



**CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL  
Office of Youth and Community Restoration  
(OYCR) Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, March 1, 2023  
1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.**

**[Virtual by Zoom:](#)  
[ZOOM](#)**

Telephone: (669) 254-5252  
Meeting ID: 161 827 1055

In Person: Clifford L. Allenby Building  
11<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco  
Room – (1113)  
1215 O Street, Sacramento 95814

---

**1. Call to Order: Welcome, Chair's Opening Comments, Announcement of New Members and Roll Call, and Meeting Agenda**

**1:03 p.m.:** Committee Chair Katherine Lucero called the meeting to order and welcomed Committee members, Ex-Officio members, and members of the public. Committee Chair Lucero provided meeting instructions for participants and provided instructions to address IT issues.

**1:04 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero introduced and welcomed Kasey Halcón as the new member to the Committee. Committee Chair Lucero welcomed Kasey Halcón and provided brief background of her work experience. Committee Chair Lucero invited new Committee member Halcón to briefly introduce herself.

Committee Member Kasey Halcón thanked Committee Chair Lucero for the opportunity to serve on the Committee. Member Halcón provided a brief background of her work experience.

**1:05 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero thanked Member Halcón and provided additional meeting instructions. Committee Chair Lucero briefly introduced IT support Aaron Matlen and invited him to provide technical assistance meeting instructions.

IT support Matlen thanked Committee Chair Lucero and welcomed everyone. IT support Matlen provided meeting instructions then he turned the meeting over to OYCR Deputy Director Alani Jackson.

**1:07 p.m.:** Deputy Director Alani Jackson took Committee Member roll call. The following Committee Members were present at the meeting via Zoom or in-person:

- Chair Katherine Lucero
- Sarah Belton
- Elizabeth Calvin
- Virginia Corrigan
- Tyee Griffith
- Frankie Guzman
- Brooke Harris
- Kasey Halcón
- Honorable Robert Leventer
- Danielle Lowe
- Chief Dan Prince
- Chief Brian Richart
- Rosalinda Vint
- The following Committee Members were absent:
  - Diane Becton
  - Sophia Cristo
  - Dr. Carly Dierkhising
  - Breon Hatcher
  - Laura Mendez
  - Chris Sanders
  - Honorable Patrick Tondreau
  - Chief Kelly Vernon

Deputy Director Jackson confirmed meeting quorum was met and turned the meeting over to Committee Chair Lucero.

## **2. Action Item: Approve Minutes from December 16, 2022**

**1:10 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero thanked Deputy Director Jackson and continued the meeting to the second item on the agenda. Committee Chair Lucero explained the

meeting minutes being discussed are from the December 16, 2022, CWC meeting. Committee Chair Lucero asked if Committee Members had questions or concerns about the meeting minutes.

**1:11 p.m.:** Member Sarah Belton reminded the Committee about her stance of abstention for the approval of the September 14, 2022, CWC meeting minutes due to her absence at the September 14, 2022, CWC meeting.

Committee Chair Lucero acknowledged Member Belton's comments and expressed edits will be made as a result.

Committee Chair Lucero welcomed additional comments from the Committee present in person or virtual. No additional Committee Member comments were received.

**1:12 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero asked for a motion to approve the December 16, 2022, CWC meeting minutes.

Committee Member Dan Prince motioned to approve the minutes. The motion received a second by Committee Member Brooke Harris.

All present Committee Members agreed to approve the minutes. No Committee Members opposed nor abstained.

**1:13 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero confirmed meeting minutes, as corrected, will be approved.

Committee Chair Lucero shifted to Deputy Director Jackson to provide OYCR informational items. Deputy Director Jackson thanked Committee Chair Lucero and briefly mentioned Committee Chair Lucero and Chief Technical Assistance Officer, Marica Rincon-Gallardo will also be providing informational items.

