

Fall 2021

Juvenile Justice Realignment: A policy analysis of California Senate Bill 823

Stewart Patri
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects



Part of the [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patri, Stewart, "Juvenile Justice Realignment: A policy analysis of California Senate Bill 823" (2021).
Master's Projects. 1037.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.824h-nfcq>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects/1037

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Juvenile Justice Realignment: A policy analysis of California Senate Bill 823

By

Stewart Patri

A Thesis Quality Research Project

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Master's Degree

in

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Professor Frances Edwards, Ph.D.

Advisor

The Graduate School

San Jose State University

December 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....5

 Problem Statement5

 Scope.....5

Research Question9

Background10

 California Juvenile Incarceration10

 SB823 Overview13

 Division of Juvenile Justice Overview14

Literature Review16

 Evidence-Based Programs16

 Community Placement.....17

 Incarceration Costs.....18

 U.S. Juvenile Incarceration Systems.....19

Methodology21

 Data Collection21

 Institutional Review Board Exclusion21

Findings.....23

 Division of Juvenile Justice23

 County of Del Norte.....25

 County of Tuolumne.....26

 County of San Benito.....27

 County of Tehama.....28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

County of Yuba.....28

County of Mendocino30

County of Humboldt30

County of Napa.....31

County of Kings.....32

County of Madera33

County of Shasta.....34

County of Imperial.....34

County of El Dorado.....35

Findings Overview.....36

Analysis38

 Discussion.....38

 Limitations40

 Future Research41

Conclusion42

References43

Appendix A: DJJ Population Statistics - June 30, 202052

Appendix B: Information Regarding DJJ Offender Potential Incarceration Location.....54

Appendix C: Potential County Agencies Accepting Out-of-County Youth55

TABLE OF LISTS AND FIGURES

Tables

Table 1: Juvenile Hall Facilities by County.....6

Table 2: Omitted Counties7

Table 3: Scoped Counties and Juvenile Detention Population8

Table 4: State Juvenile Agency by Type19

Table 5: Division of Juvenile Justice Commitment Data24

Table 6: County of Del Norte Data.....25

Table 7: County of Tuolumne Data26

Table 8: County of San Benito Data27

Table 9: County of Tehama Data.....28

Table 10: County of Yuba Data29

Table 11: County of Mendocino Data30

Table 12: County of Humboldt Data31

Table 13: County of Napa Data32

Table 14: County of Kings Data32

Table 15: County of Madera Data33

Table 16: County of Shasta Data34

Table 17: County of Imperial Data35

Table 18: County of El Dorado Data36

Table 19: All County Statistics.....36

Figures

Figure 1: Historical California Youth Authority Population Data.....10

Figure 2: Historical Juvenile Felony Arrest Data12

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

New legislation (Senate Bill 823) in the State of California, to realign the serious felony juvenile offender population from state facilities to county facilities, will go into effect July 1, 2021 (SB823, 2020). County probation departments will now be faced with determining how to provide adequate programming to a new population type of serious offender that includes adults in the age range of 18 to 25 years old. This places pressure on smaller county agencies to either find a cost-effective solution to modify their current facilities and programs or send this population to other county agencies. This research project analyzes the impact of SB823 on a sample of smaller counties.

Scope

The scope of the research project encompasses a sample of smaller counties in the State of California, with the main requirement being that the organization maintains a juvenile hall facility within their jurisdiction. For the population requirement, the research focused on counties with populations under 200,000 residents, which are 30 of California's 58 counties (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). This provides a good scope of the state and focuses the research on agencies with fewer resources. Table One lists the 30 counties with a population under 200,000 and the status of their juvenile hall facilities. An agency that does not maintain an active facility is denoted with "N/A" for not applicable. Active juvenile halls are denoted with "JH" and special purpose juvenile halls are denoted with "SPJH". Any county that does not maintain an active juvenile hall was omitted from the scope of the research. These counties already use contracts with out-of-county agencies to perform most, if not all, juvenile incarceration services.

Table 1: Juvenile Hall Facilities by County, Population Under 200,000

County	Population	Juvenile Hall Facility
Alpine	1,129	N/A
Sierra	3,005	N/A
Modoc	8,841	N/A
Trinity	12,285	SPJH
Mono	14,444	N/A
Mariposa	17,203	SPJH
Inyo	18,039	SPJH
Plumas	18,807	N/A
Colusa	21,547	N/A
Del Norte	27,812	JH
Glenn	28,393	N/A
Lassen	30,573	N/A
Amador	39,752	N/A
Siskiyou	43,539	N/A
Calaveras	45,905	N/A
Tuolumne	54,478	JH
San Benito	62,808	JH
Lake	64,386	N/A
Tehama	65,084	JH
Yuba	78,668	JH
Mendocino	86,749	JH
Sutter	96,971	N/A
Nevada ¹	99,755	N/A
Humboldt	135,558	JH
Napa	137,744	JH
Kings	152,940	JH
Madera	157,327	JH
Shasta	180,080	JH
Imperial	181,215	JH
El Dorado	192,843	JH

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 & California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), 2021b, BSCC, 2021c

SPJH facilities are only meant for temporary confinement that does not exceed 96 hours (BSCC, 2021a). The counties with active SPJH facilities include Inyo, Mariposa, and Trinity

¹ The County of Nevada no longer operates a Juvenile Hall facility as of January 1, 2021 (BSCC, 2021c).

(BSCC, 2021b). These counties were also omitted from the research since the new legislation does not directly impact their current juvenile detention service delivery model.

The counties that do not have active juvenile detention facilities have contracts with other agencies to provide these services. The following table outlines these counties and their contracted agency. Below are agencies omitted from the detailed scope of this research.

Table 2: Omitted Counties and Contracted Juvenile Detention

County	Population	Contracted Agency
Alpine	1,129	El Dorado
Sierra	3,005	Butte
Modoc	8,841	Shasta
Trinity	12,285	Shasta
Mono	14,444	El Dorado
Mariposa	17,203	Tuolumne
Inyo	18,039	Tuolumne
Plumas	18,807	Butte
Colusa	21,547	Yuba
Glenn	28,393	Tehama
Lassen	30,573	Shasta
Amador	39,752	Tuolumne
Siskiyou	43,539	Tehama
Calaveras	45,905	Tuolumne
Lake	64,386	Tehama
Sutter	96,971	Yuba
Nevada	99,755	Placer

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020, BSCC, 2021c, County of Yuba, 2019, County of Mono, n.d., Metcalf, 2020, County of Siskiyou, n.d., County of Lake, 2017, County of Sierra, 2020, Hopper, 2020

The far-right column of Table 2 includes agencies that provide contracted juvenile detention services for the counties identified in the far-left column. Of the agencies listed, the County of Butte and the County of Placer are not included in the scope of this research project due to their larger population size. Some of the agencies that will be included in the scope of this research project already accept juveniles from out-of-county agencies.

The following table outlines the 13 organizations that have been chosen to be included in this research project:

Table 3: Researched Counties and Juvenile Detention Population

County	Population	Juvenile Hall/Camps Population (Q1 - 2020)
Del Norte	27,812	6
Tuolumne	54,478	19
San Benito	62,808	9
Tehama	65,084	7
Yuba	78,668	28
Mendocino	86,749	15
Humboldt	135,558	15
Napa	137,744	21
Kings	152,940	34
Madera	157,327	32
Shasta	180,080	23
Imperial	181,215	9
El Dorado	192,843	14

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 & BSCC, 2020

RESEARCH QUESTION


California's Juvenile Justice realignment policy, under Senate Bill 823 (SB 823), directly impacts California's 58 counties. How does SB823 impact small counties regarding their placement of incarcerated youth and the budget required for their detention?

