

**PROBATION DEPARTMENT
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**



**Michael Callagy, County Executive Officer
Adam Ely, Deputy Executive Officer**

Members

John T Keene
Chief Probation Officer

Michael Callagy
County Executive Officer

Noelia Corzo
Board of Supervisors

Susan Etezadi
Superior Court

Rebecca Baum
District Attorney's Office

Ziomara Ochoa
Behavioral Health
and Recovery Services

John Fong
Human Services Agency

Ron Rayes
Private Defender's Office

David Norris
Chief, Menlo Park
Police Department

Matthew Fox
Sheriff's Office

Kris Shouse
County Office of
Education

Susan Manheimer
Community at-large

Jane Smithson
Community at-large

Nick Jasso
Youth Voice

Monroe Labouisse
Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
Commission

**Community Based
Organization Members:**

Ben Marks
StarVista

Margaret Hitchcock
Y.M.C.A.

Kate Hiester
Fresh Lifelines for Youth

Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) Meeting

Thursday, November 30, 2023
12:00 p.m.- 2:00 p.m.
222 Paul Scannell Drive, San Mateo
Chief's Conference Room

MINUTES

Present Members:

Chief John Keene
Judge Susan Etezadi
Supervisor Noelia Corzo
Rebecca Baum
Ziomara Ochoa
Ron Rayes
Captain Matthew Fox
Kris Shouse
Ben Marks
Margaret Hitchcock
Kate Hiester
Nick Jasso
Monroe Labouisse

Absent Members:

Michael Callagy

John Fong
Chief David Norris
Susan Manheimer
Jane Smithson

Other Attendees:

Adam Ely, County Executive Board; Jacki Rigoni, Board of Supervisors; Regina Moreno, BHRS; Kate Hiester, FLY; Claire Cunningham, HSA; Johanna Rasmussen, JJDPC; Kevin Paygh, MPPD; Nancy Goodban, Becca Kieler, In Our Care; Bonnie MacAskill, Chris Abalos, Jehan Clark, Sanam Aram, Becky Powers, Hong Liu, Noelle Vergara, Tony Burchyns, Yanitxa Albino, Probation.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:03 p.m.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Nancy Goodban – In Our Care Organization

III. ROLL CALL

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Approval of Minutes from August 17, 2023

The JJCC Minutes from August 17, 2023, were approved.

M: Kate Hiester/ **S:** Kris Shouse

Abstentions: Ron Rayes



V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Probation Update

- Chief Keene stated that we will be taking in consideration what Supervisor Corzo had requested during the last meeting, which was to provide a report of demographic data. We developed a report that will be part of the JJCC packet and will go out prior to the next meeting and posted for public access. Today's data will be posted after the meeting.

See the attached documents for summary of Juvenile Services & Institution Data.

- Status of Camp Kemp – Chief Keene shared that Camp Kemp is not closed. The population has been reduced to only two youth over the last quarter. In the past we had a contract with Sonoma County to have youth come to our facility for services. We also attempted to establish a contract with Santa Cruz, and it was deemed by the Board as not appropriate for us to enter into these types of agreements.

Moving forward we are working to determine how to better utilize the Camp Kemp space. County Council is aware that there are limitations to how we can use that space due to funding.

We know there's a couple of main issues to address. When our young people are released from detention there tends to be a longer period to get them enrolled back into school. Sometimes it can be multiple weeks where they are not actively or fully integrated back into school. We see Camp Kemp as an opportunity to utilize the support of our education partners to build a space where youth can receive educational services while they're making the transition back into their school.

We would like to keep the space for the Girls Empowerment Program and continue to utilize as a high school space. The Girls Empowerment program was utilized as a way for them not to fall deeper into the system. We believe that we can offer two alternative paths, both educationally driven to serve both boys and girls in this environment. Additionally, we also envision a day programming space where our community partners can provide services. It will not be a 24-hour space and we would work with the schools to figure out appropriate time slots.

There are ongoing conversations with the Judge and our justice partners who will have a huge say in terms of what the process looks like. There is currently one individual in the program that we guarantee will complete the Camp Kemp program as it exists today.

Whatever we build is going to be under continuous evaluation to determine if it's making the impact we want with young people and will be engaging the board in these discussions.



Questions & Answers

Q: Is the program going to serve more of a reiteration type component of transition as it is not for long-term educational placement to help us step down their home school?

A: Chief Keene states that from a logistical perspective it would do both; offer a long-term support through the day programming where youth can come back for tutoring or support services, with the initial goal to transition the youth back into their school district and get them stabilized.

Q: Are we going to have additional conversations about what the utilization is going to be? We have certain educational law statutes for home schools and their immediate requirement to reenroll the youth that have been released back into their home school. We don't want to create an environment where we get schools off the hook for stalling when it comes to reenrolling these youth.

A: Chief Keene states he agrees and would like to see more superintendents engaged in the conversations and hear our concerns. The goal is always going to be getting youth back in school districts so they can provide the services that they are legally required to provide. How we bridge that gap could be hopefully a way to offset this situation and get the young people back into school and we'll continue to join you in that advocacy to make sure that the districts do their part.

Kris Shouse stated the County Office has not removed any of the educational services. It's absolutely our goal to keep working with Probation to figure out what this model looks like and even past statute. There are roughly about 10 different types of schools, so we've been in conversation about what that may end up needing to look like. It may require us to notify the California Department of Education as well, depending on what gets built to be able to support a student.

It's always best if we can get them back to their district of residence. But in the interim, we are seeing students that are not enrolling and are out in the community and those whose transition plan from districts isn't always there. Being able to have additional partners at the table within Camp Kemp and working on what programming looks like in partnership to serve both boys and girls can give another outlet for youth to have a place to feel successful.

Chief Keene stated that the goal is to have a day programming space that will also offer educational support. The primary function of the facility would still be to deliver programming and hearing some of the requests of the community over the last couple of years to figure out the ways to support boys as well. We see this as kind of a way to bridge the gap.

Q: How many long-term youth will be in the hall until they are 20?

A: Chief Keene stated that number is still to be determined at this point. We only have one youth at this point that has been fully disposition to that space.

Q: What does 226 processes of court mean?

A: Chief Keene stated most of these cases are what we call diversion cases, or they could be in lower levels of supervision that are not officially wards of the court; better known as informal probation. Youth could be deferred in the community with our partners, at a school-based site, or through our assessment process. Youth could also be in the facility in "court type process" or in the Electronic Monitoring Program.



Q: What does transportation currently look like for youth in the program, and what would it look like if it's expanded to more youth?

A: Chief Keene stated that we have the infrastructure and history of providing transportation to youth and could expand our transportation services to meet additional needs.

Q: How would this be different than Gateway?

A: Chief Keene stated it is different from Gateway. Gateway, it's a court school that you're receiving those services while you're in detention. These are youth that theoretically are transitioning out. They're in the community, but they're still kind of at home, not really receiving anything. I envisioned those similar services in terms of credit recovery and other subject specific needs that will be individually determined. We hope to provide an individualized targeted need for youth and then utilize Kris's team to figure out how that's delivered. Ideally a combination of direct support and instruction from teachers with an electronic and virtual element. Those are all still things that need to be worked out.

Kris Shouse stated that another piece or major difference is that through Camp Kemp there are usually legal pieces that need to be addressed which may not be necessary with Gateway. Gateway it's more of an Ed code process driven between the Districts and the County Office of Education free of Probation or legal status.

Chief Keene added the importance of having therapeutic and counseling services available.

Q: What is the timeline for redesign? Is there a vision for when things would start transitioning?

A: Chief Keene stated that from a foundational perspective we have the space, the schedule, and our justice partners. We envision the kind of design structure would not take a very long time, but we are not able to give an exact timeline because of the conversations that still need to happen. Our hope is that we can get something off the ground and functionally running within the next two to three months. Our justice partners are actively having conversations during their monthly meetings about what this would look like. We also must work with County processes that take time.

Q: I'm wondering if there is a piece of service design, that could engage district partners who struggle to take children back quickly.

A: Chief Keene stated when he worked in Alameda County, his role was to be a Connection Coordinator. He called districts to get youth back on campus and he envisions one of our staff being that same person to ensure things are being processed and to document the efforts made.

Judge Etezadi stated that we could potentially in collaboration with our justice partners, draft court orders when we release a minor from therapeutic detention to include the youth's educational plans.

Q: What will be the experience of young women coming into detention long term? Will it be relative to what camp was?

A: Chief Keene stated we haven't settled yet with these conversations. We still envision using Camp Kemp as a support space for programming, which we do now. There's a lot of programming that happens for boys and girls now that start at Camp Kemp as they go out into the community whether it be community releases or just activities that are supported by the Group Supervisors. As far as a fully functioning standing girls' program, I don't see how we'll be able to run that at the same time as running other programs.



If a cohort of young women were to come, then we would have to have a separate conversation again.

Q: When it comes to Camp Kemp with this new model, would people be housed there?

A: Chief Keene stated it will not be an overnight facility. It will count as a day programming space where you would receive services and go home at the end of the day.

Q: There have been folks in the community that wanted to see Camp Kemp expanded in the version that it existed before and also recognize that the unintended consequence of the advocacy and the decision not to allow youth from out of county kind of led us to where we are now, where there's not enough young people there to offer the programming and keep the program as it exists now. If that were to change, would there still be an opportunity to keep Camp Kemp as it existed before?

A: Chief Keene stated that this program existed before he came and some people in the room were part of that planning process. It did serve a particular number of young women at that time that made it sustainable just internally. The reality was we charged a fraction of what it cost to run the facility. We operated at a loss to provide services because we believed in the program itself and what it was able to do transformative for young people. The program received national attention. In the first year, we hosted probably no less than 15 different groups that came from around the country to see the program because they believed in it and heard great things about it and wanted to replicate it. We will reengage our partners in the Community if the numbers dramatically increase.

B. Budget Update

Chief Keene reported that there are no budget updates, everything is still status quo. There were no structural changes logistically at the State level. There is an ongoing conversation at the State level with the Department of Finance regarding the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant and how the funds get allocated moving forward.

Chief Keene will share all the information with the group in the coming months.

C. JPCF/JJCPA & YOBG/JJRBG

Kim Gillette from ASR provided a presentation titled Comprehensive Annual Report.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chief Keene stated that the upcoming JJCC meetings will be in a hybrid format with members physically present in the room. The meeting agenda will include details regarding the AB 2449 requirements.

Announcements:

- Juvenile Justice Commission elected a new chair on Tuesday night, which is Johanna Rasmussen. Monroe Labouisse will be stepping down.
- Assistant Chief McCaskill will be retiring before the next meeting.

The JJCC meeting was adjourned at 1:47 p.m.

The next JJCC meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2024.