### **3. Informational Items: Updates from OYCR**

- Introduction of New Staff

**1:13 p.m.:** Deputy Director Jackson briefly explained OYCR is now at thirteen full-time staff and two special consultants. Deputy Director Jackson continued by informing everyone about the nine active recruitments for OYCR that will also be shared via the OYCR newsletter or the next CWC meeting, whichever comes first.

- Youth Justice Committee

Committee Chair Lucero provided an update on her [request](#) to not have the Child Welfare Council sunset on July 1, 2023, but rather continue as a standing committee as the Youth Justice Committee of the Child Welfare Council.

Committee Chair Lucero explained the current membership would remain unless any Committee Member elects to resign. Committee Chair Lucero also explained the Committee will seek new members to have representation from all aspects of the juvenile justice continuum.

Committee Chair Lucero explained the Committee would be voting at the next Child Welfare Council special meeting on March 13, 2023, on making the current Committee into a Standing Youth Justice Committee.

Committee Chair Lucero further clarified the special meeting will be to vote on the Standing Youth Justice Committee item, to discuss other action items from the previous Child Welfare Council meeting that were not discussed, and to discuss an item recommended by the Prevention and Early Intervention Committee of the Child Welfare Council on mandating reporting. Committee Chair Lucero mentioned more information will be shared for anyone interested in joining the meeting.

- Community Based Organization Capacity Development Deliverables

**1:15 p.m.:** Chief Technical Assistance Officer Marcia Rincon-Gallardo greeted everyone and continued by providing additional OYCR updates.

Chief Rincon-Gallardo provided an update on the Higher Education and Vocational Training Committee where OYCR has contracted with Forward Change. Forward Change will be helping the Child Welfare Council OYCR Committee achieve the higher education and career training deliverable.

Chief Rincon-Gallardo explained the Higher Education Advisory Committee met in February 2023 and consisted of a diverse group of educational providers and support services. The purpose of the meeting was to review current legislation and funding to expand higher education programs for juvenile justice impacted youth.

Chief Rincon-Gallardo continued by providing a brief overview of the Community-Based Organizations Capacity Building workgroup. The workgroup consists of a diverse membership with more members expected to be invited. This workgroup will make recommendations on the Child Welfare Council deliverable that the Council has already been working on since the September 14th Child Welfare Council meeting.

- OYCR Technical Assistance Initiative: Ending the Incarceration of Girls

Chief Rincon-Gallardo provided an update regarding the partnership with the Vera Institute and the initiative on Ending Incarceration on Girls and Gender Expansive Youth. On January 18, 2023, OYCR and Vera initiated the competitive application process for statewide technical assistance to immediately reduce and eliminate the incarceration of girls in California. Four Counties will be selected to receive funding from

OYCR and technical assistance from Vera to implement equitable policies, gender responsive programs for girls, and gender expansive youth. Interested counties submitted their applications on February 28, 2023. Interviews will be completed by March 17, 2023, and the four selected counties will be informed by March 24, 2023.

**1:18 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero thanked Chief Rincon-Gallardo for the updates.

Committee Chair Lucero reminded the Committee about the items on the agenda and about the Committee's deliverable on Higher Education and Vocational Training. Committee Chair Lucero introduced Arnold Chandler with Forward Change.

#### **4. Information Item: Forward Change Education Deliverable Update**

**1:19 p.m.:** Mr. Chandler thanked Committee Chair Lucero and proceeded with the presentation on the Higher Education and Vocational Training deliverable.

Presentation: [Toward a Model Approach for Building Higher Education Pathways for Secure Treatment Youth](#)

Mr. Chandler addressed a question in the chat asking if participants have already been selected for an interview. Mr. Chandler responded by clarifying a list of 55 interviews have been compiled and scheduled. The final list will depend on who can be scheduled for an interview in March.

**1:24 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero thanked Mr. Chandler for his presentation and updates. Committee Chair Lucero mentioned there may be some more key stakeholder interviews missing and welcomed Committee Members to contact Mr. Chandler for suggestions on further key stakeholder informant interviews.

#### **5. Facilitated Discussion: Step Home/Alternatives to Detention**

- Attachment 1: [Questions](#) for OYCR Committee in Preparation for March 1 Meeting
- Attachment 2: [Continuum of Care for Stepping Home](#) [updated]

**1:25 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero introduced the next agenda item and welcomed UCLA team Dr. Elizabeth Barnert and Dr. Laura Abrams to begin their facilitated discussion around the Stepping Home Model and Alternatives to Detention.

**1:26 p.m.:** Dr. Barnert thanked Committee Chair Lucero and briefly introduced herself. Dr. Barnert continued with the presentation on Continuum of Care for Stepping Home.

[Continuum of Care for Stepping Home](#)

**1:37 p.m.:** Dr. Barnert thanked everyone at the conclusion of her presentation and welcomed Dr. Abrams to continue with the facilitated discussion. The purpose of the facilitated discussion is to receive Committee Member feedback which will then culminate to a vote on a deliverable.

Dr. Abrams thanked Dr. Barnert and briefly introduced herself. Dr. Abrams continued by briefly reviewing the meeting [memo](#) shared with the Committee Members on February 16, 2023. Dr. Abrams suggested the Committee start with questions two and three:

2. Is there anything in terminology (e.g., “Step-Home,” “earned days,” etc.) that is of concern? Is there anything about the terminology that you really like?
3. Consider the name “Stepping Home” rather than “Step-Home” for the model. Which name fits the concepts of the model and its goals best?

**1:38 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams welcomed feedback from the Committee about the terminology and asked whether the Committee agreed with the idea of Stepping-Home as a model versus Step-Home.

Dr. Abrams acknowledged a public comment in the chat about serious offenses. Committee Chair Lucero responded in the chat by clarifying legislation SB823 addresses youth who commit offenses that are listed in W&I Code section 707(b).

**1:40 p.m.:** Member Harris expressed her thoughts around the use of the hyphen separating Step and Home. Member Harris believes the hyphen symbolizes a youth is a step before home or not yet home. Member Harris also questioned the model as having a middle ground between incarceration and home with the utilization of SYTFs, Camps, and Ranches. She believes this term is unclear when identifying home-like placements

Dr. Abrams thanked Member Harris and briefly explained the UCLA team’s thought process but understood part of the deliverable was to define what is the Step-Home model.

**1:42 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero reminded everyone about the opportunity for public comment at the end of the discussion but welcomed questions or comments through the chat box.

**1:43 p.m.:** Member Guzman asked if the presentation’s focus was on the concept of reentry rather than the process of going from a secure facility to a less secure facility.

A member from the public expressed their stance around the term “cottage: in the chat. The community member believed the term is outdated and not the best term when identifying culturally responsive approaches.

Dr. Abrams briefly clarified the model and emphasized the prefer track for youth would be to avoid an out of home placement. Dr. Abrams further clarified if a youth were to be adjudicated, the youth would still need robust services if placed in an out of home placement setting. Dr. Abrams explained, in her experience, youth who come from an out of home placements typically get offered intensive services; however, youth who do not get adjudicated could also benefit from those intensive services as well. Dr. Abrams agreed more clarification could be helpful.

**1:46 p.m.:** Dr. Barnert suggested taking out the word reentry when defining “wrap around reentry supports”. This would help to move away from the idea that a youth would need to be adjudicated and incarcerated to receive services upon reentry.

**1:47 p.m.:** Member Guzman clarified and hoped the Step-Home Model was to address the deep-end youth who would have otherwise been sent to DJJ. Member Guzman also believed services should be provided for youth early in their stay, and throughout the various stages, so that youth can continually be developing.

**1:49 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams acknowledged Member Guzman’s comments and further agreed more clarification is needed in the presentation. Dr. Abrams also explained every youth will have different paths, but the model provides the most flexibility for Judges and Probation to follow the law and address the needs of youth.

**1:50 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams welcomed feedback from Members who have a background in Probation.

