

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SUPERVISORS

Phillip Peters District 1
Zack Scrivner District 2
Jeff Flores District 3
David Couch District 4
Leticia Perez District 5



KATHLEEN KRAUSE
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Kern County Administrative Center
1115 Truxtun Avenue, 5th Floor
Bakersfield, CA 93301
Telephone (661) 868-3585
TTY Relay (800) 735-2929

April 10, 2024

The Honorable Aisha Wahab
Chair, Senate Committee on Public Safety
1020 N Street, Room 545
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: SB 1057 (Menjivar), Juvenile justice coordinating council – OPPOSE

Dear Senator Wahab,

I am writing on behalf of the Kern County Board of Supervisors, in lockstep with the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC), to express our strong opposition to SB 1057 (Menjivar), which would repurpose, reprioritize, and redirect the expenditure of critical juvenile justice investments which are currently allocated in accordance with research-based standards and producing highly effective results.

This funding has been foundational to supporting positive youth outcomes resulting in a 60% decline in youth detention rates and a 73% decline in juvenile arrest rates over the last decade. Additionally, the bill seeks to revise the composition of local Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils and make changes to multiagency juvenile justice plans. In doing so, this bill seeks to do away with collaborative and multi-agency approaches currently relied upon which have been essential tools in supporting an entire continuum that prevents juveniles from becoming more formally system involved through effectuating successful and expeditious re-entry post system involvement. This measure largely mirrors failed previous legislative efforts – AB 1007 (Jones-Sawyer, 2020) and SB 493 (Bradford, 2021) and AB 702 (Jackson, 2023).

First, it is important to understand that the current system supports both transparency and multi-disciplinary voices as fundamental pieces to advise the direction of these plans in each of the 58 counties. County probation departments have invested resources and organizational culture changes in the evolution of the juvenile justice system for over the past two decades by integrating system responses and focusing on the development of a continuum from prevention to re-entry. Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) supports our ability to provide cognitively designed, evidence-based and trauma-informed care. These efforts manifest in either partnerships with other system stakeholders, contracts with non-governmental entities where appropriate, or specific skill building within the probation department to deliver direct prevention services and programming. SB 1057 would create further instability at a time when we are absorbing the responsibility and liability

of moving the entire continuum to probation and counties as continue to advance the historical progress made to divert youth away from detention.

Second, SB 1057 would impact county funding in several ways.

- New language in the bill would allow the State, via the Board of State and Community Corrections, to withhold the funding if a county fails to establish a juvenile justice coordinating council. This mechanism is subjective, unclear, and sets a precedent for funding to counties to be withheld for service delivery that is provided by counties.
- Establishes a new request for proposals process for these funds to be disbursed and would prohibit a law-enforcement related agency from overseeing the process. Utilizing this method can result in bifurcated processes to get funding out into the field and into programs and may further delink the ability to fund programs and efforts that reflect the multiagency plan.
- Redirection of important investments in local systems would create instability and diminution for the provision of necessary supports and services for youth in our communities. We would reiterate the constitutional concerns associated with the requirement to redirect JJCPA resources, given that this funding resides within the 2011 fiscal structure that is constitutionally protected under the provisions of Proposition 30 (2012).
- Changes and adds new elements and information within what is required to be included in the local plans.
- Changes and adds new requirements for information that is included in the annual report to the State.

Third, while we support and acknowledge the benefit of having multiple perspectives on this committee, the local councils currently include an at-large community member as well as representatives from nonprofit community-based organizations providing services to minors. However, we are concerned that the changes proposed in this bill will have an adverse impact to its stated goals. It is important to note that there are instances within the current committee composition that despite probation's best effort to obtain participation for all of the members, there have been challenges in doing so. By requiring, rather than authorizing, additional members, it would create considerable obstacles rather than opportunities to fulfill the goals of the committee.

Furthermore, the changes to the composition exacerbate the issues noted above regarding the ability of the state to withhold funding if a council is not established. Counties and probation are statutorily responsible for the safety and rehabilitation of all youth across the juvenile continuum, yet this bill removes probation from the role of coordinating the planning process with these statutory duties. Therefore, probation and counties take on the responsibility and accountability for outcomes of juvenile services without the ability to coordinate and guide the plans to meet the goals, outcomes, and requirements.

It is unclear how the approach in this bill, for the reasons outlined above, would support the advancement of integrated and coordinated delivery of juvenile prevention and diversion services. The provisions in this bill further bifurcate planning, program funding, and holistic efforts towards the outcomes outlined in the locally developed plan and from the historical progress to prevent and divert individuals from the juvenile justice system. It is also unclear why this change is being proposed in light of the evolution and decline of youth in detention and with counties' significant focus on preventing youth from coming into contact with the juvenile justice system through efforts such as JJCPA over the last decade.

For these reasons, the Kern County Board of Supervisors must oppose this legislation and respectfully requests that you vote **NO on SB 1057**.

Sincerely,



David Couch, Chairman
Kern County Board of Supervisors

cc: Honorable Members, Senate Committee on Public Safety
Honorable Members, Kern Legislative Delegation
Chief Probation Officers of California
California State Association of Counties
Kern County Probation Department
Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange