

**JJCC Meeting November 2, 2021
Public Comments Submitted via E-mail
Agenda Item IVb.**

1. Alex Cina

the committee is urgently needed and it took way too long to happen considering funding for a consultant to help staff this subcommittee was approved over two years ago. This shows that probation is clearly not equipped to be the administrator of these funds. The JJCC governance subcommittee must focus on improving the CMJJP process and public engagement in how JJCPA funding is spent. We just not find school based probation again this year.

2. Milinda Khakhani

This governance committee is urgently needed, and it took WAY too long to happen. Funding for a consultant to help staff this subcommittee was approved over 2 years ago, without any progress. This is just one example that shows that Probation is not equipped to be the administrator of these funds. We should be exploring other governance examples like the San Diego, where the Probation department partnered with community leadership to do it better

The JJCC governance subcommittee must focus on improving the CMJJP process and public engagement in how JJCPA funding is spent. The CMJJP process has improved A LOT, but it is still very flawed and completely lacks public engagement and transparency. The CMJJP process and the JJBG should be supported by an entity outside of Probation with expertise in public engagement and facilitating decision-making to provide more capacity to these subcommittees. The JJCC should look to the successes and challenges of other community-driven funding processes, such as Measure J/CFCI, to learn from what has worked and what has not. All of the funding proposals reviewed by the CMJJP subcommittee should be posted online so the public can also review the details of these proposals, and there should be a comparable way for the public to submit their own proposals. The CMJJP should hold listening sessions and create a way for the public to submit questions and concerns about the proposals so subcommittee members can consider these when making funding decisions. JJCC members and the public need to get all written materials days in advanced of meetings.

3. Aditi Sherikar

The JJCC governance subcommittee must focus on improving the CMJJP process and public engagement in how JJCPA funding is spent.

The CMJJP process has improved A LOT, but it is still very flawed and completely lacks public engagement and transparency. The CMJJP process and the JJBG should be supported by an entity outside of Probation with expertise in public engagement and facilitating decision-making to provide more capacity to these subcommittees. The JJCC should look to the successes and challenges of other community-driven funding processes, such as Measure J/CFCI, to learn from what has worked and what has not. All of the funding proposals reviewed by the CMJJP subcommittee should be posted online so the public can also review the details of these proposals, and there should be a comparable way for the public to submit their own proposals. The CMJJP should hold listening sessions and create a way for the public to submit questions and concerns about the proposals so subcommittee members can consider these when making funding decisions. JJCC members and the public need to get all written materials days in advanced of meetings.

We should NOT fund school-based probation again this year. Enough is enough. The JJCC should not fund School based probation any longer. Juvenile Probation has a \$570 million budget. School based probation should be ended, and we certainly should not be using \$4.4 million in JJCPA funding for this.

The Board of Supervisors has endorsed Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) through multiple unanimous votes, and YJR recommends phasing out school-based supervision in the first 18 months. A year has already passed, so it is the responsibility of the JJCC to stop funding this program. PRA requests have been sent to Probation to better understand this program. They have never been answered, and probation stated there is no specialized training for this program. Last year's CMJJP showed that the number of youth on probation supervision has decreased by 30% over 3 years. Why then do we still need to use JJCPA funding for this program? Which schools have school-based probation officers? What are their caseloads? How many youth are arrested in these schools each year? What is the program's total budget? The JJCC should have all of these answers and more before giving this program any more funding!

4. Leah Gasser-Ordaz

On Agenda Item 4(b), the JJCC- Governance and Procedure Ad-Hoc Subcommittee, I urge the JJCC Governance Subcommittee to focus on improving the Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan process, including engaging the public in how JJCPA funding is spent. Some suggestions on improving transparency and engagement are: (1) posting all of the funding proposals reviewed by the CMJJP subcommittee online; (2) creating an online portal where the public can submit their own funding proposals; (3) holding town halls to create a way for the public to submit questions/concerns about any funding proposals; and (4) providing written materials days in advance of JJCC meetings.

One example of funding proposals that would be supported by more transparency in the CMJJP process is the fact that \$4.4 million in JJCPA funds have been allocated to School based Probation. This is completely out of alignment with the County's Youth Justice Reimagined Initiative, which recommends that school based Probation should be phased out in the first 18 months of YJR implementation. School Based Probation is harmful to young people and needs to end.

5. Casey Massimino

This subcommittee is supposed to assist the JJCC in improving its "governance" procedures, meaning the processes the JJCC uses for decision-making and public involvement.

- The committee is urgently needed, and it took WAY too long to happen.
- o Funding for a consultant to help staff this subcommittee was approved OVER 2 YEARS AGO!!!! What took so long?
- o This is just one example that shows that Probation is not equipped to be the administrator of these funds. We should be exploring other governance examples like the San Diego, where the Probation department partnered with community leadership to do it better
- The JJCC governance subcommittee must focus on improving the CMJJP process and public engagement in how JJCPA funding is spent

Note: The Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plan (CMJJP) is a countywide plan which guides \$40 - 60 million in JJCPA funding for youth programming each year. The plan is created each year by a subcommittee.