BACKGROUND

California Juvenile Incarceration

The State of California’s juvenile detention programs have been around for decades. In 1941 the California Youth Authority (CYA), which would be later renamed to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), was created to manage a statewide juvenile corrections program. Between 1941 and 1970 the juvenile population detained at the state facilities never surpassed 7,000. The population would continue to rise to reach its peak in 1996 of 10,122 juveniles (Krisberg et al, 2010). Populations steadily declined over the next decade as outlined in Figure 1, based on data collected from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

Figure 1: Historical California Youth Authority Population Data




Source: Krisberg et al, 2010

The population as of a June 2019 report from the CDCR was 717 juveniles (CDCR: Office of Research, 2020). This decline in the incarcerated population at the state level stemmed from multiple factors. Alternative programs with increased state funding, increased charges to counties for state-level incarceration, reduction in felony juvenile arrests, and a realignment

through Senate Bill 81 (SB81) contributed to the reduction in the state incarcerated population. Counties have increased their use of alternative programs, like in-home supervision or camps, and have been able to expand programs with increased state funding. The costs of sending juveniles to the state juvenile justice programs used to be \$25 per month. This cost increased greatly starting in 1996 with the passage of Senate Bill 681, which increased the cost to a minimum of \$150 per month and decreased the incentive for local agencies to send juvenile offenders to state facilities (Krisberg et al, 2010). The cost charged to counties beginning July 1, 2012 was an annual rate of \$24,000, and with the passage of SB823 the cost for a committed juvenile on or after July 1, 2021 was set at an annual rate of \$125,000 (SB823, 2020).

Additionally, the cases of juvenile felony arrests have decreased. Crime statistics for the state show that starting in 1980, the number of felony juvenile convictions rose to an all-time high over the next four decades of 97,376, then decreased to 16,288 in 2019 (California Office of the Attorney General, n.d.). Possible causes for the recent decline include the passage of Proposition 47, which reclassified certain theft and drug possession offenses from felony to misdemeanor charges (Judicial Council of California, 2021a), and Proposition 64, which reduced most juvenile marijuana related offenses to infractions (Judicial Council of California, 2021b). Figure 2 shows juvenile arrest data for felony crimes collected from the California Office of the Attorney General's Open Justice data portal:

Figure 2: Historical Juvenile Felony Arrest Data, 1980-2019



Source: California Attorney General’s Office, n.d.

During the early 2000’s, multiple lawsuits were brought against DJJ, and there were multiple news stories reporting on violence and abuse, like 23-hour solitary confinement practices. “The biggest and most influential case, however, was *Farell v. Harper*, filed in 2003 by Prison Law Office,” (Krisberg et al, 2010, n.p.). The *Farell* case brought up several issues of violence, abuse, poor rehabilitation programming, inadequate medical care, and discrimination. The lawsuit resulted in legislation requiring strict reform within the DJJ. SB 81, for instance, moved the nonserious juvenile offender population back to the counties, and only allowed serious, violent and sex offenders to be sent to state facilities (Krisberg et al, 2010).

SB823 Overview

Senate Bill 823 (SB823), commonly referred to as Juvenile Justice Realignment, has three main components. First, “...the bill would, commencing July 1, 2021, prohibit further commitment of wards to the Division of Juvenile Justice,” (SB823, 2020, n.p.). This change will

effectively end the DJJ, a division of the CDCR, by 2025 and move the juvenile population under local county jurisdictions (SB823, 2020). Second, the bill outlines the creation of a new division under the California Health and Human Services Agency, referred to as the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR), (SB823, 2020). The last component is the establishment of a new grant program called the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Program (SB823, 2020).

SB823 was introduced as a trailer bill during the fiscal year 2020/2021 budget creation process (Chow, 2020). In the Governor's May Revision Budget Summary for fiscal year 2020/2021, the components for SB823 were introduced (Newsom, 2020b). The budget outlines an allocation of \$9.6 million of general fund revenue for jurisdictions that will act as hubs for these juvenile offender populations (Newsom, 2020b). According to the Bill Analysis, the funding is to be used by the jurisdictions for capital projects and planning (Francis, 2020). Additional operating funds for juvenile realignment will be allocated from the state's general fund with the following amounts scheduled over the first four years (SB823, 2020):

- Fiscal Year 2021/2022: \$39,949,000
- Fiscal Year 2022/2023: \$118,339,000
- Fiscal Year 2023/2024: \$192,037,000
- Fiscal Year 2024/2025: \$208,800,000

The allocation methodology for the funding will take into consideration juvenile population statistics, but a county will not receive less than \$250,000 each year (SB823, 2020).

Furthermore, SB823 identifies increased costs to counties that continue to use DJJ for incarceration services. For any commitments to DJJ after July 1, 2021 a county will be required to pay \$125,000 on an annual basis per commitment (SB823, 2020). Any of the commitments

that were accepted by DJJ before July 1, 2021 will continue at the pre-SB823 rate of \$24,000 per year (SB823, 2020).

As identified in SB823, one of the driving factors to implement this policy change is keeping youth offenders in their community (SB823, 2020). SB823 states, “to ensure that justice-involved youth are closer to their families and communities and receive age-appropriate treatment, it is necessary to close the Division of Juvenile Justice and move the jurisdiction of these youth to local county jurisdiction,” (SB823, 2020, n.p.). Further analysis on the feasibility of local placement will be reviewed in following sections of this report.

Division of Juvenile Justice Overview

Prior to SB823, the DJJ was responsible for offenders tried in the juvenile court system up to age 25, “...who have the most serious criminal backgrounds and most intense treatment needs,” (CDCR, 2020a, n.p.). California law outlines that youth would be transferred to adult facilities when they turn 18 years old unless their sentence can be completed prior to reaching age 25 (CDCR, 2020b). The facilities managed by the DJJ, at the time of the passage of SB823, include:

- N.A. Chaderjian Youth Correctional Facility - This facility houses an all-male population ranging from 14 to 25 years in age and provides various treatment and education programs, located in Stockton, California (CDCR, 2020c).
- O.H. Close Youth Correctional Facility – Located in Stockton, California, this facility has an all-male population of youths aged 18 to 25 years (CDCR, 2020d).
- Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp – The conservation camp, located in Pinegrove, California, provides training to low-risk youth in wildland firefighting for future job

opportunities (CDCR, 2020e). It should be noted that SB823 intends to retain this facility to provide job training opportunities (SB823, 2020).

- Ventura Youth Correctional Facility – A facility that provides treatment and education programs to both female and male populations (CDCR, 2020f).

Placement into a facility that is located near the youthful offenders' home is not guaranteed. The DJJ indicates, in a frequently asked questions webpage, that “youth are assigned to a program based on their age, maturity level, educational needs, and individual risk/needs level,” (CDCR, 2020b, n.p.). A 2020 population report from DJJ showed that incarcerated youth from southern region counties were held in northern region DJJ facilities and vice versa, although not all incarcerated youth are sent outside of their regions (CDCR, 2020g).

According to the *Spring 2020 Population Projections* report, completed by the CDCR, the average daily population across all four youth facilities in June of 2019 was 717 persons. The CDCR is expecting that by June of 2021 the average daily population will increase to 880 (CDCR: Office of Research, 2020). As SB823 is implemented, a realignment of approximately 900 youthful offenders from DJJ to county facilities will occur.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evidence-Based Programs

Much of the recent juvenile justice research has focused on evidence-based programming (Greenwood, 2010, Henggeler & Schoenwald, 2011, and Seave, 2011). Evidence-based programs are "...a program or strategy that has been evaluated through rigorous scientific study using experimental or quasi-experimental methods," (Greenwood, 2010, p. 1). Under section 1(e) of SB823, county jurisdictions are tasked to use evidence-based programs when managing youth populations (SB823, 2020). Dr. Peter Greenwood stated in a 2010 report to the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy that over 80 percent of juvenile programs have little to no effect on recidivism.² The argument was that agencies should be focusing time and resources on these scientific based methods rather than deviating from them (Greenwood, 2010).

Evidence-based programming has gained popularity and many states and agencies have incorporated some form of these programs into their legislative statutes or administrative regulations. Data compiled by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) in 2014 indicated that 18 states had incorporated evidence-based programs in statute (NCJJ, n.d.a). An additional 28 states had agency administrative regulations that included evidence-based programming in some capacity (NCJJ, n.d.a).

Residential placement, incarcerating juveniles in a facility such as a juvenile hall or treatment center, is one such evidence-based program that has been deemed ineffective (Henggeler & Schoenwald, 2011). Henggeler and Schoenwald (2011), identified that residential

² Recidivism is "a tendency to relapse into a previous condition or mode of behavior," (Merriam-Webster, n.d., n.p.). The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) measures recidivism "...by criminal acts that resulted in rearrest, reconviction or return to prison with or without a new sentence during a three-year period following the prisoner's release," (NIJ, n.d., n.p.). This measurement is used as an evaluation tool to determine effectiveness of incarceration facilities (NIJ, n.d.).

placement programs should exist only for juveniles who have committed serious crimes. As with the hub-based system proposed by the Governor's Office, many counties will be moving their juvenile population from a state institution to an out-of-county institution (Newsom, 2020b). It is important to note that SB823 shifts responsibility to county jurisdictions but does not necessarily provide an evidence-based alternative that must be implemented (SB823, 2020). The state not identifying which evidence-based practice or program that must be used in statute was a problem identified by Seave (2011). Implementation challenges will still plague probation departments that do not have the resources and technical knowledge base to implement evidence-based programs, even if they were identified in a statute such as SB823 (Seave, 2011).