**1:51 p.m.:** Member Prince provided his reflections and explained Probation departments are working toward destigmatizing and creating opportunities within their juvenile facilities for youth. Member Prince further clarified all Probation departments are different and many are working toward implementing a return home model.

**1:52 p.m.:** Member Richart briefly explained the focus was that legally aged adults who are in the Juvenile Justice system will be in a secure facility at one point and will need to be supported as they transition. Member Richart agreed with Member Prince in that all Probation departments are different but are working toward addressing the needs of youth with extended stays. He also explained the terminology of step home or stepping home did not have a difference.

**1:54 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Prince and Member Richart for their comments. Dr. Abrams acknowledged a question in the chat regarding the term “cottage” and agreed the term is outdated. Dr. Abrams explained the term is a placeholder to refer to out of home placements but understood each county may use a different term to identify out of home placements.

**1:55 p.m.:** Member Belton agreed with Member Harris. Member Belton briefly explained the terminology could matter in the sense of goal setting and messaging. She

suggested adding the term “community” in a title to address people who may not have the same meaning of home or feel it is the safest place.

Member Robert Leventer provided a comment in the chat. He expressed there may be some confusion with the identification of a step-down program for SYTF youth. Member Leventer provided experience with the use of terms “Youth Justice Reimagined” to encompass a broad approach.

**1:56 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Belton for her comments. Dr. Abrams acknowledged more information would be required and will be consulting with the OYCR team as well.

**1:57 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked the Members who provided feedback and moved to the second question. Dr. Abrams asked the Committee what systems of care would need to be available for young people.

**1:58 p.m.:** Member Lowe suggested implementing an educational support component. Member Lowe explained that often the transition of young people from custody school to public school can be difficult, especially when there is no relationship between schools. Member Lowe further suggested services such as mental health supports, case management, legal supports, family development and family inclusion.

**2:01 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Lowe for her feedback. Dr. Abrams emphasized if this model is going to be a guiding model, then it is important to understand what every county needs to have a paradigm shift.

**2:02 p.m.:** Member Leventer suggested case planning be essential at the beginning for all youth in every county and to include providers, youth, and the youths’ support system. Member Leventer further suggested the Committee not develop a model for all youth but rather a guide so that it can be applied case by case.

**2:03 p.m.:** Member Harris agreed with Member Leventer’s comments about implementing a case planning approach starting pre-adjudication. Member Harris emphasized the purpose of the youth realignment was to avoid out of home placement when possible and be provided with community supports. Member Harris believes a core principle of realignment was to move away from traditional supervising models.

**2:04 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Harris and highlighted the State would need to understand what exists for young people through government systems.

**2:05 p.m.:** Member Calvin thanked the UCLA team for their work. Member Calvin suggested in the Step-Home model, out of home placement pathway, there be a non-lock-up option. She also agreed with the Members with Probation backgrounds in that the target population will be in some type of secured facility but hoped California would development alternatives to a secured facility for such cases. Member Calvin also



expressed it is important to have viable programs that could be considered by judges at the youth's six-month review. Moreover, she emphasized the need to have a uniform and fair way of communicating the progress of the youth.

**2:08 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked member Calvin for her comments and suggestions.

**2:09 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero also thanked Member Calvin for her suggestions. Committee Chair Lucero proposed having the Ranch and Cottage placements under the less restrictive section and provide examples of similar programs across the state. Committee Chair Lucero believed the Step-Home Model is not clearly defined.

**2:11 p.m.:** Dr. Barnert acknowledged all the members' feedback and clarified the intention of the Step-Home model was to encompass all that has already been mentioned. However, Dr. Barnert understood the diagram is not clearly defined. Dr. Barnert offered guiding details of the types of feedback the UCLA team is seeking regarding what entity should oversee and provide services to young people in the less restrictive settings.

**2:12 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams provided a question in the chat around what entities or agencies should oversee or staff the services and placements, and how this might differ in a large metropolitan city versus a small rural county.

