



CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL

Wednesday, June 14, 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 11th 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**

1:02 p.m.: Committee Chair Katherine Lucero called the meeting to order and welcomed Committee members, Ex-Officio members, and members of the public. Deputy Director Alani Jackson provided meeting instructions for participants and provided instructions to address IT issues.

1:04 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

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

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

2. Action Item: [Approve Minutes](#) from March 1, 2023

1:06 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero facilitated minutes approval and informed members that minutes from last meeting posted for accessibility.

Committee Member Dan Prince motioned to approve and Committee Member Patrick Tondreau second to approve. No further discussion indicated by committee. Members approved minutes by calling “Aye” unanimously. Committee Member Vernon abstained due to missing last meeting.

1:08 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero confirmed meeting minutes will be approved.

3. Presentation: Forward Change Updates and Discussion

1:09 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero provided an update on the Forward Change consultants and explained that Forward Change is an organization that works to advance equity, especially educational equity, by taking a life course view and looking at best practices, research data across the State, the nation, and perhaps even the world. Committee Chair Lucero introduced Arnold Chandler, to present on behalf of Forward Change and provide an update on the education deliverable.

1:10 p.m.: Mr. Chandler thanked Committee Chair Lucero and proceeded with the presentation on the Building Higher Education Pathways for Secure Treatment Youth in California: A Call-to-Action report. Mr. Chandler explained that the report is still in

draft phase but ready for people to read and provide feedback.

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

1:39 p.m.: Deputy Director Jackson transition to a call for questions for Mr. Chandler regarding the presentation. Committee Chair Lucero specified this was open to committee members and for them to unmute and ask questions.

Committee Member Richart asked “although no debate with the notion whatsoever, that the reduction of policies and practices that are more akin, to excuse me, a maximum-security facility versus a medium security facility for kids that are there for longer terms. I'm curious how that is related to the educational environment? In other words, are there some specific things captured in the report that demonstrated how that policy adjustment helped benefit the educational experiences of the youth?”Mr... Chandler answered “The short answer is, no, because the literature really doesn't, cover that question. This mostly came from various folks making those recommendations across stakeholders that we interviewed. The question that was positioned was mostly around climate, and the perception that you're a college student, or that you're perceived as someone who has the freedom of interaction and freedom of movement that has a higher fidelity to the college experience. And so, it was talked about more in those terms. It was often counterposed to what had been described as available at DJJ. Folks would say, 'Rooms look like this... You'd have interactions like this...’ That reflects what people were characterizing as the medium security context versus the details that they're alluding to about what maximum security looks like in these local contexts. Often the characterization is that some of these facilities look like Pelican Bay, with some of the characterization that people put on the table. That's where the distinction really came up between how the facility both looks and how behavior and mobility are governed are another aspect of the policies.”

1:42 p.m. Committee Member Tondreau commented that he thought Mr. Chandler gave a terrific presentation. Committee Member Tondreau stated that he was hoping for a copy of the presentation then went on to say that he knows it is very important to focus on getting a job for success in life. He stated there are additional benefits to college education such as getting to know a wider world, developing critical thinking skills and a lifelong love for learning that seems to be a key goal of a bachelor's education in addition to the pathway to a job. He then stated that he would like to see this integrated into Child Welfare Commission Goals.

Mr. Chandler acknowledged Committee Member Tondreau regarding this request.

1:44 p.m. Committee Chair Lucero stated that OYCR will be sending out the report and Power Point Presentation and welcomed additional feedback from the committee. Committee Chair Lucero then reminded the committee that this presentation, specifically around these three specific topics was a request from this committee to

identify what resources are currently established for the youth and how we can deliver these services.

Committee Member Prince commented and stated that he thought the presentation was important and valuable. All four of Imperial County secure track youth are enrolled or engaged in college courses. Committee Member Prince stated that they would be following up regarding the material presented. Committee Member Prince stated that the data presented, specifically around the impacts of learning environment, were going to be considered moving forward. He then thanked Mr. Chandler.

1:45 pm.: Committee Chair Lucero facilitated the end of this portion of the meeting indicating that if there were no more comments from Members that the meeting would move on to the next area of discussion. Committee Chair Lucero reminded attendees that there would be space for public comment at the end of the meeting also reminding that the chat feature was an available option. Committee Chair Lucero thanked the Forward Change team for their national expertise and contributions as it is going to be one aspect of the North Stars that is guiding work during this post DJJ time.

