



**Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council Meeting
DJJ Realignment Subcommittee Meeting
March 10, 2026, 3:30pm-5:00pm**

**Hosted by the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department
375 Woodside Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94127
Main Conference Room**

MEETING MINUTES (Approved at 4/14/26 Meeting)

1. Welcome – Roll Call

- a. Meeting called to order at 3:37 pm.
- b. Members Present:
 - i. Chief Katherine Miller, Juvenile Probation Department
 - ii. Monika Loya, Bar Association of SF (BASF)
 - iii. Chaniel Williams, Community Member Appointee
 - iv. Will Roy, Community Member Appointee
 - v. Liz Jackson-Simpson, Community Member Appointee
 - vi. Mona Tahsini, Department of Public Health
 - vii. Jean Roland, District Attorney's Office
 - viii. Kisai Hernandez, Huckleberry Youth Programs
 - ix. Jessica Mateu-Newsome, Human Services Agency
 - x. Ron Stueckle, Juvenile Justice Providers Association
 - xi. Patricia Lee, Public Defender's Office
 - xii. Judge Anne Costin (for Judge Roger Chan), Unified Family Court, Managing Superior Court
- c. Member(s) Not Present:
 - i. Rachel Noto, SFUSD & County Office of Education
- d. Chief Miller welcomed back Ms. Tahsini and welcomed Judge Costin to her first time at this meeting.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

- a. No public comment.

3. Review and Approval of the 9/30/25 DJJ Meeting Minutes

- a. Motion to approve the 9/30/25 minutes made by Patricia Lee ; Second by Will Roy
- b. Votes:
 - i. Yes: All members present.
- c. Motion passed.

4. DJJ Realignment Subcommittee Updates – [See attached Presentation on the meeting webpage](#)

Presented by Emily Fox

a. Programmatic Updates

- i. We have been doing a lot of work during the past four and a half years, covering a lot of ground and we now have in place all sorts of programming that we began to conceptualize back in 2021. Among the highlights of the work accomplished are the following:
- ii. We put together re-entry services recommendations and turned them into an RFP; we awarded two grants, one to Sharp Circle and one to Sunset Youth Services to implement these recommendations.
- iii. The Culinary Arts CTE Program launched this past January, with the first final project concluded yesterday, with the young people in the cohort creating and plating a four-course meal served to staff and members of the young people's support team. There will be more cohorts in the future.
- iv. RISE program will roll out to all units
- v. We launched our first Urban Agriculture CTE cohort
- vi. We are in contract with two structured, holistic residential less restrictive programs, (LRPs) for young people stepping down from Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF).
- vii. We have identified the need for additional intensive sex offender services and have a plan to procure those in the coming months.
- viii. We will be submitting the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant for 2026 to the Office of Youth & Community Restoration (OYCR).

b. Updates to the DJJ Realignment Population

- i. There are currently 73 youth on the probation caseload with prior sustained 707(b) petitions; and 12 young people currently committed to SYTF. Four young people are in Less Restrictive Programs (LRPs).

c. Q&A

- i. Patricia Lee asks how many of the young people in secure track have sustained 707(b) sex offenses
 1. Emily Fox responds that one young person does, and the sex offender program will be offered to that young person as part of their rehabilitation plan.
- ii. Liz Jackson-Simpson asks which are the LRP's we contract with
 1. Emily Fox answers RAMP LA and Welcome Home Oasis, both in Southern California, as well as locally, Third Street Youth Center in San Francisco.
 2. Chief adds that we only send youth to those locations if it makes sense for them to be there.

d. Public Comment

- i. No public comment.

5. Coastal Valley Academy Site Visit Report Back

- a. Coastal Valley Academy staff came to present at our last meeting. Subsequently, three members of the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee (Liz Jackson-Simpson, Chaniel Williams and Ron Stueckle) went on a site visit to the Coastal Valley site. JPD is exploring this

partnership to make sure that we would have a menu of different options, especially for girls, and Coastal Valley is a coed facility that offers a lot of programming for girls.

- b. The Subcommittee members who went on the site visit reported back to the group on their impressions:
 - i. While the Coastal Valley facility still felt institutional, the interactions that they observed with staff and the young people were impressive. The facility also allows young people to personalize their rooms, with their own decorative items, as well as allowing awards to be displayed on the outside of their doors. The facility's programming offers opportunities for youth to visit outside on field trips for activities such as getting haircuts and other outings. Coastal Valley also encourages youth's involvement in community activities and offers job training opportunities, as well as skilled services, arts programming, and has a recording studio on site. Coastal Valley's director indicated that they have worked for over 10 years to hire the right staff. At the time of the visit there were only 3 girls there, and a total of 8 youth. Most of the youth seemed to be youth of color, the staff was not as diverse. Members of the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee wished they had more time to engage with the young people as well as seeing more of the outside providers that serve the youth in the facility. They also express the sentiment that an important factor is that programming can support girls with substance abuse and mental health issues. The distance from here is also of concern.
 1. Chief Miller indicates that we would support families to travel to visit their kids at Coastal Valley.
 2. Chief Miller adds that she hopes that we can move forward with a contract with the facility so that we will be ready if the need presents, her concern would be not to have a good option for girls that need custodial placement.
- c. Q&A
 - i. Patricia Lee asks what the cost is
 1. Emily Fox answers that we will get that information
 - ii. Mona Tahsini asks if there were a lot of youth from their own county there, and if there are gender specific activities.
 1. Ron Stueckle and Liz Jackson-Simpson answer that most kids seemed local to the area of the facility, with one youth from Sonoma. And yes there seemed to be gender specific activities.
 - iii. Mona Tahsini asks if the facility can accommodate and support juvenile sex offenders
 1. Chief Miller answers that yes, they recognize that there are many different needs that young people have. And for our girl population, the facility would be an option for girls that need a long-term custodial setting.
 - iv. Patricia Lee asks if there are job training opportunities and how do they handle family reunification, as well as asking clarification if this is a placement program
 1. Ron Stueckle answers that yes there are job trainings, one young person is training to become an airplane mechanic
 2. Chief adds that we would support families to visit from here