Member Richart asked for clarification on which Child Welfare entity would potentially provide services, County Child Welfare, or some other entity. Member Richart also wanted clarification if County Child Welfare would provide services for youth on the Secure Treatment track within the community.

**2:13 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams confirmed the UCLA team was referring to, not just County Child Welfare, but other different types of Child Welfare entities understanding not all counties are the same.

**2:13 p.m.:** Member Halcón informed the committee about her early departure from the meeting via chat. She thanked everyone for the robust conversation and is looking forward to the next Committee meeting.

**2:13 p.m.:** Member Calvin agreed with having Child Welfare involved understanding that many youth on the Secure Treatment track will have serious mental health challenges and trauma.

**2:14 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero provided information regarding returning foster youth who may still have AB12 funds and can receive services from a social worker. Committee Chair Lucero also expressed the importance of working with all partners to better serve youth. She also acknowledged Probation Departments would be in charge but hopes the Department would identify the need to cross collaborate with community stakeholders.

**2:15 p.m.:** Member Vint expressed her concerns about the model and emphasized the need to view the community holistically. Member Vint believed the concern is not where we can house these youth but rather when and with what resources. She expressed it's going to take a village to serve these youths.

**2:17 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Vint and provided examples of collaborations with Probation departments, such as the multi-disciplinary teams for dual status youth in Los Angeles, and other models of Probation agency partnerships. Dr. Abrams welcomed the perspective from the Members with Probation background on how their departments have been able to work collaboratively with other entities.

**2:18 p.m.:** Member Prince provided his experience with working collaboratively with other entities and emphasized moving forward, it will be common practice for Probation departments to work collaboratively with other entities in a multi-disciplinary approach while including the youth.

**2:19 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Prince for his comments. Dr. Abrams acknowledged Probation departments have welcomed nonprofits into facilities to work with youth in many counties and asked the Committee if they believed this practice should be formalized or included into the model.

Member Richart briefly explained many components of the model, in particular the collaboration with community partners, are already being implemented in many Probation departments across the state. Member Richart further clarified there would need to be two different conversations for Secure Treatment track youth and youth entering the justice system.

**2:21 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Richart and asked if he could provide more detail to the difference between Secure Treatment youth and youth entering the Juvenile Justice system.

Member Rosalinda Vint thanked everyone in the meeting in the chat and informed all she will need to depart early from the meeting. She looks forward to continuing the work within the Committee.

Committee Member Virginia Corrigan provided her stance via chat on the importance of integrating housing navigators/integration of housing services.

Member Richart briefly explained roughly eighty percent of the youth entering the Juvenile Justice system are diverted out of custody by the Probation department and not by the court. Member Richart further explained when Probation departments divert youth, youth are connected to a form of informal service that is not directly connected to Probation. Member Richart explained the youth who will be on the Secure Treatment track will need a different treatment plan that would include longer stays under supervision and assistance with transitioning into adulthood. Member Richart clarified

the model being discussed is specific to the Secure Treatment youth and not for all youth entering the Juvenile Justice system.

**2:23 p.m.:** A member from the public suggested making the interdisciplinary meeting a necessary part of the youths' process and agreed to formalize this process.

Dr. Abrams confirmed the model is intended for the youth with extended stays in custody, i.e., Secure Treatment youth.

**2:24 p.m.:** Member Corrigan express the importance of including housing and homelessness services early in the youths' treatment plan. Member Corrigan emphasized not all youth will be former foster care youth and would need assistance navigating housing challenges.

**2:25 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams agreed and mentioned the model includes many components of services, including housing.

Member Guzman explained the development of the Step-Home model is a new process to addressing the needs of youth who would have traditionally been sent to a medium security state operated facility. As a result of the new process, these youth will now be housed in maximum security short-term county operated facilities. Member Guzman further explained Probation's caseload hugely serves adult populations and is not already addressing the needs of youth with extended stays. Member Guzman also questioned whether Probation departments would relinquish their authority to collaborate with outside partners who may be better equipped to address youth needs or share resources.