4. Informational Item: Updates from OYCR, Where We Are Today

1:46 pm.: Committee Chair Lucero stated that the next part of the presentation is going to be around the Stepping Home model and alternatives to detention work that OYCR has been doing. Committee Chair Lucero stated, "Our work with UCLA on modeling stepping home strategies has been evolving, we have been taking feedback from you all, from staff with expertise in this area, from the research, the data, from UCLA and what we have come to is a presentation of an iterative progression." Committee Chair Lucero explained that at first, they thought that this would be one deliverable and one model, but new findings show that this work is a process that will evolve. Committee Chair Lucero explained that it is important to look at each counties resources and this brings us to discuss overarching standards of excellence and the values being developed in today's discussion.

1:46 pm.: Committee Chair Lucero explained that the information presented is intended for members to take in and contribute to as these will be the collective components of the elements in the Stepping Home model that is being created. This information in turn will contribute to the key elements document. Committee Chair Lucero stated that there will be a series of research founded issues and implementation briefs that will expand on those elements to support and guide partners. These will be shared with the committee and posted to the OYCR website on a flow basis.

5. Presentation: Stepping Home; Standards of Excellence

1:47pm.: Committee Chair Lucero introduced the UCLA team that would be presenting the Standards of Excellence and informed the committee that these standards would be presented again in September for a formal adoption. Committee Chair Lucero stated that if any members wanted to contribute any thoughts or concerns or point out any potentially missing information that there would be an opportunity to do so that day or again in September. The goal was to present these Standards of Excellence, assuming there was an agreement, to the Child Welfare Council in December.

1:48 pm.: Committee Chair Lucero formally introduced Dr. Elizabeth Barnert and Dr. Laura Abrams to present.

1:49 pm.: Dr. Elizabeth Barnert thanked Committee Chair Lucero for her explanation of the work and introduced herself, Dr. Laura Abrams, and Cassandra Angel who is also on the team to present slides.

Presentation: [Stepping Home: Standards of Excellence and Key Elements](#)

2:01 pm.: Dr. Laura Abrams concluded the informative part of the presentation and welcomed any committee member questions or feedback.

Committee Member Tondreau commented that both presentations mentioned the urgency of having mentors with lived experience. He asked who was envisioned to carry out the mentorship components. He specified his question and asked if it should be held by outside nonprofits, the probation department, or a combination of.

Dr. Laura Abrams answered that this component is going to be expanded on in the briefs and that they would be looking at the research and community knowledge for awareness of these elements. She then explained that UCLA is working to delineate the different models that include, credible messengers, peer mentors, life coaches and the many different terms used to fully understand and explain these. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that generally these mentors are from community-based organizations that get to meet the youth when they are still inside and continue out this mentorship into re-entry. These models already exist through the Anti Recidivism Coalition and other organizations that they want to promote particularly for vulnerable young people where having a mentorship can be a turning point in their lives.

Dr. Laura Abrams added that they understand that they can provide these overarching ideas, including the theories and research to back it up, yet they understand that what services will look like and how services will be implemented in each county is going to be different based on the differing factors including resources available, location, accessibility to CBO's as well as the relationship between probation and non-profits. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that although they can provide this data, it is up to the county

groups to figure out their plan to implement these concepts.

2:05 pm.: Committee Member Tondreau asked a follow up question if there has been any funding identified to support these mentorships.

Dr. Laura Abrams deferred to the county for this because it is out of the domain of UCLA.

Committee Chair Lucero deferred to Committee Member Brian Richart for this question and stated that she can talk about how the documents presented can lead to policy work that can possibly lead to resources.

2:07 pm.: Committee Member Richart thanked UCLA for their presentation then asked for understanding of the uniformity of assessment tools because it is a broad spectrum across multiple disciplines. Committee Member Richart informed that he was not sure what the presentation was referring to and asked for the research team to define community evidence because it is a term he was unfamiliar with.

Dr. Laura Abrams addressed Committee Member Richart's first question and explained that they understand that tools for youth in the system can range from measuring deficits to trying to calculate risk rather than look at the strengths and needs where trauma or behavioral health may need to be addressed. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that they will be looking at tools that are research based and would also focus on identifying strengths with the best possible evidence about what assessment tools could be used in counties that help promote healthy development.