Community Placement

Other juvenile based research has analyzed the impacts of placing juveniles in detention programs near their homes. One such study concluded that in-home placement was more impactful at reducing recidivism for first time violent juvenile offenders than probation camps or group homes (Ryan, Abrams, & Huang, 2014). A report by Washburn and Menart (2020), for the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, identified that approximately 50 percent of the youth that are held at the DJJ were from counties over 100 miles from the current State of California incarceration facilities. Since one of the goals of SB823 is to place this juvenile offender population in programs that are close to home, it will be important to analyze whether this will be the reality, as counties consider using hubs to handle this population. In a report completed by the Council of State Governments Justice Center, with support from multiple government and non-profit agencies, the authors stated that "...many of the programs that have demonstrated the most success focus not only on facilitating youth behavioral change, but also seek to strengthen

youth-family interactions, improve parenting skills, and connect youth to other positive adults, peers, and activities in their schools and community,” (Seigle, Walsh, & Weber, 2014, p. 18).

Another recent study completed by Ruch and Yoder (2017) used data from a national survey of incarcerated youthful offenders to determine if there is a relationship between a youth’s family involvement during incarceration and having a prepared reentry plan. Ultimately, this study concluded that increased family contact generally resulted in an increased chance that a youthful offender had a reentry plan in place (Ruch & Yoder, 2017). Other research has provided comprehensive examples of potential models for juvenile justice that are based on the research of successful family involvement throughout the incarceration and reentry process (Burke et al, 2014). Additional research has focused on analyzing the success of family-focused services (Early, Chapman & Hand, 2013). Early, Chapman, and Hand (2013) analyzed one such program that provided counseling and programming services for both the juvenile offender and the family. Their research concluded that the family-focused program performed better at reducing recidivism over other programs (Early, Chapman & Hand, 2013). Family involvement is critical in successful reentry and reduced recidivism. It will be important to project the potential outcomes of where the realigned DJJ population will be located to see whether SB823 will offer opportunities for more success.

Incarceration Costs

Another focus area of juvenile justice system research is on the actual costs of incarceration. One study analyzed the costs of a treatment program versus normal incarceration at a detention facility. The study consisted of 202 youth split into two groups, consisting of a treatment group and a comparison group, at a correctional facility in the State of Wisconsin. The results of the study concluded that upfront costs for the treatment program were more costly than

the status quo incarceration program, but the overall benefits outweighed this initial investment in the youth’s treatment (Caldwell, Vitacco, & Van Rybroek, 2006).

A recent study completed by Washburn and Menart (2020) identified direct costs of incarceration at the State of California DJJ facilities. On an annualized basis, the cost of incarceration at the state facilities was approximately \$336,012 (Washburn & Menart, 2020). This research project also analyzed the cost of DJJ incarceration and compared it to the cost of potential hub sites at county facilities that are projected to act in this capacity due to the SB823 realignment.

U.S. Juvenile Incarceration Systems

Currently, the operation of juvenile facilities differs from state to state. The National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) compiled data from 2015 on what types of state agencies administered juvenile corrections (NCJJ, n.d.). The data showed the following and included the District of Columbia separately:

Table 4: State Juvenile Agency by Type

Type	Count
Independent Juvenile Corrections Agency	18
Family/Child Welfare Agency or Division	11
Broad Human Services Agency	12
Adult Corrections Agency or Division	10

Source: National Center for Juvenile Justice, n.d.

SB823 will change the State of California from the adult corrections division category to the broad human services agency as the DJJ is closed and the OYCR, under the California Human Services Agency, takes over juvenile justice responsibilities (SB823, 2020).

A recent study completed by Howell et al. (2017) reviewed the juvenile justice systems in the United States to identify whether the negative connotation behind these agencies is justified.

POLICY ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 823

Review of the current trends in incarceration rates were found to be positive, with most states seeing a decline in overall incarceration rates (Howell et al, 2017). As many states have transitioned to focus on evidence-based programs and legislative reforms, rather than a focus on incarceration, there has been positive progress on reducing recidivism rates.

METHODOLOGY

A policy analysis of Senate Bill (SB) 823 was completed using Bardach and Patashnik's (2019) eightfold path method. The criteria to be used will be a cost analysis and review of projected program outcomes that will examine the differences between SB823 and the status quo policy. The eightfold path provides a framework that includes problem identification, data gathering, outlining alternatives, criteria selection, outcome projections, trade-offs, findings, and presentation. SB823 is a new policy that will not go into effect until July of 2021. The eightfold path method was chosen as it provides a framework to review future policy alternatives by projecting potential outcomes (Bardach & Patashnik, 2019).

Data Collection

Research was conducted on the 13 counties included in the sample for this project, as well as the DJJ. Data was gathered from multiple agency websites as well as direct email requests to the Chief Probation Officers of California association. The data collection also consisted of budgetary information, incarceration statistics, and staff reports. Additional research information was pulled from various scholarly sources, government websites, and from a survey conducted by the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC).

Institutional Review Board Exclusion

This research project met the guidelines of San Jose State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) policies for exclusion from the review process (San Jose State University, n.d.). All data and information contained throughout this research project can be procured through public sources and no information was taken through human subject responses. San Jose State University's IRB exclusion decision tool was used to determine that all requirements were

POLICY ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 823

met regarding this project for systematic investigation, generalizable knowledge, human subjects, identifiable information, and secondary identifiers (San Jose State University, n.d.).

FINDINGS

The following sections present research findings for selected counties, as well as the DJJ. Specifically, the pieces of information that are presented include the most recent and readily available juvenile detention budgets, staffing levels for juvenile facilities, average cost to house a youth at the facility, and current juvenile population statistics. Information related to the scope of this report is presented based on the responses from counties to a survey conducted by the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) between December 2020 and January 2021. The BSCC indicated that, “the survey requested information about the county’s intent to house these youth after June 20, 2021, specific programming that may be developed/offered for the population, whether youth from other counties will be housed, anticipated number of these youth to be housed, and infrastructure needs to house these youth,” (BSCC, 2021c, p. 3). The survey provides insight into the current capabilities of housing the DJJ incarcerated youth population at county facilities.

Division of Juvenile Justice

Commitment, or youth offender, data for all 58 counties can be found in Appendix A. As of June 30, 2020, the DJJ had 782 commitments in their facilities (CDCR, 2020g). Of this population, 16 individuals were placed in the Division of Adult Institutions (DAI) facilities.

Table 5 lists the commitments by facility and location:

Table 5: Division of Juvenile Justice Commitment Data

Facility	Location (City, County)	Commitments (June 30, 2020)
N.A. Chaderjian Youth Correctional Facility	Stockton, San Joaquin County	254
O.H. Close Youth Correctional Facility	Stockton, San Joaquin County	178
Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp	Pine Grove, Amador County	76
Ventura Youth Correctional Facility	Camarillo, Ventura County	258
Division of Adult Institutions	N/A	16
Totals:		782

Source: CDCR, 2020g

Among the four juvenile facilities, there were 766 commitments on June 30, 2020.

Approximately 66% of the juvenile offenders were placed in Northern California facilities, while 34% were in the sole Southern California facility in Ventura County.

To support the staffing, programming, and operation of these facilities, the California state budget for fiscal year 2020-2021 allocated \$234.1 million for juvenile offender programs under the CDCR (California Department of Finance, 2020). The DJJ has three different budgeted programs that have the following position and budget amounts for fiscal year 2020-2021 (California Department of Finance, 2020a):

- Operations and Offender Programs: \$182.5 million; 938.6 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions
- Academic and Vocational Education: \$26.8 million; 158.5 FTE positions
- Health Care Services: \$24.8 million; 108.5 FTE positions

Data presented in the Washburn and Menart report (2020) identified an average estimated cost of \$336,021 per individual. This estimate comes directly from the estimates in the 2020-2021 Governor's Budget (Department of Finance, 2020b). These estimates were revised in the 2020-2021 enacted state budget to \$273,722 per individual (Department of Finance, 2020c). For

purposes of this report and comparisons with county level data, a new calculation will be performed.