**2:26 p.m.:** OYCR Special Consultant LaRon Dennis briefly explained, via chat, historically, 1-2% of all youth who are contacted by the juvenile justice system end up in DJJ. She further explained the large majority of youth are dealt with in other ways.

**2:28 p.m.:** Member Leventer asked, via chat, if this model is intended for only SYTF youth because he believes the model currently does not look specific to only SYTF youth.

**2:30 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero thanked the members for their comments and suggestions. Committee Chair Lucero wanted to remind the Committee that purposeful work is challenging work, and everyone's voice will be valued no matter their roles. She also emphasized the focus of these discussions and the actions that are made will be for youth in the Juvenile Justice system. Committee Chair Lucero also acknowledged there are good practices being implemented in the counties already; however, more work is required to better address the needs of the youth.

**2:32 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Committee Chair Lucero for her statement and acknowledged it is an honor to work alongside this Committee. Dr. Abrams

acknowledged there are many different perspectives on this Committee. Dr. Abrams asked the Committee if there are other entities that should be invited to contribute to the Step-Home model.

**2:33 p.m.:** Member Prince suggested members from youth advocacy organizations or individuals, representatives from educational services such as community colleges or county offices of education, and the Defense Bar. Member Prince believed it was important to invite these types of individuals that can bring different schools of thought when discussing how to address the need of SYTF youth.

**2:34 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Prince for his suggestions. Dr. Abrams also acknowledged a public comment in the chat about including representatives who can speak on disability rights.

Member Corrigan suggested including families, clergy, and other community leaders who may not be part of community-based organizations or transitional programming but can be engaged in the services provided.

**2:35 p.m.:** Member Harris agreed, via chat, with public comments and Member Prince regarding inclusion of young people, youth advocacy orgs, and the defense bar.

**2:36 p.m.:** Member Guzman and Member Harris both suggested including crime survivors who have been incarcerated via chat.

## **6. Public Comment**

**2:36 p.m.:** Deputy Director Jackson provided instructions on how to provide public comment and welcomed the public to participate.

Community member Rodney Brooks suggested support for community-based organizations by providing employment opportunities for individuals who may be better equipped to support the target population of youth. Community member Brooks also emphasized buy-in is key from local judges for the model to be successful. He also highlighted the direction of the State where Juvenile Justice moved from Corrections to Health & Human Services and suggested counties consider the same when discussing youth treatment and care.

**2:39 p.m.:** Community member Israel Villa briefly introduced himself and thanked the Committee for their work. Community member Villa emphasized community members, who are the most impacted, are often missing from the conversation and suggested they be included. He also shared his work experience which includes speaking to youth who have been in the Juvenile Justice system. Community member Villa suggested including youth who are currently in the Juvenile Justice system to speak about their experience.

**2:42 p.m.:** Community member Laura Ridolfi thanked the Committee and briefly introduced herself. Community member Ridolfi supports any model that helps bring youth home, but also acknowledged more clarifications are needed with the current Step-Home model. She also emphasized the need to define what the close to home or placements are, whether they are facilities, licensed community care, or new designation. Community member Ridolfi also highlighted the need to identify not how to move youth from confinement to community, but where should youth start their commitment on day one.

**2:43 p.m.:** Community member Amy Price briefly introduced herself and thanked the Committee for their discussion and inputs. Community member Price suggested clarifying what wrap around services are and identifying who would be providing those services. She emphasized there is a distinct difference between supervision and the healing model.

**2:44 p.m.:** Public member thanked the committee for the discussion via chat and asked if the meeting recording will be shared.

**2:45 p.m.:** Community member Sarah Alvarado Mejia briefly introduced herself and thanked the Committee. Community member Mejia provided her experience as an educator where on many occasions too much focus was spent deciding terminology, but when in practice, it did not matter as much. She acknowledged the importance of terms for messaging and mapping but emphasized the need to also focus on the practice. Community member Mejia also suggested inviting young people to help with identifying the appropriate terminology. Community member Mejia also emphasized the need to implement a mentorship component to the Step-Home model.