Dr. Laura Abrams addressed Committee Member Richart's second question and explained that there are lots of levels of evidence in research, she highlighted how Mr. Chandler's presentation also consisted of qualitative data through interviews which is an example of community evidence. Dr. Laura Abrams informed that community evidence can be something that isn't published, and that community evidence is broad especially when considering the voices of people with lived experience. She stated that UCLA is collecting multiple types of evidence as they are working on the briefs and will always point out where the evidence is from.

2:10 p.m.: Committee Member Richart replied by asking if what Dr. Laura Abrams was saying is if they are making a claim in the report that appears to be a practice that has better outcomes, as an example, and the source is an interview and assertion made, that they are referencing to an anecdotal level evidence.

Dr. Laura Abrams addressed this question by stating that they would explain and describe that different types of evidence exist, including certain types of evidence that gets funded and National Institutes of Health (N.I.H.) stamped as well as evidence that often goes unnoticed and unused. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that their job as researchers is to understand these levels of evidence and to be able to relay to the

broader audience what they mean.

Committee Member Richart replied by stating that what he wanted to make sure of is that the report contains enough information to demonstrate that this piece of information or the assertion is anecdotal versus backed by a double-blind study level of evidence research. He stated that those are two different things and that he wants to make sure that the report covers that so that he doesn't have to rely on a future policy brief to defend when he must explain why he does or does not practice something in his institution.

Dr. Laura Abrams responded by reassuring that as a part of role of the UCLA team as researchers is to make sure they are very clear about that and will be defined in the report.

2:12 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero called on Committee Member Brooke Harris.

Committee Member Harris thanked the UCLA team and stated that she appreciated the work that has gone into the meetings from December. Committee Member Harris commented that it is clear and contains much synthesis with the previous iterations of the model.

Committee Member Harris stated that her concern is that the premises of both the models, including the element model, is that less restrictive placements being camps or ranches is inferring that Secure Youth Treatment Facilities (SYTF) standards should be based in Juvenile Halls.

Committee Member Harris clarified her stance about this research and model is that it continues to evolve as these programs are developed and that there is not a reliance on juvenile hall as the standard for SYTF. She stated that safe and secure facilities is the only place that some young people can be in and hopes that this model is further defined before ultimately being published. Committee Member Harris stated that there is more nuance when it comes to defining Less Restrictive Placements (LRP) because there should be a vast continuum. Committee Member Harris stated that some of the phrasing in the presentation can infer that juvenile hall is the starting point and she hopes that there is more room to evolve that phrasing as we get further down with realignment.

Dr. Laura Abrams responded by indicating that earlier on in the first iteration of this work they had talked about youth being able to go home sooner, and that from their understanding from working with OYCR and other colleges, is that the youth in the current system is who they are developing this model for and that this is the standard of where they are starting for SYTF at the time of this research. Dr. Laura Abrams then stated that if the laws should change than this work would evolve with that. She then deferred to Committee Chair Lucero for additional comment.

2:15 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero stated that as it stands Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), the statewide youth carceral setting, is closing as of June 30th and what has come up as a solution is a county based, regional based system. Committee Chair Lucero clarified that SYTF's are currently in previously built juvenile detention facilities, although there is a great variety of what that looks like in various counties. Committee Chair Lucero stated that at the present time, when a youth is committed to an SYTF for committing a 707(b) offense that is where a judge will likely place a youth, unless something happens in the court room where a youth will go directly to a less restrictive program. Committee Chair Lucero addressed Committee Member Harris and stated that our job as a committee is to continue to look at alternatives and to evolve but as it stands the current reality is that this is where Judges will be putting kids that they would have ordinarily sent to DJJ.

Committee Chair Lucero welcomed additional feedback from members of the committee.

2:15 p.m.: Committee Member Leventer stated that he agreed with Committee Member Harris, and he didn't know if this report would be the appropriate vehicle but that it should be explicit in defining that juvenile hall is not an appropriate setting for SYTF youth who could have secure placement outside of juvenile halls. Committee Member Leventer went on to state that this is what we all had hoped for when we learned of the Governor's intention of shutting down DJJ although that hasn't materialized, especially in Los Angeles. Committee Member Leventer stated that it's a travesty what we are doing here and that he would like to see this organization, or this report to clearly state that we want to move away from any commitment to a juvenile hall setting for all SYTF youth. Committee Member Leventer clarified that he understands that does not mean a transition to the community directly, but it does mean away from juvenile hall.