3. Chief Miller clarifies that this is a step-down program but it is a custodial program, not a secure track or a placement, and there is much more community integration.
 - v. Patricia Lee would like to confirm more details about credit for time served, cultural responsiveness, language issues, and family reunification, as well as what type of job trainings and other educational opportunities the facility offers.
 1. Emily Fox will provide this information
 - vi. Judge Costin asks if there would be other options available for girls
 1. Chief Miller answers that the other option is to keep the girls here
- d. Chief Miller will ask for a motion to vote on this next time this body meets on April 14, she asks that members of this Subcommittee please consider the matter, and send any questions or comments to Emily Fox.
- e. Public Comment
 - i. No public comment.

6. Review of the San Francisco’s Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG) Annual Plan Submission to the Office of Youth & Community Restoration (OYCR) - [See attached Presentation on the meeting webpage](#)

Presented by Emily Fox

- a. A high-level overview of this year’s updates to the Annual Plan was provided. The plan we submitted last year constituted a big overhaul and we are now more aligned on an annual basis to satisfy state requirements. Data was updated accordingly to reflect the most recent information. We did add information about contracting with Armstrong, PhD for sex offender services, the new executed partnership with the County Office of Education for the culinary arts program, the urban agricultural program, and the college and career counseling offerings. We also outlined upgrades to the outdoor space to accommodate the culinary arts. We added information on all our reentry services grants, and new furlough programming. Our behavioral development program has also been included, along with less restrictive programs such as Welcome Home Oasis and RAMP LA.
- b. Updated information on transfers to adult court is also included.
- c. If we have young people stepping down to less restrictive programs in other counties we are working on closer collaborations with those Probation Departments for curtesy supervision to help support the young people.
- d. As part of a new requirement, the budget table on page 29 of the Annual Plan breaks down prior year’s expenditures outlining the various categories of services and programming with corresponding costs. We get \$2.3 million from the realignment grant, but the grant formula is changing next year. The realignment grant is only one piece of the money we use to pay for what we do, the other funding comes from the General Fund, as well as from a one-time competitive grant that we received from the state for reentry services, but that money will end. For next year, we are hoping that the City of San Francisco (the City) might be able to help fill some of the gaps in state funding.
- e. In addition to Community Based Organizations (CBOs), we also fund other providers of programs for young people that are not CBO’s but who provide needed services for our kids such as Air Tutors services and financial empowerment programs, or hair care services to name a few.
- f. Q&A

- i. Will Roy points out that one of the arguments for closing DJJ was the cost of keeping kids in detention facilities
 - 1. Chief Miller indicates that the closing of DJJ was important, but that yes the cost did shift to counties as they take on responsibility for young people in the juvenile justice system that prior to the closing of the DJJ would have been the responsibility of the state – and counties are getting less support from the state than what they need, yet it is important for kids to be closer to home, and it is important for the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department to support all the reentry services, even as they come at a high financial cost.
- ii. Will Roy observes that every option that the county provides to a child does come with a cost
- iii. Kisai Henriquez adds that there is likely a long-term benefit and cost saving associated with helping kids rehabilitate and going back to community as opposed to being locked up.
- iv. Ron Stueckle asks who watches over our funding sources, and are the General Fund dollars safe
 - 1. Chief responds that we are pretty secure this year, but hoping that the City might fill the gap next year
 - 2. Maria McKee and Chief Miller add that the Controllers’ Office does scrutinize how our dollars are spent. Some of the funding goes directly to the Department of Children Youth and their Families (DCYF) which funds a lot of the CBOS that serve our young people.
- v. Patricia Lee asks what the measures of success are
 - 1. Emily Fox adds that the state does not give us measures of success, though they are soliciting information from counties, it seems that they are in the process of determining how to do it.
 - 2. Chief Miller adds that the Office of Youth & Community Restoration (OYCR) does report back to the Governor’s office and each county will need to figure out a way to show how success is measured.
- vi. Patricia Lee suggests that we could ask our young people what they consider a measure of success
- vii. Chief Miller explains that programming is different from Detention units vs. Secure Track units, some programming are the same, but some are specific to Secure Track kids which are the programs funded by the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant.
- g. Public Comment
 - i. No public comment.

7. Future Scheduling & Agenda Items

- a. Please send feedback on the discussion today, as well as on any items that you would like to discuss in this space to Emily Fox.
- b. Please come prepared to vote on the Annual Plan and on the Coastal Valley Academy at our next meeting on April 14, 2026.
- c. Those members of this body who also sits on the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council will also be voting on the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) Annual Plan on April 14 at the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council meeting.

8. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 4:49 pm.