**2:48 p.m.:** Community member Sonja Tonnes briefly introduced herself and thanked the Committee. Community member Tonnes highlighted the need to include family and youth voice in the process. She also suggested investing in community alternatives rather than Probation and surveillance.

**2:51 p.m.:** Community member Cynthia Druley thanked the Committee for their work and was happy to hear about the Stepping-Home process. She briefly shared her experience and how her home county does not have a Secure Youth Treatment Facility. She asked what types of offenses would allow for a youth to benefit from the Stepping-Home model being discussed.

**2:52 p.m.:** Member Leventer expressed, via chat, judges will not release youth into the community who have committed violent gun related charges until the judges are reasonably secure the youth will not reoffend. Member Leventer further expressed; his concern would need to be addressed to receive judicial buy-in.

**2:53 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero invited Member Leventer to provide some clarity.

Member Leventer expressed he also shares some concerns mentioned about the seriousness of offenses from youth who are on the Secure Youth Treatment track. He also expressed the Step-Home model seems to be geared for short-term commitments, but the SYTF youth will be incarcerated for longer stays based on their offenses. Member Leventer believes many youths who have gone to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) were not immediately ready to change upon their return into the community. He emphasized the complexities judges must navigate to be certain a youth on the Secure Treatment track will not reoffend if placed on a Step-Home model path.

**2:54 p.m.:** Public member clarified, via chat, Credible Messenger programs mean non-law enforcement led.

**2:55 p.m.:** Deputy Director Jackson thanked the members of the public for their comments and input. Deputy Director Jackson invited Dr. Abrams to continue with the Committee deliverable.

**2:55 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams thanked Member Leventer for his comments and confirmed the Step-Home model and Committee deliverable is intended for the youth on the Secure Treatment track.

**2:56 p.m.:** Member Leventer acknowledged Dr. Abram's response and further clarified the Committee and community stakeholders all agree and support the role of sending youth home safely and with robust support services, on paper; however, he expressed if Members were to visit some county SYTF facilities, the Members would be upset to see what is happening.

**2:57 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams acknowledged there are many different perspectives and suggestions from Committee Members and recognized more information is needed to improve the Step-Home model.

Public member asked, in the chat, if there was a State office like the Foster Care Ombudsperson at CDSS.

Committee Chair Lucero acknowledged the comment in the chat and informed all in attendance about the OYCR Ombudsperson.

## **7. Action Item - Select Deliverable**

**2:58 p.m.:** Dr. Abrams provided a brief overview on Committee deliverable options referencing the [memo](#) provided to Committee Members. Dr. Abrams asked the Committee to consider selecting a deliverable in the next meeting.

Public member inquired about, via chat, what Los Angeles County Judges are doing to hold system stakeholders accountable when rules and policies are broken.

**2:58 p.m.:** Committee Chair Lucero suggested having a special meeting to incorporate the diverse perspectives of the Committee through dialogue. She recommended the special meeting be solely for the purpose of discussing the action item of selecting a deliverable. Committee Chair Lucero suggested scheduling a virtual special meeting in the next thirty to forty-five days. She mentioned OYCR staff will contact Committee Members once a date is confirmed.

**2:59 p.m.:** Public comment, via chat, states many youths who are returning home from DJJ have been incarcerated for many years and in need of various resources such as, housing, life skills, employment, and family support. The public member believes if these needs are not met, youth will likely return to the adult criminal system.

### **8. Announcements & Adjourn**

Committee Chair Lucero thanked the Committee Members, Community, and Staff for participating in the meeting. She reminded everyone about the meaningful work everyone is doing to better serve the youth in the Juvenile Justice system. She further reminded everyone it will take a collective to serve the youth and only through partnerships will this work be successful.

**3:00 p.m.:** Meeting Adjourned