, and similar operations.

The relief factors used in this study are the same as those used in the May 2017 report. Relief factors across public safety departments reflect the unique staffing requirements for the population served. Probation currently has staffing challenges due to the number of personnel on various forms of leave (e.g., workers' compensation, Family and Medical Leave Act, illness, etc.). The County's Department of Human Resources (DHR) is working with Probation to assist with these challenges.

The relief factors used in this report are based on actual time off taken during FY 2015-16 and include 40 hours of annual training. The relief factors are:

- Detention Services Officers and Deputy Probation Officers
 - Mandatory 40-hour (per week) shifts: 1.27
 - Mandatory 56-hour (per week) shifts: 1.77
- Group Supervisor, Nights
 - Mandatory 40-hour (per week) shifts: 1.28
 - Mandatory 56-hour (per week) shifts: 1.80

Better Managing Recruitment, Leave, and Callouts

Staff on leave, personnel call outs, and staff with doctor-prescribed physical restrictions all impact staffing needs in the halls. These impacts manifest themselves in the following ways: a staff member may be completely unable to work; a staff member is available to work but has work restrictions that prevent them from performing some or all of their customarily assigned duties. Recruitment also impacts staffing in the halls. DHR and Probation are collaborating to address these issues. Milestones to date include eliminating a decentralized personnel infrastructure for certain personnel functions in favor of a centralized personnel structure within Probation's Human Resources division to increase efficiency. Since the ramp-up of efforts to hire 150 staff for the juvenile halls from January to June 2023, DHR and Probation have collaborated on refinements to accelerate the background check process. These refinements include refreshing various qualifying standards, conducting more frequent State Peace Officer testing, streamlining scheduling for medical clearance exams, and eliminating the polygraph requirement.

According to DHR, the following accomplishments have been achieved in the last 12 months:

- Hiring 115 new staff who commenced academy training with only nine (7.8 percent) of those hired subsequently leaving County service.
- Resolving 94 or 54 percent of 173 new long-term leave cases.
- Reducing by 27 percent background processing time for new employees from 67 to 49 days.
- Reducing by 77 percent the overall time to hire new employees from 15 months to 3.5 months.
- Implementing an automated callout system to better manage staff who call out for work and to forecast staffing needs more quickly as a result of the call outs.

DHR and Probation continue to look at systems improvements to better manage and expedite these processes.

CURRENT FACILITIES NEEDED, WORKING ASSUMPTIONS AND OPTIONS, OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

Based on methods developed in the previous study, applying current population data, and adjusting for hall operations, data supports our recommendation that Probation should operate two halls and three camps (including DKC). Probation is currently operating two halls and five camps.

This staffing analysis assumes Probation continues with its two-hall operation. At the time of the study, Probation's operations had two halls, each specializing in different populations. CJH houses the medically fragile (CJH is located across from the LAC+USC Medical Center) and female populations, whereas BJNH houses DJJ youth and the high-risk juveniles needing accommodations in a high security setting. However, other configurations not analyzed herein may also work. For example, operating LPJH as a single hall for non-DJJ youth is an option. If pursued, Probation could leverage the staffing analysis to generate appropriate staffing ratios for LPJH.

Our camp analysis is based on two main assumptions: 1) the DJJ youth population being housed at BJNH; and 2) CVK not housing youth. CVK includes insufficient staff sleeping quarters to operate much more than two cottages while also accommodating the 56-hour work week required in Probation's MOU with labor. Probation currently houses about 15 to 20 DJJ youth at CVK. Approximately 39 staff support current operations. Although not included in this analysis, we have calculated the projected staffing needs for two-, three-, four- and five-cottage scenarios at CVK and will provide these scenarios to Probation.

JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES OPERATIONS

Bureaus

Probation's Juvenile Field operations include the Field Services, Placement Services and Special Services bureaus that collectively are responsible for overseeing the post-adjudicated juvenile population. Field Services provides investigative reports to the court and supervision services to the youth residing in the community. Probation's Placement Services Bureau supervises youth living in various out-of-home placements settings. Probation's Special Services Bureau provides various specialized supervision services and interventions for youth with a variety of complex needs (e.g., education, gang, mental health, developmental disabilities, etc.), and who reside in the community.

The bureaus operate from a variety of offices throughout the County, and much of the work affiliated with the three bureaus is linked to caseloads.