2:16 p.m.: Committee Member Leventer thanked Dr. Laura Abrams for the work and that he thinks the roles of credible messengers is critical. He went on to state that this role can eventually be a steppingstone for many of those people to other careers such as to counseling or social work and suggested that she emphasize this in that part of the plan. He also suggested that they emphasize that these positions should be compensated and not volunteer positions. Committee Member Leventer stated that they should be seen and considered as professionals in the urgent work they are doing.

2:18 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero thanked Committee Member Leventer. Dr. Laura Abrams responded to the committee by clarifying that the standards of excellence would not indicate that juvenile hall would be an appropriate place for young people. She also stated that they are given the honor to say what would ideally be the standard of care for a young person. Dr. Laura Abrams informed that a standard of care should include access to a quality assessment, a treatment plan, a team

informed of education and rehabilitation process, and to return to the community. She went on to inform that this is not the environment of a juvenile hall and that it is going to be up to the counties to implement the Stepping Home process. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that she is hoping that they can help follow that process through with the committee to make this a reality beyond the report.

2:20 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero deferred to Committee Member Frankie Guzman for a comment he entered in the chat tool and asked if he would like to speak on it or if he would like her to read it.

Committee Member Guzman's comment in the chat read: "Nothing in the law says a SYTF must be in a juvenile hall."

Committee Member Guzman stated that he felt that people were not addressing Committee Member Harris's point that they hope what is written about secure youth treatment facilities will accurately describe what they know according to science, best practices, and common sense. He stated that presently, what has been created for Judges to utilize might be juvenile hall but that doesn't mean that secure youth treatment facilities are required to be in juvenile hall. Committee Member Guzman clarified that it is a local decision that is being made against best practices and evidence due to administrative convenience. He stated that Judges are deciding to commit youth to secure youth treatment facilities and what they have available is somebody else's decision such as probation or the county. Committee Member Guzman stated that if probation or the county wanted to create a different secure youth treatment facility then the judges would put them there. Committee Member Guzman indicated that we are responding to something inclusive and is subject to change and, hopefully, an evolution. He stated that we honor the words "less restrictive environment" which is required by law to not be the most restrictive inappropriate environment which is what we have now.

2:22 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero thanked Committee Member Guzman and called on Committee Member Prince.

Committee Member Prince stated that all of those that are currently providing the programming and planning for the secure track youth are focused, intently on the step downs and what comes after juvenile hall. He stated that we must be careful about making outdated assumptions about juvenile hall. He went on to say that there has been a fair degree of funding that has gone into repurposing the juvenile halls and that many are actively involved in changing the infrastructure by creating spaces that are not typical of the earlier iterations of the facilities but that look more like college classrooms and campuses with different types of living arrangements. Committee Member Prince informed that youth are already stepping out in Imperial County and that youth are already engaging in activities outside of the juvenile halls as a part of their transition back to their home and communities. Committee Member Prince stated that he would be interested in seeing some of the models from non-Government

Organizations (NGO) and others so they can closely engage with these ideas. He went on to state that he does not believe that all the ideas should be coming from probation. Committee Member Prince stated that he is interested in learning from the step-down models from other organizations to plan along those lines with the goals of getting youth community-based and education-based programming. Committee Member Prince encouraged others to do the same.

2:25 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero thanked Committee Member Prince and called on Committee Member Danielle Lowe. Committee Member Lowe commented on the presentations being in line with much of the work done as a non-profit and asked what they can do now to prepare for the implementation of these next phases. Committee Member Lowe asked if there were trainings or certifications that needed to be done for staff then, asked how they can prepare the community and agencies to ensure they are able to uphold the model to the highest standard and follow through.

2:27 p.m.: Dr. Laura Abrams responded by stating that collaborations are very important and that what she knows from her research is that many times collaboration ideas can fail due to a number of reasons such as gate keeping and other reasons but if this group can focus on a collective approach to encourage agencies to share that the youth they are working with need certain resources in order to maintain a collaborative partnership that this would be the ideal for this process. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that with all the different counties and different set ups she is unsure of how these partnerships will be forged or how they will be tracked. Dr. Laura Abrams stated that this is likely a discussion that will need to be had at some point. Dr. Laura Abrams informed that as the essential elements as well as the research is released, she is assuming that OYCR will present both the data and briefs as quickly as possible. Dr. Laura Abrams then opened it up to OYCR to add any ideas for sustainable collaboration.