Using commitment data as of June 30, 2020, and the enacted budget amount for juvenile programs, the cost per juvenile offender can be calculated to provide a comparison with county level agencies. The estimated annual average cost to house a juvenile offender is \$305,613³ per individual. Since this estimate is consistent with the state’s 2018-2019 actual per capita cost of \$296,656 and 2019-2020 estimated per capita cost of \$306,398 it will be used for comparison purposes throughout this report.

County of Del Norte

The County of Del Norte is in the Northern California region and did not have any DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Del Norte’s 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 18 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in fiscal year 2020-2021 is approximately \$2.5 million (County of Del Norte, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Del Norte’s juvenile detention program:

Table 6: County of Del Norte Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Del Norte	\$ 2,484,180	18	0	6	\$ 414,030

Source: County of Del Norte, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Del Norte’s responses to the BSCC, (2021c) survey, the county will refer any commitments to other counties that have DJJ eligible offenses. The County

³ The average estimate is based on a static population amount. Average daily population amounts were not used in this calculation. This amount represents a snapshot in time and can change substantially based on allocated budget amounts and population fluctuation.

of Del Norte does not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications to house the DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would not accept out-of-county commitments. As identified in Appendix B, the closest agency to the County of Del Norte willing to accept out-of-county youth and will provide services to all DJJ offenders is the County of Shasta with a distance between the counties of 211 miles (Google, 2021a). Agencies that may be able to accept out-of-county youth are identified in Appendix C.

County of Tuolumne

The County of Tuolumne is in the Northern California region and did not have any DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). It was indicated that this county has regional partners that consist of the County of Calaveras, the County of Mariposa, the County of Amador, and the County of Inyo. Each of these four counties has a contract with the County of Tuolumne to provide juvenile detention services (BSCC, 2021c). According to the County of Tuolumne’s 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the Mother Lode Regional Juvenile Detention Facility had a total of 14 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for this regional juvenile detention center in 2020-2021 is approximately \$1.6 million (County of Tuolumne, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Tuolumne’s juvenile detention program:

Table 7: County of Tuolumne Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Tuolumne	\$ 1,610,232	14	0	19	\$ 84,749

Source: County of Tuolumne, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Tuolumne’s responses to the BSCC survey, they will accept any commitments they have or will have in the future under the DJJ scoped population. The county does have adequate space but will need infrastructure modifications if they were to house

this type of population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would accept out-of-county commitments and estimated that they could accept approximately five individuals (BSCC, 2021c). In their responses they stated that “our juvenile facility is already accepting youth from our regional partnership counties with DJJ eligible offenses,” (BSCC, 2021c, n.p.).

County of San Benito

The County of San Benito is in the Northern California region and did not have any DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of San Benito 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 12 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$1.7 million (County of San Benito, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of San Benito’s juvenile detention program:

Table 8: County of San Benito Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of San Benito	\$ 1,735,290	12	0	9	\$ 192,810

Source: County of San Benito, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of San Benito’s responses to the BSCC survey, they will refer any offenders with sexual offenses, mental illness, or have long term commitments to other counties. Serious juvenile offenders and female offenders with DJJ eligible offenses will remain at county facilities. They do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the new population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would not accept out-of-county commitments (BSCC, 2021c). As identified in Appendix B, the closest county to the County of San Benito willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Madera with a distance between the counties of 92 miles (Google, 2021f).

County of Tehama

The County of Tehama is in the Northern California region and did not have any DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Tehama 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 26 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$3.4 million (County of Tehama, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Tehama’s juvenile detention program:

Table 9: County of Tehama Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Tehama	\$ 3,449,925	26	0	7	\$ 492,846

Source: County of Tehama, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Tehama’s responses to the BSCC survey, they will refer any commitments to other counties that have DJJ eligible offenses. They responded that they do have adequate space and do not currently need infrastructure modifications for housing additional commitments. Additionally, the county indicated that they may be willing to accept out-of-county commitments (BSCC, 2021c). As identified in Appendix B, the closest county to the County of Tehama that was willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Shasta, with a distance between the counties of 32 miles (Google, 2021b).

County of Yuba

The County of Yuba is in the Northern California region and had two DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$7.2 million (County of Yuba, 2020a). The probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 39 FTE budgeted positions (County of Yuba, 2020b). In May of 2014, the

County of Yuba entered a joint powers agreement with Sutter and Colusa counties to operate a juvenile detention center. Due to the cost share agreement that was amended in 2015, the County of Yuba covers approximately 44 percent of the costs. The facilities managed by the County of Yuba include a juvenile detention facility and a youth camp (County of Yuba, 2019). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Yuba’s juvenile detention program:

Table 10: County of Yuba Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Yuba	\$ 7,150,173	39	2	28	\$ 255,363

Source: County of Yuba, 2020a, County of Yuba 2020b, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Yuba’s responses to the BSCC survey, they will refer any sex offender or mentally ill offender to other counties. Serious juvenile offenders, long-term commitments, and female offenders that have committed DJJ eligible offenses will remain in county custody. They do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the additional population from DJJ. Additionally, the county indicated that they may be willing to accept out-of-county commitments and could support four additional offenders at a time (BSCC, 2021c). Due to the County of Yuba’s responses, they would need support from a separate agency for specific offender types. The closest county willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Shasta with a distance between the counties of 119 miles (Google, 2021c), compared to the closest DJJ facility at 89 miles (Google, 20211), see Appendix B. It is important to note that the counties of Sutter and Colusa are impacted by the County of Yuba’s capabilities.

County of Mendocino

The County of Mendocino is in the Northern California region and had two DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Mendocino’s 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 25 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$2.5 million (County of Mendocino, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Mendocino’s juvenile detention program:

Table 11: County of Mendocino Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Mendocino	\$ 2,467,075	25	2	15	\$ 164,472

Source: County of Mendocino, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Mendocino’s responses to the BSCC survey, any commitments with serious offenses, mental illness, or long-term commitments that have DJJ eligible offenses will remain in county facilities. Females and sex offenders will be referred to other agencies. They would need infrastructure modifications, mainly to provide classroom space and transition services, to support the new DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would accept out-of-county commitments from adjacent counties and had capacity for three commitments of DJJ eligible youth (BSCC, 2021c). As identified in Appendix B, the closest county to the County of Mendocino willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Shasta with a distance between the counties of 189 miles (Google, 2021d).

County of Humboldt

The County of Humboldt is in the Northern California region and had two DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Humboldt’s

2020-2021 Proposed Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 31.4 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$3.8 million (County of Humboldt, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Humboldt’s juvenile detention program:

Table 12: County of Humboldt Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Humboldt	\$ 3,835,855	31.4	2	15	\$ 255,724

Source: County of Humboldt, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Humboldt’s responses to the BSCC survey, all offenders with DJJ eligible offenses will remain in county, except for sex offenders. They do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would accept up to five out-of-county commitments (BSCC, 2021c). As identified in Appendix B, the closest county to the County of Humboldt willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Shasta, with a distance between the counties of 147 miles (Google, 2021e).

County of Napa

The County of Napa is in the Northern California region and had one DJJ commitment as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Napa’s 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 36.75 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$6.2 million (County of Napa, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Napa’s juvenile detention program:

Table 13: County of Napa Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Napa	\$ 6,188,952	36.75	1	21	\$ 294,712

Source: County of Napa, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Napa’s responses to the BSCC survey, they will refer any commitments that have DJJ eligible offenses to other counties. They responded that they do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would not accept out-of-county commitments (BSCC, 2021c). As identified in Appendix B, the closest county to the County of Napa willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Tuolumne, with a distance between the counties of 132 miles (Google, 2021g) compared to the closest DJJ facility at 71 miles (Google, 2021o).

County of Kings

The County of Kings is in the Northern California region and had 14 DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Kings’ 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile treatment center division had a total of 45 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$5 million (County of Kings, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Kings’ juvenile detention program:

Table 14 : County of Kings Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Kings	\$ 4,947,077	45	14	34	\$ 145,502

Source: County of Kings, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Kings’ responses to the BSCC survey, they will refer sex offenders, offenders with mental illness, and female offenders to other counties. All other offenders will remain in county facilities. They do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would accept up to 12 out-of-county commitments (BSCC, 2021c). As identified in Appendix B, the closest county to the County of Kings willing to accept out-of-county youth is the County of Tulare, with a distance between the counties of 20 miles (Google, 2021h).