Non-Mandatory Staffing Posts and Relief Factor

Field Services, Placement Services and Special Services bureaus are organizational units staffed with Senior Directors, Directors, Assistant Directors, Supervising DPO, DPO II, Program Analysts, and clerical personnel. The DPO series works with and supervises the youth. The assignments in these bureaus are not considered mandatory posts. Therefore, a relief factor was not used in calculating the total staff needed during this portion of the staffing analysis. However, allowances were made for personnel who have been on long-term leave for six or more months. In these cases, manual adjustments were made to the staffing matrices.

Calculating High and Low Caseload Ratios

Functions connected to the work done within the three bureaus are typically linked to caseloads. Caseload ratios identified in the labor MOUs governing this work could benefit from an assessment to determine if these ratios continue to represent current supervision requirements and services offered.

Comparable caseload ratios were provided by four neighboring Southern California counties based on their caseload types. Due to the diversity of its justice-involved youth population and the varying service needs, Probation has developed specialized caseload ratios to better address the need for intensive case management associated with substance abuse, trauma, sexual abuse, etc. This makes direct comparison difficult, as Probation has more caseload types than its local counterparts. If a match in caseload types was identified during this study, the lowest reported ratio from the other counties was applied to the staffing analysis. This excludes the team approach Probation has developed for the Intensive Gang Supervision program and the DJJ youth populations.

Probation requested that lower caseload ratios be used for computing the staffing needs associated with four caseload types. The staffing difference between using the higher caseload ratios and lower caseload ratios equates to 39 DPO II items. The staffing analysis at the end of this report will include both scenarios.

Youth Populations

Youth populations served by the three bureaus have generally declined over the last few years. This reduction has provided Probation the capacity to adjust to the increased requirements/additional services not yet reflected in the labor MOU ratios. However, reductions in caseloads or populations served is not the trend in Probation's investigation's unit. The investigation population represents investigative work done as a case progresses through the juvenile court's criminal process. Probation noted that investigation populations under the Field Services Bureau appear to have reversed a longer-term trend of diminishing population numbers and increased by 32 percent during the 2022 calendar year.

COMBINED STAFFING ANALYSIS

Halls and Camps

The halls and camps study suggests that Probation should be operating two halls and three camps (including DKC) for existing populations to maximize efficiency. This equates to a reduction of two camps. As explained above, assumptions built into the model include DJJ youth residing in two housing units at BJNJH, and CVK not housing youth. The analysis is predicated on the ongoing operation of DKC, Camp Rockey, and either Camp Afflerbaugh or Paige. Comparing the staffing needs of this configuration to the items allocated to two halls and five camps in late 2022 results in a surplus of 247 items.¹ Table 1 below provides a detailed count of existing and required items:

Table 1. Halls & Camps Item Analysis
(2 Halls & 3 Camps - 1:8 - DJJ Youth at BJNJH)

Staffing	Budget vs Need & Vacancies					Comments
	Budgeted	Required	Excess vs (Need)	Vacant	Items Needed Filled	
Sr. Director	2	2	0	0	0	Camp calculations based on 2022 need. This does NOT include the DJJ youth population at CVK. Hall models are based on Full Operational Need and include the DJJ youth population at BJNJH.
Director	19	15	4	1	0	
Assistant Director	10	6	4	3	0	
Supervising DPO	80	39	41	15	0	
DPO III	4	0	4	4	0	
DPO II	165	107	58	38	0	
DPO I	319	211	108	66	0	
Supervising DSO	60	84	(24)	16	40	
Sr DSO	137	133	4	30	26	
DSO	603	597	6	200	194	
GSN	359	325	34	129	95	
Office	42	34	8	10	2	
Total:	1,800	1,553	247	512	357	

Minimum Requirement - Direct Supervision: 1:8 & 1:16

The 247 excess items can be properly interpreted to mean that Probation has more budgeted items than supported by this staffing analysis. The excess budgeted items, however, do not automatically correlate to a specific amount of funding and/or net County cost (NCC). The reasons include, but are not limited to, the following:

¹ As discussed above, CVK remains in operation for DJJ youth, with approximately 39 staff supporting current operations.

- a. Vacant items may consist of revenue-backed positions for which Probation receives no funding unless the positions are filled, employees are completing specified tasks, and the Department claims reimbursement for those tasks.
- b. Careful analysis of the operational impacts of removing those items is needed before concluding whether Probation's available funding can be reduced.
- c. Probation uses some of the savings from vacant positions to fund a portion of its overtime budget. Some of Probation's overtime budget is used to address current and anticipated staffing shortages in the halls and camps. As such, further analysis is needed to determine how many of the excess positions can be eliminated from its budget without negatively impacting its ability to pay overtime when necessary.
- d. Legislative changes are needed before certain Probation functions and their associated revenues could be considered for adjustment within Probation's budget.
- e. A lower supervision ratio in the halls and camps may need to be considered due to the elimination of OC spray. Other jurisdictions have adopted lower ratios in response, in order to manage their populations more effectively. Lower ratios have also been used to more effectively manage populations that have higher mental acuity and trauma, as well as to implement small group models like the LA Model. Doing so will reduce the number of excess items available.