2:27 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero responded and stated that OYCR is the entity to develop this work, to build an essential partnership with both statewide advocates and statewide probation structures to bridge these interties for an essential partnership.

Committee Chair Lucero stated that the County Liaison team already tracks data such as the variety of step downs and resources for each county as this work will eventually be a county-by-county approach. Committee Chair Lucero stated that there is a call for applications from probation departments to partner with community-based organizations on less restrictive programming. Committee Chair Lucero stated that this is an iterative process, and we get to create a new paradigm, but this partnership of the committee is an essential component to that.

Committee Chair Lucero stated that in September, OYCR will send out models for feedback and word smithing then asked if anyone else would like to speak on this topic before moving on.

2:29 p.m.: Deputy Director Alani Jackson confirmed that there were no hands in the chat indicating a request to speak. Committee Chair Lucero thanked the UCLA team for their presentations and for taking in all the feedback from the group. Committee Chair Lucero introduced OYCR Senior Consultant Will Lightbourne to discuss funding opportunities.

6. Informational Item: Funding Opportunities

2:30 p.m.: Sr. Consultant Lightbourne reported that OYCR has begun to reach out to various probation departments with funding solicitations to expand services in two specific areas, both of which need to be conducted in partnership with community. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne stated that one of these areas is to support intensive behavioral health services and the other is to demonstrate timely transitions from secure youth treatment facilities to less restrictive programs. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne informed that in OYCR's work with the Consortium through the goal of having all DJJ youth who are in the process of returning to counties go into situations that can serve their needs. He stated that one of the critical issues that has been identified is enough resources to serve a small number of youths with intensive behavioral health needs. The concern is that without these resources to serve the 15-30 youth that are at risk of being placed in a setting with inadequate programming needed for their safety and their healing. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne stated, with this in mind, the partnership proposed a two phased strategy and issued a request for applications. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne clarified that the request has the following two phases; the first is that there are at least five to six hubs that will have intensive behavioral health services in small four to six bed settings. These are anticipated to be held by probation in partnership with behavioral health providers who have the expertise to serve these youth and to follow them back into the community. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne stated that they do not want any youth housed in a secure youth treatment facility due to lack of placement and that the secure youth treatment facility is the only place to receive these services.

2:35 p.m.: Sr. Consultant Lightbourne reported that the second phase would be asking those counties to work in partnership with OYCR, other departments across human services, as well as with stakeholders to define, design and determine how to make transitions from the first phase facilities into a purpose built, designed more community-based behavioral health facility for those youth who have been convicted of serious offenses but also have serious mental health needs. He reported that OYCR is encouraging counties that have an interest to engage with OYCR to look at what regional needs exist, how to get those needs met, and sort of partnerships are available for community providers as well as how to support these partnerships in happening.

2:37 p.m.: Sr. Consultant Lightbourne explained that the second source of funding solicitation is to support a limited number of demonstrations of quick transitions from

secure youth treatment facilities to less restrictive placement within one year of entry to a SYTF. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne stated that this is also informed by the research and work with UCLA for the strategies for step-down. He stated that OYCR is looking for early implementors of this task to provide demonstrations and strategies both to prepare the young person while in a secure youth treatment facility for a quick transition as well as to support through those transitions to community living with housing resources, educational services, income supports and linkages to health and behavioral health services as needed. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne briefly explained OYCR is inviting counties to submit letters of interest by the end of July and then OYCR will work with them to identify and build partnerships as well as to develop proof of concept proposals that can be tested and evaluated over a two-year period. He informed that these results would feed into the developmental work that UCLA is doing in their research and evidence-based practice.

Sr. Consultant Lightbourne informed that both the Request for Applications (RFA) and invitation for letters of interest will be posted to the OYCR website after the committee meeting and that he is optimistic that partners will be able to engage as several counties have already expressed an interest.

2:39 p.m.: Sr. Consultant Lightbourne welcomed Committee Member questions or feedback.

2:40 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero supported the question facilitation and invited members to ask questions if they had any. Committee Chair Lucero stated that OYCR will continue to provide updates on the type of feedback they are receiving. Committee Chair Lucero stated they did have one question regarding the step down RFA in the chat that asked counties to have a program design that allowed youth to earn an opportunity to step out and step home within one year apply, then indicated that this will not apply to some youth. Committee Chair Lucero stated that the average length of stay is 2.6 years and that we know youth do better if they have that interim step to a less restricted program. Committee Chair Lucero informed that as this stand, it is a judicial decision, she went on to state that OYCR is interested in program designs that can have a youth step down to a less restrictive placement in that timeline, based on the research that tells us that, this is a turning point for a youth.

2:41 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero confirmed that there were no questions. Sr. Consultant Lightbourne thanked the committee. Committee Chair Lucero concluded this portion of the meeting and passed the facilitation over to Deputy Director Jackson to facilitate Public Comment.

7. Action Item: Public Comment

2:42 p.m.: Deputy Director Jackson provided instructions on how to provide public comment and welcomed the public to participate.

Deputy Director Jackson called on meeting community member Nazly Restrepo and invited to come off camera as an option.

2:43 p.m.: Community member Nazly Restrepo stated that she was on her phone and would not be able to utilize her camera. Community member Nazly Restrepo stated that she was with a nonprofit in Orange County and thanked OYCR for the information presented in the report. Community member Nazly Restrepo commented that this information is great for non-profits as they look for validation of their work as well as finding funding. Community member Nazly Restrepo commented regarding the comments mentioning concerns around facilities being housed in juvenile hall and stated that she knew that was what was happening in Orange County. Community member Nazly Restrepo added that she understands that this is a starting point of a developing foundation but is concerned about the formation of formal partnerships for small non-profits like her own that want to reach out to justice involved youth. Community member Nazly Restrepo reiterated that her non-profit agrees with everything the report highlighted and stated that her question is how to build and enhance partnerships to overcome the challenges such as the time it takes to establish an MOU especially for non-profits. Community member Nazly Restrepo stated that her hope is that when foundations are being formed that this is taken into consideration because it takes 6 months which is a barrier that delays the start of services. Community member Nazly Restrepo informed that this is a challenge when non-profits have state grants that need to start immediately. Community member Nazly Restrepo stated that she would like to see how Child Welfare Council (CWC) can support a coordinated effort to build the collaboration between Community Based Organizations (CBO) and formal entities like probation moving forward.

2:44 p.m.: Deputy Director Jackson thanked community member Nazly Restrepo and confirmed that there were no more comments.

2:45 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero thanked community member Nazly Restrepo and stated that this is a common and important issue that has been raised by CBO's. Committee Chair Lucero informed that OYCR has created a CBO Capacity Building Group for CBO's to engaged in and deferred to OYCR Chief of Systems Change and Equity, Marcia Rincon Gallardo to connect with community member Nazly Restrepo in the chat to address her issue as it is the type of problem that OYCR is to support with.

2:46 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero concluded public comment and handed the discussion over to OYCR Counsel Alisa Hartz to announce public meetings parameters and the Bagley-Keene Act.

2:46 p.m.: OYCR Counsel Hartz announced a reminder that the Bagley-Keene open meeting act flexibilities around virtual access were presented previously and that those flexibilities were due to expire on July 1, 2023, unless there is a last hour change. OYCR Counsel Hartz stated that for future meetings OYCR is going to need to comply under the prior Bagley-Keene rules about how to establish quorum which state that a majority of committee members need to be present and in publicly noticed locations that are open to the public. OYCR Counsel Hartz stated that OYCR will work with

community members to identify and facilitate one or more locations that will allow for maximum in person participation and that this will be done with well advanced notice to ensure that OYCR can establish quorum for meetings going forward. OYCR Counsel Hartz stated that OYCR appreciates everyone's assistance in adhering to the stricter Bagley- Keene rules that we will have to go back to and stated that she is open to any questions regarding this public announcement.

8. Announcements & Adjourn

2:48 p.m.: Committee Chair Lucero asked for any new announcements to be placed in the chat. 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 also reminded everyone of the next scheduled meetings on September 13th from 1pm to 3pm in Sacramento and December 6th also in Sacramento. Committee Chair Lucero stated that we will look for alternative locations to meet that may include the Bay Area, North Lake Tahoe or even Imperial County.

3:00 p.m.: Meeting Adjourned