County of Madera

The County of Madera is in the Northern California region and had five DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Madera’s 2020-2021 Proposed Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 41 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$5.5 million (County of Madera, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Madera’s juvenile detention program:

Table 15: County of Madera Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Madera	\$ 5,496,238	41	5	32	\$ 171,757

Source: County of Madera, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

The County of Madera indicated that all DJJ eligible offenders will remain in county facilities. They responded, to the BSCC survey, that they have adequate space and do not require infrastructure modifications to house the DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they would accept up to five out-of-county commitments (BSCC, 2021c).

County of Shasta

The County of Shasta is in the Northern California region and had two DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Shasta’s 2020-2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile rehabilitation facility division had a total of 47 FTE budgeted positions. Staffing increased in this fiscal year by 11 positions that are funded through funds from the county’s Health and Human Services Agency. The positions are part of a new treatment program that will keep more youth within their facilities. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$7.2 million (County of Shasta, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Shasta’s juvenile detention program:

Table 16: County of Shasta Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Shasta	\$ 7,186,325	47	2	23	\$ 312,449

Source: County of Shasta, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

According to the County of Shasta, all offenders with DJJ eligible offenses will remain in the county. They do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the incoming DJJ population. The County of Shasta indicated that they already have contracts to house youth from Modoc, Trinity, and Lassen counties. They may be able to house other county youth if determined feasible and could support up to three out-of-county DJJ eligible offenders (BSCC, 2021c).

County of Imperial

The County of Imperial is in the Southern California region and had nine DJJ commitments as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of Imperial’s 2020-

2021 Adopted Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 34 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$3.1 million (County of Imperial, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of Imperials’ juvenile detention program:

Table 17: County of Imperial Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Imperial	\$ 3,126,187	34	9	9	\$ 347,354

Source: County of Imperial, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

The County of Imperial did not provide responses to the BSCC survey; thus, there is no comparative data for the status of their facilities and programming availability to DJJ offenders. As a southern region agency, the closest county that stated they would accept out-of-county youth and could support all DJJ eligible offenders was the County of Riverside (BSCC, 2021c). The distance between these two counties is 159 miles (Google, 2021q).

County of El Dorado

The County of El Dorado is in the Northern California region, and had one DJJ commitment as of June 30, 2020 (CDCR, 2020g). According to the County of El Dorado’s 2020-2021 Recommended Budget (2020), the probation department’s juvenile hall division had a total of 34 FTE budgeted positions. The total budget for the juvenile division in 2020-2021 is approximately \$4.8 million (County of El Dorado, 2020). The following table outlines key cost and population data for the County of El Dorado’s juvenile detention program:

Table 18: County of El Dorado Data

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of El Dorado	\$ 4,779,426	34	1	14	\$ 341,388

Source: County of El Dorado, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, BSCC, 2020

Offenders with DJJ eligible offenses will remain at the County of El Dorado’s juvenile facilities. In response to the BSCC survey, the County of El Dorado stated that they do not have adequate space and would need infrastructure modifications if they were to house the DJJ population. Additionally, the county indicated that they may accept out-of-county commitments and could support up to 10 out-of-county youthful offenders (BSCC, 2021c).

Findings Overview

The following table compiles the data of each agency for comparison purposes.

Table 19: All County Statistics

Agency	FY20/21 Budget	FTE Positions	DJJ Commitments	Q1 2020 Juvenile Hall Population	Average Cost Per Youth
County of Del Norte	\$ 2,484,180	18	0	6	\$ 414,030
County of Tuolumne	\$ 1,610,232	14	0	19	\$ 84,749
County of San Benito	\$ 1,735,290	12	0	9	\$ 192,810
County of Tehama	\$ 3,449,925	26	0	7	\$ 492,846
County of Yuba	\$ 7,150,173	39	2	28	\$ 255,363
County of Mendocino	\$ 2,467,075	25	2	15	\$ 164,472
County of Humboldt	\$ 3,835,855	31.4	2	15	\$ 255,724
County of Napa	\$ 6,188,952	36.75	1	21	\$ 294,712
County of Kings	\$ 4,947,077	45	14	34	\$ 145,502
County of Madera	\$ 5,496,238	41	5	32	\$ 171,757
County of Shasta	\$ 7,186,325	47	2	23	\$ 312,449
County of Imperial	\$ 3,126,187	34	9	9	\$ 347,354
County of El Dorado	\$ 4,779,426	34	1	14	\$ 341,388
Totals:	\$ 54,456,935	403.15	38	232	\$ 234,728

Source: County of Del Norte, 2020, County of Tuolumne, 2020, County of San Benito, 2020, County of Tehama, 2020, County of Yuba, 2020a, County of Yuba 2020b, County of Mendocino, 2020, County of Humboldt, 2020, County of Napa, 2020, County of Kings, 2020, County of Shasta, 2020, County of Imperial, 2020, County of El Dorado, 2020, CDCR, 2020g, & BSCC, 2020

POLICY ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 823

The average cost to house youth from the thirteen counties identified above was \$234,728 annually. The median amount is \$255,724. Total DJJ commitments from this group of counties was 38 offenders, and the juvenile population held at county facilities was 232, as of quarter one 2020. The 38 youth offenders represent approximately five percent of the total DJJ population.

ANALYSIS

Discussion

The cost of housing youth offenders varied greatly among the thirteen counties reviewed in this research project. As identified in Table 10, they ranged from a high of \$492,846 per individual to a low of \$84,749 per individual. The annual average cost was \$234,728, and the median was calculated at \$255,724 per individual. In comparison, the per capita cost for the DJJ was calculated to be \$306,398. Five of the thirteen counties had costs higher than the DJJ for housing youthful offenders. It should be noted that these numbers could vary greatly depending on fluctuations in the size and type of offense of the incarcerated juvenile population.

Historically, it has been cost effective for counties to send juvenile offenders to DJJ. With many of the legislation changes that have realigned youth incarceration to the local level, counties have had to continue to adapt programming and facilities for varying needs (Krisberg et al, 2010). With the passage of SB823, counties will need to adapt again to a new group of juvenile offenders that has its own set of facility, programming, and rehabilitation needs. As discovered in the BSCC survey, many counties do not have and cannot provide the facilities and services needed by these more serious offenders, or females needing segregated accommodations (BSCC, 2021g).

In many cases the DJJ offender population will need different services and programming than the current services provided at the county level. Most of the agencies indicated that they would need infrastructure and programming modifications to serve the new DJJ offender population (BSCC, 2021g). This could increase the cost substantially on a per capita basis for these agencies. Additionally, many of the agencies indicated that they could not accept individuals from the DJJ and will need to use other county agencies for certain offender groups,

see Appendix B. Depending on space availability, and the willingness of an agency to accept out-of-county youth, the cost for a county to send offenders could change based on the agency they are sent to. Additionally, this could be a substantially different cost than the \$24,000 per year that counties were paying, for individuals incarcerated at DJJ, prior to SB823 (SB823, 2020).

SB823 provides a source of funding to local agencies but it is not equivalent to the operating budget of the DJJ. The fiscal year 2020-2021 allocated budget for DJJ was \$234.1 million, with a population level of 782 juvenile offenders. SB823 has a fiscal year 2024-2025 allocation to local agencies of \$208.8 million to cover an increased population of approximately 928 juvenile offenders (SB823, 2020). If the state were to maintain funding at their current per capita level (\$306,398) the amount of funding needed would be \$284.3 million, an increase of \$75.5 million. This reduced funding may leave counties, especially lower-resourced counties, with inadequate funding to support the programming needs of the DJJ eligible offender population.

As seen from the data in the *Characteristics of Population Report*, by the CDCR (2020), individual juvenile offenders may not be assigned to a facility that is closest to their home. For example, the N.A. Chaderjian facility in San Joaquin County, a northern region county, housed 45 individuals from southern region counties (CDCR, 2020g). Even though the focus of placement may rest on the availability or types of programming, this could hinder the ability of families to be involved with the treatment process for these youth, which research suggests can be an important factor in proper rehabilitation (Early, Chapman & Hand, 2013, Ryan, Abrams, & Huang, 2014, Seigle, Walsh, & Weber, 2014, Ruch & Yoder, 2017).

SB823 attempts to support this research by returning youthful offenders back to their local communities. As identified in Appendix B, eight out of the thirteen counties would need to refer some of the youthful offenders with DJJ eligible offenses to other counties. Specifically, females (five counties), mentally ill (six counties), and sex offenders (eight counties) were the least likely to remain in local custody. These populations need specific housing or programming that many of the agencies cannot provide.

Alternatively, eight out of the thirteen counties would be positively impacted with reduced distances to the offenders' home counties (see Appendix B). One of the offender populations, females, had a great disadvantage with community placement prior to SB823. The only DJJ location that accepted females was in the County of Ventura, which provided no northern California region location. Once fully implemented, SB823 should provide some distance relief to this population, with the number of counties willing to retain their female offenders growing, and closer regional facility contracts becoming available.

From an initial assessment, SB823 seems to have the potential to positively impact the location issue and bring offenders closer to their communities. It will remain to be seen whether the closer distance will be as impactful on recidivism and programming success as placement directly in a youth offender's home county. Much of the potential for future success will require the collaboration of counties to provide regional centers that can accept out-of-county offenders.

Limitations

Current limitations on the research are based on the fact that SB823 has not been fully implemented, and many of the contracts for out-of-county placements have not yet occurred. At this point, many assumptions need to be made to determine whether there will be a positive or negative impact from SB823. Under the eightfold path, which was the method of policy analysis

used in this research project, projecting outcomes is considered the most difficult step, as there is no complete indication of what the future may hold (Bardach & Patashnik, 2019). Additionally, the County of Imperial did not provide responses to the BSCC survey, thus no relevant information regarding the retention of the DJJ population under this county could be ascertained.

Future Research

There are many issues relating to juvenile incarceration. Future research directly related to SB823 should be based on three different focus areas. First, general research on the impacts of SB823 should occur after the policy has been implemented to supplement the research of this project. Once multiple years of data are made available, the true impact of SB823 will be possible to measure. Second, future research should focus on how certain offender groups have been directly impacted by SB823. Appendix B identifies five different incarcerated youth groups that may be impacted differently once this legislation is implemented. Future research should also take a comprehensive look at the impacts on juveniles of different racial and ethnic groups, as well as transgender and gender-nonconforming people. Finally, future research should identify the regional locations that will accept out-of-county youth, and evaluate whether these agencies are able to provide services at a comparative level to DJJ.

CONCLUSION

The intent of SB823 is to end the state run juvenile correctional system by transferring the juvenile population to the county juvenile correctional system. The overall outcome that the state is trying to achieve is to place the DJJ population back into their local communities. Research suggests that the placement in a juvenile offender's home community, combined with increased family involvement, can have a great impact on the success of their rehabilitation (Burke et al, 2014, Early, Chapman, & Hand, 2013, Ruch & Yoder, 2017, Ryan, Abrams, & Huang, 2014, Seigle, Walsh, & Weber, 2014). This report researched a sample of counties with a population under 200,000. The sample was chosen to look at the impact of this new legislation on smaller counties that may not have the same access to resources as larger counties.

The research found that each county within the sample had varying degrees of resources, in the form of funding and positions, allocated to their current juvenile programs. With the implementation of SB823, some counties indicated that they do not have the capabilities to accept youth offenders that have committed DJJ eligible offenses. The ability of these counties to provide adequate juvenile incarceration services to the DJJ population will rely on their regional partners to provide a suitable alternative to the state juvenile correctional system. If these regional partnerships provide enough space for the out-of-county youth population, SB823 has the potential to return youthful offenders closer to their home communities. As SB823 is implemented, it will be important to see whether the proposed funding attached to this policy will provide adequate resources for the counties to provide a network of regional facilities that can accept out-of-county youth offenders.

REFERENCES

- Bardach, E. & Patashnik, E. M., (2019). *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More effective Problem Solving* (6th Edition). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Burke, J. D., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., & Garbin, S. R. (2014). The challenge and opportunity of parental involvement in juvenile justice services. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 39, 39– 47.
- Caldwell, M. F., Vitacco, M., & Van Rybroek, G.,J. (2006). Are violent delinquents worth treating? A Cost–Benefit analysis. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43(2), 148-168. doi:10.1177/0022427805280053
- California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2020). Juvenile detention profile survey. Retrieved from http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_fsojuvenile detentionprofile/
- California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2021a). *Local detention facility inspection reports*. Retrieved from https://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_fsolocaldetentionfacilityinspectionreports/
- California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2021b). Open facilities as of 3.10.21. Retrieved from <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/All-facilities-list-for-web-3.10.21.pdf>
- California Board of State and Community Corrections. (2021c). *Request for information: regional youth programs and facilities grant program (survey summary findings)*. Retrieved from <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Attachment-C-1-Survey-Summary-Findings-Final.pdf>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020a). Division of juvenile justice. Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020b). Frequently asked questions (FAQs). Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/faqs-about-djj/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020c). N.A. Chaderjian youth correctional facility. Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/facility-locations/n-a-chaderjian/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020d). O.H. Close youth correctional facility. Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/facility-locations/o-h-close/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020e). Pine Grove youth conservation camp. Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/facility-locations/youth-conservation-camps/>

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020f). Ventura youth correctional facility (VYCF). Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/facility-locations/ventura/>

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2020g). *Characteristics of population report, June 2020*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/division-of-juvenile-justice-research-and-data-analytics/>

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation: Office of Research. (2020). *Spring 2020 population projections*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/research/population-reports-2/>

California Department of Finance. (2020a). *2020-21 State Budget: Enacted Budget Detail*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/budget/publication/#/e/2020-21/BudgetDetail>

California Department of Finance. (2020b). *2020-21 Governor's Budget: 5165 Department Of Youth And Community Restoration*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/GovernorsBudget/4000/5165.pdf>

California Department of Finance. (2020c). *2020-21 Governor's Budget: 5225 Department Of Corrections And Rehabilitation*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/Enacted/GovernorsBudget/5210/5225.pdf>

California Office of the Attorney General. (n.d.). Crime statistics: Arrests. Retrieved from <https://openjustice.doj.ca.gov/exploration/crime-statistics>

Chow, K. (2020). *03/11/2020 - Senate Floor Analyses: SB823*. Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB823

County of Del Norte. (2020). *2020-2021 Final Adopted Budget*. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=Y28uZGVsLW5vcnRILmNhLnVzfGRuY298Z3g6MzEzNWZlNTk3M2MxYTVkOA>

County of El Dorado. (2020). *El Dorado County 2020-21 Recommended Adopted Budget*. Retrieved from <https://www.edcgov.us/Government/CAO/Pages/Fiscal-Year-2020-2021-Recommended-Budget.aspx>

County of Humboldt. (2020). *2020-21 Proposed Budget*. Retrieved from <https://humboldt.gov/247/Budget>

County of Imperial. (2020). *Adopted Budget Fiscal Year 2020-2021*. Retrieved from <https://imperialcounty.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/2020-2021-FINAL-ADOPTED-BUDGET-09-22-20.pdf>

POLICY ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 823

- County of Kings. (2020). *Final Budget 2020-2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.countyofkings.com/departments/administration/budget>
- County of Lake. (2017). Probation: Juvenile Hall. Retrieved from http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Probation/Juvenile/Juvenile_Hall.htm
- County of Madera. (2020). *Recommended Proposed Budget For The Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.maderacounty.com/home/showpublisheddocument/21924/637348095398430000>
- County of Mendocino. (2020). *FY 2020-21 Adopted Budget*. Retrieved from <https://www.mendocinocounty.org/home/showpublisheddocument/39202/637414011645070000>
- County of Mono. (n.d.). Probation: Detention. Retrieved from <https://monocounty.ca.gov/probation/page/detention>
- County of Napa. (2020). *Napa County, California Adopted Budget FY2020/21*. Retrieved from <https://www.countyofnapa.org/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/646>
- Hopper, M. County of Placer. (2020). *Juvenile Detention Facility Bed Space Rental To Nevada County: Contract with Nevada County probation*. Retrieved from <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/48100/28A>
- County of San Benito. (2020). *County of San Benito Adopted Budget Fiscal Year 2020-2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.cosb.us/home/showpublisheddocument/6256/637426821890870000>
- County of Shasta. (2020). *Adopted Budget Fiscal Year 2020-2021*. Retrieved from https://www.co.shasta.ca.us/docs/libraries/cao-docs/2019-2020-adopted-budget/2020-2021-adopted-budget.pdf?sfvrsn=9a7f589_2
- County of Sierra. (2020). *Regional Facility Agreement*. Retrieved from <http://www.sierracounty.ca.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/8830?fileID=8681>
- County of Siskiyou. (n.d.). Probation. Retrieved from <https://www.co.siskiyou.ca.us/probation>
- County of Tehama. (2020). *County of Tehama Adopted Budget*. Retrieved from <https://www.co.tehama.ca.us/images/stories/auditor/2020-2021%20Budget.pdf>
- County of Tuolumne. (2020). *Tuolumne County Adopted Budget Fiscal Year 2020-21*. Retrieved from https://stories.opengov.com/tuolumnecountyca/published/57_1_h36-