These and other funding issues will be more fully addressed under separate cover in response to the Board's March 21, 2023 motion titled "Care First, Jails Last: Holding the Probation Department Accountable and Advancing Youth Justice Reimagined."

Juvenile Field Services, Placement Services, and Special Services Bureaus

The staffing study of the Juvenile Field Services, Placement Services, and Special Services bureaus assumes that Probation's existing area offices will continue to serve their respective communities, and that any staffing adjustments are linked to changes in caseloads, caseload ratios, or the needs associated with a particular assignment or specialty care service. The recomputed need is then compared to the current items assigned to each bureau. As mentioned previously, the caseload ratios applied in the study are linked to Probation's specialized ratios, in instances where alternatives could not be found, or to the lowest caseload ratio identified in a survey of the four neighboring Southern California counties.

Two matrices are presented below. Table 2 (Higher Ratios) includes the caseload ratios identified as part of the study, and Table 3 (Lower Ratios) includes lower ratios requested by Probation for four specific caseload types. Probation has provided documentation to support its request for lower ratios. The difference between the two models is 39 DPO II items. Cumulatively, there are at least 64 DPO II vacancies in the three bureaus. As noted in the hall and camp analysis above, the funding connected with the Juvenile Field Services, Placement Services and Special Services bureaus is complex.

Although not represented in the charts below, the three analyses also suggest a variety of internal movements within each Bureau to help ensure items and personnel were

moved from operations with sufficient resources to operations needing additional resources. Internal movements like these were netted out prior to the development of the staffing recommendation.

Table 2. Juvenile Field Operations Item Analysis
(Field Services, Placement Services & Special Services Bureaus - Higher Ratios)

Staffing	Budget vs Need & Vacancies					Comments
	Budgeted	Required	Excess vs (Need)	Vacant	Items Needed Filled	
Sr. Director	3	3	0	0	0	Operations include case and non-case carrying functions. Caseload ratios are based on a limited survey of other Counties or existing ratios connected to unique caseloads
Director	25	25	0	0	0	
Assistant Director	2	2	0	0	0	
Supervising DPO	78	81	(3)	11	14	
DPO II	475	428	47	64	17	
Program Analyst	15	15	0	2	2	
Special Assistant	2	2	0	0	0	
Clerical	159	159	0	22	22	
Others	0	0	0	0	0	
Total:	759	715	44	99	55	

Table 3. Juvenile Field Operations Item Analysis
(Field Services, Placement Services & Special Services Bureaus - Lower Ratios)

Staffing	Budget vs Need & Vacancies					Comments
	Budgeted	Required	Excess vs (Need)	Vacant	Items Needed Filled	
Sr. Director	3	3	0	0	0	Operations include case and non-case carrying functions. Caseload ratios are based on a limited survey of other Counties, existing ratios connected to unique caseloads or a Probation request.
Director	25	25	0	0	0	
Assistant Director	2	2	0	0	0	
Supervising DPO	78	81	(3)	11	14	
DPO II	475	467	8	64	56	
Program Analyst	15	15	0	2	2	
Special Assistant	2	2	0	0	0	
Clerical	159	159	0	22	22	
Others	0	0	0	0	0	
Total:	759	754	5	99	94	

As noted earlier in this report, models represent a moment in time and can be recomputed based on revised plans/assumptions and changes in populations.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this staffing analysis are based on assumptions that may change as final decisions are made by the Board regarding the overall direction of Probation's halls and camps. The staffing model will be updated once decisions are made based on which facilities will remain open and the population that will be housed in them.

Under current assumptions, this analysis concludes the need to remove youth from two camps and identifies 247 potential excess budgeted items. The Juvenile Field Services, Placement Services and Special Services reviews identifies five or 44 excess items depending on the caseload ratios used in four categories. These 252 (i.e., 247 items plus five items) to 291 (i.e., 247 items plus 44 items) items are linked to various funding sources including NCC, restricted State revenue, or a blend of both, and may be based on claim reimbursement (i.e., funding is generated only if a qualifying task is completed and/or tasks are performed by specified type of staff).

