



County Executive
David Villanueva

Governmental Relations and
Legislative Officer
Elisia De Bord

County of Sacramento

Board of Supervisors
Phillip R. Serna, District 1
Patrick Kennedy, District 2
Rich Desmond, District 3
Sue Frost, District 4
Patrick Hume, District 5

May 3, 2024

The Honorable Anna Caballero, Chair
Senate Appropriations Committee
State Capitol, Room 2200
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: SB 1057 (Menjivar). Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council.
Oppose (As amended April 25, 2024)
Hearing: May 13, 2024**

Dear Assembly Member Menjivar:

On behalf of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, I respectfully write to oppose SB 1057. This bill repurposes and reprioritizes new processes that will redirect the expenditure of critical juvenile justice investments. This funding resulted in a 60% decline in youth detention rates and a 73% decline in juvenile arrest rates over the last decade statewide. Sacramento County has observed an approximate 73% decline in bookings at the Youth Detention Facility over the last 15 years.

SB 1057 also revises the composition of local Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils and changes the multiagency juvenile justice plans. It forgoes collaborative and multi-agency approaches, which have been essential to support an entire continuum that prevents juveniles from becoming more system involved.

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

SB 1057 would negatively impact county funding in several ways:

- New language in the bill would allow the State via the Board of State and Community Corrections to withhold the funding if a county fails to establish a juvenile justice

May 3, 2024

-2-

coordinating council. This mechanism is subjective, unclear, and sets a precedent for funding to counties to be withheld for service delivery that is provided by counties.

- Establishes a new request for proposals process for these funds to be disbursed and would prohibit a law-enforcement related agency from overseeing the process. Utilizing this process can result in bifurcated processes to get funding out into the field and into programs and may further delink the ability to fund programs and efforts that reflect the multiagency plan.
- Redirection of important investments in local systems would create instability and diminution for the provision of necessary support and services for youth in our communities. We would reiterate the constitutional concerns associated with the requirement to redirect JJCPA resources, given that this funding resides within the 2011 fiscal structure that is constitutionally protected under the provisions of Proposition 30 (2012).
- Changes and adds new elements and information within what is required to be included in the local plans.
- Changes and adds new requirements for information that is included in the annual report to the State.

While we acknowledge the benefit of having multiple perspectives on this committee, the local councils currently include an at-large community member and representatives from nonprofit community-based organizations to provide services to minors. It is sometimes challenging to obtain participation from all members within the current committee composition despite probation's best effort. The requirement to add members creates considerable obstacles to meet the goals of the committee. The changes to the composition exacerbate the issues noted above regarding the ability of the state to withhold funding if a council is not established. Counties and probation are statutorily responsible for the safety and rehabilitation of all youth across the juvenile continuum, yet this bill removes probation from the role of coordinating the planning process with these statutory duties. Therefore, probation and counties take on the responsibility and accountability for outcomes of juvenile services without the ability to coordinate and guide the plans to meet the goals, outcomes, and requirements.

Finally, this measure mirrors failed legislative efforts: AB 1007 (Jones-Sawyer, 2020), SB 493 (Bradford, 2021), and AB 702 (Jackson, 2023). For these reasons, Sacramento County opposes SB 1057. Please feel free to contact me at (916) 874-4627 or deborde@saccounty.gov.

Sincerely,



Elisia De Bord
Governmental Relations and Legislative Officer

cc: Hon. Caroline Menjivar
Sacramento County Delegation
Chair and Members, Board of Supervisors
Audrey Ratajczak, Cruz Strategies
Danielle Sanchez, CPOC