County of Yuba. (2019). *Yuba County 2019-2020 Proposed Budget: Probation*. Retrieved from <https://www.yuba.org/Yuba%20County/County%20Administrator/Budgets/2019-2020/22A-Probation.pdf>

County of Yuba. (2020a). *County of Yuba Final Budget Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.yuba.org/Yuba%20County/Auditor-Controller/Budget%20Book/2020-2021%20Final%20Budget%20Book.pdf>

County of Yuba. (2020b). *County of Yuba Position Allocation For Fiscal Year 2020-2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.yuba.org/Yuba%20County/Human%20Resources%20and%20Organizational%20Services/2.%20Class%20&%20Salary%20Information/Department%20Position%20Allocations/2021-002%20DPA%20Schedule%20FY%2020-21%20Eff%20Jan%201%202021.pdf>

Early, K. W., Chapman, S. F., & Hand, G. A. (2013). Family-focused juvenile reentry services: A quasi-experimental design evaluation of recidivism outcomes. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 2(2). Crescent City, California.

Francis, C. (2020). *08/31/20 - Senate Floor Analyses: SB823*. Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB823

Google. (2021a). [Google Maps directions for driving between Redding, CA and Crescent City, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Redding,+CA/Crescent+City,+CA/@41.5050733,-124.3513086,8z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d291d63b4a202f:0x1f3358ec7b360f57!2m2!1d-122.3916754!2d40.5865396!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d066375c6288db:0x76e89ab07375e62e!2m2!1d-124.2025913!2d41.7557501>

Google. (2021b). [Google Maps directions for driving between Redding, CA and Red Bluff, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Redding,+CA/Red+Bluff,+CA/@40.3927292,-122.5601881,9.22z/data=!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d291d63b4a202f:0x1f3358ec7b360f57!2m2!1d-122.3916754!2d40.5865396!1m5!1m1!1s0x808283b010b9754b:0x290a04be8736765a!2m2!1d-122.2358302!2d40.1784886>

Google. (2021c). [Google Maps directions for driving between Redding, CA and Marysville, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Redding,+CA/Marysville,+CA/@39.8162181,-123.1024377,8z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d291d63b4a202f:0x1f3358ec7b360f57!2m2!1d-122.3916754!2d40.5865396!1m5!1m1!1s0x809b53402f76adf5:0x226dde8569ab3985!2m2!1d-121.5913547!2d39.1457253>

- Google. (2021d). [Google Maps directions for driving between Redding, CA and Ukiah, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Redding,+CA/Ukiah,+CA/@39.2975866,-123.4608229,8z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d291d63b4a202f:0x1f3358ec7b360f57!2m2!1d-122.3916754!2d40.5865396!1m5!1m1!1s0x808164fe9c0175e3:0x73dcbc97834dc0e6!2m2!1d-123.2077831!2d39.1501709>
- Google. (2021e). [Google Maps directions for driving between Redding, CA and Eureka, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Redding,+CA/Eureka,+CA/@40.7600928,-123.8382987,9z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d291d63b4a202f:0x1f3358ec7b360f57!2m2!1d-122.3916754!2d40.5865396!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d3ff83e6ff4ea7:0x2a860766b8290695!2m2!1d-124.1636729!2d40.8020712>
- Google. (2021f). [Google Maps directions for driving between Madera, CA and Hollister, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Madera,+CA/Hollister,+CA/@36.9177946,-121.0090238,10z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x80940b92fdc6db03:0x36c342da22e76910!2m2!1d-120.0607176!2d36.9613356!1m5!1m1!1s0x8091f7c9df189c6b:0x70474dec2693ac0!2m2!1d-121.4016021!2d36.8524545>
- Google. (2021g). [Google Maps directions for driving between Sonora, CA and Napa, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Sonora,+CA/Napa,+CA/@38.0907028,-121.9031917,9z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x8090c5d00be20bf9:0x16d807f676254777!2m2!1d-120.3821724!2d37.9829496!1m5!1m1!1s0x8084ffe7f8f2deef:0xd6629f3a3384c725!2m2!1d-122.286865!2d38.2975381>
- Google. (2021h). [Google Maps directions for driving between Visalia, CA and Hanford, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Visalia,+CA/Hanford,+CA/@36.33644,-119.6101572,11z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x8094d882d3eb8729:0x5592e3ee010b480e!2m2!1d-119.2920585!2d36.3302284!1m5!1m1!1s0x8094c37b19af7a53:0x1b16a7e4c563f490!2m2!1d-119.6456844!2d36.3274502>
- Google. (2021i). [Google Maps directions for driving between Crescent City, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Crescent+City,+CA/Stockton,+CA/@39.8245181,-124.9909312,7z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d066375c6288db:0x76e89ab07375e62e!2m2!1d->

[124.2025913!2d41.7557501!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016](https://www.google.com/maps/dir/124.2025913!2d41.7557501!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016)

Google. (2021j). [Google Maps direction for driving between Hollister, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Hollister,+California+95023/Stockton,+CA/@37.4010402,-122.2539056,9z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x8091f7c9df189c6b:0x70474dec2693ac0!2m2!1d-121.4016021!2d36.8524545!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>

Google. (2021k). [Google Maps directions for driving between Red Bluff, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Red+Bluff,+California+96080/Stockton,+CA/@39.0569593,-122.8606125,8z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x808283b010b9754b:0x290a04be8736765a!2m2!1d-122.2358302!2d40.1784886!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>

Google. (2021l). [Google Maps directions for driving between Marysville, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Marysville,+California/Stockton,+CA/@38.5468934,-121.9791707,9z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x809b53402f76adf5:0x226dde8569ab3985!2m2!1d-121.5913547!2d39.1457253!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>

Google. (2021m). [Google Maps directions for driving between Ukiah, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Ukiah,+CA/Stockton,+CA/@38.4199202,-122.8030733,9z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x808164fe9c0175e3:0x73dcb97834dc0e6!2m2!1d-123.2077831!2d39.1501709!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>

Google. (2021n). [Google Maps directions for driving between Eureka, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Eureka,+CA/Stockton,+CA/@39.2244959,-124.9903528,7z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x54d3ff83e6ff4ea7:0x2a860766b8290695!2m2!1d-124.1636729!2d40.8020712!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>

- Google. (2021o). [Google Maps directions for driving between Napa, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Napa,+CA/Stockton,+CA/@37.9986386,-122.0623657,10z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x8084ffe7f8f2deef:0xd6629f3a3384c725!2m2!1d-122.286865!2d38.2975381!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>
- Google. (2021p). [Google Maps directions for driving between Hanford, CA and Stockton, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/Hanford,+CA/Stockton,+CA/@37.1027715,-121.6065672,8z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x8094c37b19af7a53:0x1b16a7e4c563f490!2m2!1d-119.6456844!2d36.3274502!1m5!1m1!1s0x80900d737b442181:0x5876f5d1044fcbd8!2m2!1d-121.2907796!2d37.9577016>
- Google. (2021q). [Google Maps directions for driving between El Centro, CA and Riverside, CA]. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/maps/dir/El+Centro,+CA/Riverside,+CA/@33.3122443,-117.0246029,9z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m13!4m12!1m5!1m1!1s0x80d75f9c2642bbbd:0xcb0448b8249ffdaf!2m2!1d-115.5630514!2d32.792!1m5!1m1!1s0x80dca6df7ff47dbb:0xf7a1d705135e0ae8!2m2!1d-117.3754942!2d33.9806005>
- Greenwood, P. (2010). *Preventing and reducing youth crime and violence: Using evidence-based practices*. Sacramento, CA: Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy.
- Henggeler, S. W., & Schoenwald, S. K. (2011). Evidence-based interventions for juvenile offenders and juvenile justice policies that support them and commentaries. *Social Policy Report*, 25(1), 1-28. doi:10.1002/j.2379-3988.2011.tb00066.x
- Howell, J. C., Wilson, J. J., Sickmund, M. H., Hodges, N. J., & Howell, M. Q. (2017). Caught in the act: States doing some things right in juvenile justice. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, 68(4), 25-42
- Judicial Council of California. (2021a). Proposition 47: The safe neighborhoods and schools act. Retrieved from <https://www.courts.ca.gov/prop47.htm>
- Judicial Council of California. (2021b). Proposition 64: The adult use of marijuana act. Retrieved from <https://www.courts.ca.gov/prop64.htm>
- Krisberg, B., Vuong, L., Hartney, C., & Marchionna, S. (2010). *A new era in California juvenile justice: Downsizing the state youth corrections system*. Berkley, CA: Berkley Center for Criminal Justice.

- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Definition of recidivism. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recidivism>
- Metcalf, C. (2020). *Approval of the contract between Plumas County Probation Department and Butte County Juvenile Detention facility*. County of Plumas. Retrieved from <https://www.plumascounty.us/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5372>
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. (n.d.). Juvenile justice geography, policy, practice, & statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.jjgps.org/juvenile-justice-services#corrections-agency?year=2015>
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. (n.d.a). Juvenile justice geography, policy, practice, & statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.jjgps.org/juvenile-justice-services#evidence-based-practices>
- National Institute of Justice. (n.d.). Recidivism. Retrieved from <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/corrections/recidivism#:~:text=It%20refers%20to%20a%20pers on's,intervention%20for%20a%20previous%20crime.&text=Recidivism%20is%20an%20important%20feature,incapacitation%2C%20specific%20deterrence%20and%20rehabilitation.>
- Newsom, G. (2020a). *Governor's Budget Summary 2020 - 2021*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>
- Newsom, G. (2020b). *May Revision 2020 - 2021*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/Revised/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>
- Ruch, D. A., & Yoder, J. R. (2017). The effects of family contact on community reentry plans among incarcerated youths. *Victims & Offenders, 13*(5), 609-627.
- Ryan, J. P., Abrams, L. S., & Huang, H. (2014). First-time violent juvenile offenders: Probation, placement, and recidivism. *Social Work Research, 38*(1), 7-18. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libaccess.sjlibrary.org/stable/24899177>
- San Jose State University Office of Research. (n.d.). *IRB exclusion decision tool: Does my project need IRB review*. Retrieved from: <https://www.sjsu.edu/research/irb/irb-forms/index.html>
- Seave, P. L. (2011). Evidence-based practices reduce juvenile recidivism: Can state government effectively promote implementation among probation departments? *American Journal of Community Psychology, 48*(1), 138-140. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9416-8
- Seigle, E., Walsh, N., & Weber, J. (2014). *Core principles for reducing recidivism and improving other outcomes for youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. New York, NY: Council of State Governments Justice Center.

POLICY ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 823

Senate bill no. 823, 337, 2019-2020 Regular Session Cong. (2020). Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB823

U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). Annual estimates of the resident population for counties in California: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019 (CO-EST2019-ANNRES-06). Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-counties-total.html>

Washburn, M. & Menart R. (2020). *A blueprint for reform: Moving beyond California's failed youth correctional system*. San Francisco, CA: Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice.

APPENDIX A

DJJ Population Statistics - June 30, 2020

Northern Region County	Total DJJ Cases	Total DAI Cases
Alameda	10	0
Alpine	0	0
Amador	0	0
Butte	10	0
Calaveras	1	0
Colusa	1	0
Contra Costa	29	0
Del Norte	0	0
El Dorado	1	0
Fresno	37	0
Glenn	0	0
Humboldt	2	0
Inyo	0	0
Kern	42	0
Kings	14	0
Lake	1	0
Lassen	0	0
Madera	5	1
Marin	2	0
Mariposa	0	0
Mendocino	2	0
Merced	7	0
Modoc	0	0
Mono	0	0
Monterey	31	0
Napa	1	0
Nevada	0	0
Placer	2	0
Plumas	0	0
Sacramento	48	0
San Benito	0	0
San Francisco	5	0
San Joaquin	33	3
San Mateo	5	0
Santa Clara	36	1

DJJ Population Statistics - June 30, 2020

Northern Region County (cont.)	Total DJJ Cases	Total DAI Cases
Santa Cruz	7	0
Shasta	2	0
Sierra	0	0
Siskiyou	1	0
Solano	14	0
Sonoma	10	0
Stanislaus	19	0
Sutter	3	2
Tehama	0	0
Trinity	0	0
Tulare	33	1
Tuolumne	0	0
Yolo	5	0
Yuba	2	1
Totals - Northern Region	421	9
Southern Region County	Total DJJ Cases	Total DAI Cases
Imperial	9	0
Los Angeles	167	0
Orange	7	0
Riverside	50	0
San Bernardino	43	1
San Diego	56	0
San Luis Obispo	1	0
Santa Barbara	10	3
Ventura	5	0
Totals - Southern Region	348	4
Totals - Statewide	769	13

Adapted from “Characteristics of Population Report, June 2020,” California Department of

Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2020, [https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/division-of-](https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/division-of-juvenile-justice-research-and-data-analytics/)

[juvenile-justice-research-and-data-analytics/](https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/division-of-juvenile-justice-research-and-data-analytics/)

APPENDIX B

Information Regarding DJJ Offender Potential Incarceration Location

Agency	Will DJJ commitments remain in local facilities or be referred out-of-county?					Will accept out-of-county youth? (Yes, No, Maybe)	Closest agency willing to accept DJJ offenders for all offenses? ¹	Distance to County Agency (miles)	Distance to Closest DJJ Facility (miles) ²
	Serious Juvenile Offenders (WIC 707(b))	Sex Offenders	Mentally Ill Offenders	Long-Term Commitments	Female Offenders				
County of Del Norte	Refer	Refer	Refer	Refer	Refer	No	Shasta	211	420
County of Tuolumne	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
County of San Benito	Remain	Refer	Refer	Refer	Remain	No	Madera	92	108
County of Tehama	Refer	Refer	Refer	Refer	Refer	Maybe	Shasta	31	178
County of Yuba	Remain	Refer	Refer	Remain	Remain	Maybe	Shasta	119	89
County of Mendocino	Remain	Refer	Remain	Remain	Refer	Yes	Shasta	189	169
County of Humboldt	Remain	Refer	Remain	Remain	Remain	Yes	Shasta	147	336
County of Napa	Refer	Refer	Refer	Refer	Refer	No	Tuolumne	132	71
County of Kings	Remain	Refer	Refer	Remain	Refer	Yes	Tulare	20	157
County of Madera	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
County of Shasta	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Maybe	N/A	N/A	N/A
County of Imperial ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
County of El Dorado	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Remain	Maybe	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: BSCC, 2021c, Google 2021a, Google 2021b, Google 2021c, Google 2021d, Google 2021e, Google 2021f, Google 2021g, Google 2021h, Google 2021i, Google 2021j, Google 2021k, Google 2021l, Google 2021m, Google 2021n, Google 2021o, Google 2021p,

Notes:

1. Only agencies that currently provide programming for all DJJ offenses and stated that they may provide services to out-of-county youth offenders were projected as possible partnership agencies.
2. Stockton, California and Ventura, California were used as the closest DJJ facility locations.
3. The County of Imperial did not provide responses to the BSCC survey.

APPENDIX C

Potential County Agencies Accepting Out-of-County Youth

County	Housing Plan	Estimate of Out-of-County Youth Accepted
Butte	Juvenile Hall	5
Fresno	Camp	12
Humboldt	Juvenile Hall	5
Madera	Juvenile Hall detentions side and Correction Academy	5
Mendocino	Juvenile Hall C-Unit Pod	3
Merced	Juvenile Hall	N/A
Riverside	Alan M. Grogan Youth Treatment Center	10
San Mateo	Juvenile Hall and Camp	15
Santa Barbara	Juvenile Hall and Camp	10
Shasta	Juvenile Hall	3
Sonoma	Juvenile Hall	16
Tulare	Juvenile Hall	15
Tuolumne	Juvenile Detention Facility	5
Total:		104

Adapted from “Request for Information: Regional Youth Programs and Facilities Grant Program,” California Board of State and Community Corrections, 2021, <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Attachment-C-1-Survey-Summary-Findings-Final.pdf>