It is important to note that the eight percent budget curtailment taken by County departments in FY 2020-21 in response to the COVID-19 fiscal emergency resulted in a Probation structural budget deficit of \$22.7 million. Probation may also be called upon to fully staff the DJJ youth operations at the DPO level once the full population arrives later this year. In addition, Probation is reassigning 100 employees from across its operations to fill vacancies at the halls to help address staffing shortages. This reassignment does not impact this analysis, as personnel are filling required vacant items.

In general, the deletion of vacant items to yield potential funding that may be redirected requires a careful additional analysis of the foreseeable impacts to Probation's operations in terms of caseload ratios, supervision ratios, and staffing ratios. This is because doing so may prevent Probation from hiring the staff required to achieve regulatory mandates. The savings from these vacancies have historically and currently been used to cover increased overtime costs, and for staff who are helping to address staffing shortages at the halls and camps. Probation must also ensure it continues to abide by the mandated uses and limitations of the supporting funding streams.

The analysis also identifies various internal moves within each bureau that should be considered to ensure items/personnel are better aligned with duties. Probation and DHR continue to work on the leave, callout, and light duty issues by the introduction of additional controls and by actively working with personnel wellness to facilitate their return to full duty. Probation and DHR are also coordinating to improve hiring, recruitment, and retention. Addressing these issues is critical to maintaining an effective workforce.

Probation is limited in its ability to rapidly adapt to emerging staffing needs for which it has little or no control, such as court trends, legislative changes, or industry norms. Though emerging staffing influences vary from department to department, the inability

to adapt staffing to external influences is not unique to Probation because of the countywide process and timelines for budget requests, due diligence reviews, counsel oversight, and Board approval.

Probation should leverage this staffing analysis to periodically address population shifts and changing assumptions and regulations. A more frequent realignment of resources would increase efficiency while also helping to validate/address more emergent needs.



DAVID J. CARROLL
Director

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT**

Hall of Records
320 West Temple Street, Suite 7001
Los Angeles, California 90012
<https://dyd.lacounty.gov>



Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

Date: June 21, 2023

HOLLY J. MITCHELL
Second District

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

LINDSEY P. HORVATH
Third District

JANICE HAHN
Fourth District

KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

From: David J. Carroll *DC*
Director

YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: A NEW MODEL FOR YOUTH JUSTICE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ITEM NO. 19, AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 24, 2020) & YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED: FULFILLING LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S COMMITMENT TO A NEW YOUTH JUSTICE MODEL (ITEM NO. 33, AGENDA OF JULY 13, 2021)

On November 24, 2020, the Board of Supervisors (Board) unanimously adopted the core values outlined in the Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) Report and committed to the vision of transitioning the County's youth justice system to a care-first youth development model by 2025, pending resolution of necessary legal, budgetary, and legislative issues. On July 1, 2022, a key recommendation of the YJR Report was realized: the historic creation of the Department of Youth Development (DYD), charged with leading the County's care-first youth development and youth justice transformation efforts.

This memo provides the Board with an update on the phased implementation of YJR and an overview of related priorities and next steps.

Strengthening Youth Development Infrastructure

Organizational Capacity & Staffing: In the year since the Department's launch, DYD has more than doubled in size. Of the thirty (30) initial vacancies in the Department, twenty-four (24) were programmatic positions and the remaining six (6) were administrative positions.

On August 3, 2022, DYD launched its first round of competitive recruitment using the newly developed Youth Development classification series. Due to the substantially higher than anticipated volume of applicants received for the Youth Development Supervisor, Specialist, and Ambassador bulletins, additional examination content was requested in

"Supporting the Equitable Development of Young People in Los Angeles County"

September 2022. Examination results were received on October 28, 2022. The hiring team then reviewed resumes and application materials for reachable candidates and held interviews for DYD's three (3) Youth Development Supervisor vacancies in November and December 2022.

Next, interviews for seventeen (17) Youth Development Specialist vacancies were held in January and February 2023. Finally, interviews for four (4) Youth Development Ambassador vacancies were held in March and April.

By July 2023, DYD expects to have successfully hired thirty (30) new team members to fill initial vacancies, bringing the Department to almost forty (40) County employees and around five (5) contract staff. DYD is now in the midst of recruitment for the Department's Chief Deputy. In the coming months, recruitment will begin for the Youth Development Manager level and priorities will be solidified for the Department's second phase of hiring.

