

MOTION BY SUPERVISORS KATHRYN BARGER
AND JANICE HAHN

October 20, 2026

**REVISED: ESTABLISHING A FRAMEWORK FOR LESS RESTRICTIVE PROGRAMS
IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

SB 823, California’s Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Realignment, shifted responsibility for youth offenders from the state to county governments. This transition culminated in the closure of all state-run youth facilities on June 30, 2023. Counties now assume full responsibility for housing, managing, and providing rehabilitative services for youth who would previously have been committed to DJJ, using state-allocated funding.

To support this transition, the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG) was established to help counties develop local, rehabilitation-focused programs rather than punitive ones. In addition, the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR) was created to provide technical assistance, to identify and disseminate best practices around rehabilitative and restorative youth practices, and to review county realignment plans. SB 823 emphasizes minimizing confinement and requires the use of the less-restrictive dispositional options. Under the revised JJRBG formula, 25% of what counties receive will be based on youth transferred to a Less Restrictive Program (LRP) from secure youth treatment facilities (SYTF) (5% for any LRP and 20% for LRPs in the community or facilities not subject to Title 15 regulation) by fiscal year 2028–2029.

The Board of Supervisors has remained committed to the safe and appropriate transition of youth into LRPs such as Pine Grove Fire Camp. These programs offer meaningful alternatives for youth who have been committed to SYTF. Less Restrictive Programs exist along a continuum, moving from incarceration and more structured placements to community-based environments. Each step provides increasing autonomy for the youth and greater connection to community, based on individualized needs, while maintaining services, oversight, and support. In Los Angeles County, many LRPs are residential programs operated by community-based organizations whose work in youth rehabilitation is commendable. However, SB823 did not come with a prescribed framework for oversight, data collection, or evaluation. This motion applies to these types of Less Restrictive Programs.

- MORE -

MOTION

MITCHELL	_____
HORVATH	_____
HAHN	_____
BARGER	_____
SOLIS	_____

MOTION BY SUPERVISORS KATHRYN BARGER
AND JANICE HAHN

October 20, 2026

Page 2

At its March 12th meeting, the Probation Oversight Commission (POC) established an ad hoc committee to examine and strengthen LRPs. Los Angeles County Probation is responsible for supervising largest population of youth in the state. Therefore, we have an obligation to ensure that young people who are found suitable for an LRP are placed in safe environments with access to services that support their rehabilitation. Given the large and growing population of former SYTF youth stepped-down into LRPs throughout the County, a continuum of LRPs has organically taken shape. This is a unique opportunity to analyze whether establishing a tiered level system of LRP step-downs can better serve and more appropriately address any barriers or challenges that are an obstacle to youth success. It is imperative that we establish a structured and county-tailored framework to evaluate program effectiveness and measurable outcomes, as this foundation is essential to support informed decision-making and ensure accountability.

I WE, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Probation Officer in collaboration with the District Attorney, the Department of Youth Development (DYD), Public Defender, the Alternate Public Defender, the POC, technical assistance from the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR), and any other relevant departments to report back in 90 days with:

1. An overview of the current model for assessing youth such as the number of staff assigned, and any assessment tools and/or criteria used for making recommendations to the court for LRP placement.
2. A comprehensive list of all residential LRPs operated by community-based organizations and their related services. This list should include:
 - a. The LRPs that are contracted directly by the county and those that are identified by the Court and/or other justice and community partners where youth are placed.
 - b. The feasibility of Probation keeping and providing a complete list of these types of LRPs to the Court.
 - c. A description of any differences, including differences related to budgeting and billing processes, between contracted and non-contracted LRPs, as well as an analysis of the pros and cons of the County contracting directly with LRPs.
3. A detailed accounting of both contracted and non-contracted residential LRPs operated by a community-based organization, including:
 - a. the cost of housing and services for each LRP youth per month, delineated by housing costs, service costs, etc
 - b. the level of staffing structure, supervision, and safety measures provided by the program, including the requirements, policies and practices governing those measures;

MOTION BY SUPERVISORS KATHRYN BARGER
AND JANICE HAHN

October 20, 2026

Page 3

- c. the services and programming the program provides or coordinates through partner organizations, including educational, vocational, employment-related opportunities, additional rehabilitative programming, and transition planning available to youth; and
4. The program's capacity to accommodate youth with differing or changing levels of structure, supervision, and service needs.
5. A summary of the authority Probation or any other county entity has for inspections and oversight for purposes of both compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract as well as quality of the programming offered by LRPs, including any MOUs where they receive direct funding for services from another entity.

I WE, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Probation Officer, in collaboration with the District Attorney, the Public Defender, the Alternate Public Defender, the Superior Court, and with technical assistance from OYCR to report back in 90 days with the feasibility of establishing a tiered system for LRP placement that offers varying levels of structure and intervention informed by youth readiness and need.

I WE, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct the Auditor-Controller to conduct an audit of all LRP contracts by Probation and report back to the Board in writing within 120 days. This audit shall:

1. Review the current contracting process for residential LRPs operated by community-based organizations, including standardized expectations, rates, reporting requirements, and service levels;
2. ~~Include a pause on any contract renewals for existing residential LRPs operated by community-based organizations until the report is issued. This pause is not intended to prohibit the continued use of or payment to LRPs currently serving youth, whether pursuant to an existing contract or other funding arrangement. Nor is it intended to prevent youth from being placed in or referred to existing LRPs during this period;~~
3. Provide recommendations to strengthen the current process that could produce more consistent rates across providers delivering comparable services.

- MORE -

MOTION BY SUPERVISORS KATHRYN BARGER

AND JANICE HAHN

October 20, 2026

Page 4

We, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct Chief Probation Officer to pause on any contract renewals for existing residential LRPs operated by community-based organizations until the report in the above directive is issued. This pause is not intended to prohibit the continued use of or payment to LRPs currently serving youth, whether pursuant to an existing contract or other funding arrangement. Nor is it intended to prevent youth from being placed in or referred to existing LRPs during this period.

I WE, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct the Executive Director of the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CCJCC) to convene a limited term ad hoc working group within 30 days to review LRPs in Los Angeles County, including what authority the County or State has for oversight, barriers to placement, any safety challenges and develop recommendations that can be used to enhance the LRP framework and report back to the Board in 120 days.

I WE, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct DYD to engage young people and families with direct experience with LRPs, community-based LRP providers, and other community stakeholders via a town hall and/or survey seeking their feedback to inform the workgroup in the above directive.

I WE, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Probation Officer to engage OYCR within 60 days to provide technical assistance to develop training and curriculum for staff about LRPs and provide a written status update to the Board in 90 days.

I WE, FURTHER, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct Probation, in coordination with County Counsel and the Department of Justice, Care, and Opportunities (JCOD) to provide an analysis of shifting the administration of LRPs to JCOD. This effort shall include any staffing, resources, funding needs and contracting authority that can be shifted to JCOD for the administration of these programs. This effort should also analyze any legal challenges or barriers to making the shift and report back in writing to the Board within 90 days. Any authority for supervision of youth as outlined by law shall remain with Probation.

#

KB:scem