- o The CMJJP process has improved A LOT, but it is still very flawed and completely lacks public engagement and transparency.

- o The CMJJP process and the JIRBG should be supported by an entity outside of Probation with expertise in public engagement and facilitating decision-making to provide more capacity to these subcommittees.
- o The JJCC should look to the successes and challenges of other community-driven funding processes, such as Measure J/CFCI, to learn from what has worked and what has not.
- o All of the funding proposals reviewed by the CMJJP subcommittee should be posted online so the public can also review the details of these proposals, and there should be a comparable way for the public to submit their own proposals.
- o The CMJJP should hold listening sessions and create a way for the public to submit questions and concerns about the proposals so subcommittee members can consider these when making funding decisions.
- o JJCC members and the public need to get all written materials days in advanced of meetings.
- We should NOT fund school-based probation again this year. Enough is enough.
- o JJCC should not fund School based probation any longer. Juvenile Probation has a \$570 million budget. School based probation should be ended, and we certainly should not be using \$4.4 million in JJCPA funding for this.
- o The Board of Supervisors has endorsed Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) through multiple unanimous votes, and YJR recommends phasing out school based supervision in the first 18 months. A year has already passed, so it is the responsibility of the JJCC to stop funding this program.
- o PRA requests have been sent to Probation to better understand this program. They have never been answered, and probation stated there is no specialized training for this program. (See School-Based Probation Fact Sheet)
- o Last year's CMJJP showed that the number of youth on probation supervision has decreased by 30% over 3 years. Why then do we still need to use JJCPA funding for this program?
- o Which schools have school based probation officers? What are their caseloads? How many youth are arrested in these schools each year? What is the program's total budget? The JJCC should have all of these answers and more before giving this program any more funding!

6. Nicole Brown

Agenda Item 4b: JJCC - Governance and Procedure Ad-Hoc Subcommittee

The committee is urgently needed, and it took WAY too long to happen. Funding for a consultant to help staff the governance subcommittee was approved **over 2 years ago**. This is just one example that shows that Probation is not equipped to be the administrator of these funds. We should be exploring other governance examples like the San Diego, where the Probation department partnered with community leadership to do it better.

The JJCC governance subcommittee must focus on improving the CMJJP process and public engagement in how JJCPA funding is spent.

- o The CMJJP process has improved A LOT, but it is still very flawed and completely lacks public engagement and transparency.
- o The CMJJP process and the JIRBG should be supported by an entity outside of Probation with expertise in public engagement and facilitating decision-making to provide more capacity to these subcommittees.

- The JJCC should look to the successes and challenges of other community-driven funding processes, such as Measure J/CFCI, to learn from what has worked and what has not.
- **All of the funding proposals reviewed by the CMJJP subcommittee should be posted online so the public can also review the details of these proposals**, and there should be a comparable way for the public to submit their own proposals.
- The CMJJP should hold listening sessions and create a way for the public to submit questions and concerns about the proposals so subcommittee members can consider these when making funding decisions.
- **JJCC members and the public need to get all written materials multiple days in advanced of meetings.**

We should NOT fund school-based probation again this year. The JJCC should not fund School based probation any longer. Juvenile Probation has a \$570 million budget. School based probation should be ended, and we certainly should not be using \$4.4 million in JJCPA funding for this. The Board of Supervisors has endorsed Youth Justice Reimagined (YJR) through multiple unanimous votes, and YJR recommends phasing out school-based supervision in the first 18 months. A year has already passed, so **it is the responsibility of the JJCC to stop funding this program.** PRA requests have been sent to Probation to better understand this program. They have never been answered, and probation stated there is no specialized training for this program. (See [School-Based Probation Fact Sheet](#)). **Last year's CMJJP showed that the number of youth on probation supervision has decreased by 30% over 3 years.** Why then do we still need to use JJCPA funding for this program?

Which schools have school-based probation officers? What are their caseloads? How many youth are arrested in these schools each year? What is the program's total budget? The JJCC should have all of these answers and more before giving this program any more funding. I strongly urge you to stop supporting criminalization in schools, which should be places of learning, and STOP funding school-based probation.

7. Olivia Shields

Regarding item 4b, the Governance and Procedure Ad-Hoc Subcommittee and a consultant to determine who staffs this subcommittee were supposed to be hired/established over two years ago. This is one of many examples demonstrating Probation's inability to effectively administer funds they receive especially without the input of community. The JJCC governance subcommittee should focus on improving the CMJJP process, including making funding proposals public, holding listening sessions for public to submit questions and concerns about proposals, and giving JJCC members and the public all written materials days ahead of meetings.

Lastly and importantly, we should absolutely NOT fund school-based probation again this year. Juvenile Probation has a \$570 million budget, so it makes absolutely no sense for \$4.4 million of JJCPA funding to go to school-based probation. Furthermore, school-based probation should be ended entirely. Youth Justice Reimagined, unanimously endorsed by the Board of Supervisors in November of 2020, recommends phasing out school-based supervision within the first 18 months. The JJCC has a responsibility to stop funding school-based probation programming.