In June 2023, the DYD team held a multi-day staff retreat to establish strong team norms for an organizational culture of care and anti-racism as well as deepening our collective capacity and knowledge of promising practices and theoretical foundations in youth development, restorative justice, and transformational change management. The team is looking forward to building on the valuable team-building, learning, and goal-setting accomplished during this retreat to inform strategic planning in Fiscal Year 2023-2034.

DYD continues to work in close collaboration with the YJAG and YJR Research & Design Consultant team, convening YJAG and DYD Steering Committee meetings every few months to engage our wide range of youth, community, and County partners in feedback and co-design. DYD has also continued to engage philanthropic partners in collaboration with the Center for Strategic Partnerships through our jointly convened Youth Justice Funders Group.

Phased Implementation of Youth Justice Reimagined

The recommended action steps and timeline for implementation of YJR estimated three eighteen-month phases: Phase 1 from November 2020 to July 2022, Phase 2 from July 2022 to January 2024, and Phase 3 from January 2024 to July 2025. Recommendations in each phase reflect the following six categories: building youth development infrastructure; creating spaces for shared learning; expanding diversion and restorative practices; supporting system-involved youth; collaboration, planning, and oversight; and just transition. As DYD and our partners move into the second half of Phase 2, below is an update on the status of Phase 1 recommendations.

<i>Action Items for Phased YJR Implementation</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Notes and Next Steps</i>
<i><u>Phase 1: November 2020 to July 2022</u></i>		
1. <u>Youth Development Infrastructure</u> : Establish a new Department of Youth Development (DYD), including designing new staff classifications, using data to inform initial budget, and designing and implementing infrastructure for improved contracts and grants, capacity-building, data / evaluation, and oversight / accountability.	Complete / Ongoing	DYD launched in July 2022 with the new Youth Development staff classification series. DYD continues to work on refining equitable infrastructure to support the Department's goals and vision, including serving as a model for equitable County contracting and identifying sustainable funding sources.
2. <u>Spaces for Shared Learning</u> : Launch Youth Development Learning Collaborative to facilitate shared learning with other youth-serving Departments, build capacity, and collaborate closely with the Youth Advisory Commission to support youth leadership in participatory processes.	Ongoing	DYD is convening multiple spaces for collaborative learning and engagement with evaluation / research frameworks. DYD is also planning a Fall 2023 Youth Development Summit in collaboration with the Youth Advisory Commission and other partners.
3. <u>Diversion and Restorative Practices</u> : Expand YDD's pre-arrest diversion network Countywide, including resources to support schools, child welfare, and crisis response; support rebuttable presumption of diversion for non-707(b) alleged offenses; and begin to end the Probation Citation Diversion Program.	In Progress / Extended to Phase 2	DYD will be submitting legislative proposals to build on presumptive diversion policy for County-sponsored consideration. Probation's Citation Diversion has ended. DYD will complete the countywide expansion of pre-arrest diversion by Summer 2023.

4. <u>Support for System-Involved Youth</u> : Begin collaborative planning to enhance and expand support for youth in juvenile halls and camps, creating a community of practice for youth reentry services and supporting collaborative decision-making models in collaboration with Juvenile Court and legal system partners.	Complete	DYD has begun a Credible Messengers Pilot program in juvenile hall and camp and is in the progress of expanding for girls / gender-expansive youth and youth with developmental disabilities. Collaborative planning is underway for Safe Healing Center Pilot, Girls Decarceration, and reentry efforts.
5. <u>Collaboration, Planning, & Oversight</u> : Continue working with the YJAG for implementation planning, including youth centers, YES Teams, Safe and Secure Healing Centers; administration of oversight bodies like the JJCC; and adopting local and state policy changes needed to advance YJR.	Ongoing	Collaboration continues to occur in the YJAG and focused workgroup spaces to conduct research, facilitate participatory planning and design, and assess opportunities for potential demonstration projects & policy change.
6. <u>Just Transition</u> : Design equitable plan for workforce support and transition.	Extended to Phase 2	Initial research underway on promising strategies for equitable workforce support / transition. More work is needed in future phases.

Next Steps

Next month, DYD will release a Year-In-Review update to celebrate the Department's one year anniversary. This update will include additional details about the community-based youth development, diversion, and reentry services funded by DYD as well as our programmatic and policy priorities for the coming year. We look forward to sharing those updates with the Board and continuing to provide regular updates on the status of the phased implementation of YJR.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (213) 584-4331 or dcarroll@dyd.lacounty.gov.

DC:ts:zr

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors