



**Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council Meeting
DJJ Realignment Subcommittee Meeting
September 30, 2025, 3:30pm-5:00pm**

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

MEETING MINUTES

1. Welcome – Roll Call

- a. Meeting called to order at 3:47 pm.
- b. Members Present:
 - i. Chief Katherine Miller, Juvenile Probation Department
 - ii. Will Roy, Community Member Appointee
 - iii. Liz Jackson-Simpson, Community Member Appointee
 - iv. Monifa Willis, District Attorney's Office
 - v. Kisai Hernandez, Huckleberry Youth Programs
 - vi. Jessica Mateu-Newsome, Human Services Agency
 - vii. La'Dajah Mark, Juvenile Advisory Council
 - viii. Ron Stueckle, Juvenile Justice Providers Association
 - ix. Patricia Lee, Public Defender's Office
 - x. Rachel Noto, SFUSD & County Office of Education
 - xi. Judge Roger C. Chan, Unified Family Court, Managing Superior Court
- c. Liz Jackson-Simpson asks to dedicate the meeting to Mr. James Bell of the Haywood Burns Institute who recently passed away. Ms. Jackson-Simpson shares that thanks to Mr. Bell's work on reforming detention practices and his advocacy for young people, we are in a much better place today. He was a great friend, a mentor, and coach.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

- a. No public comment.

3. Review and Approval of the 3/4/25 & 4/15/25 DJJ Meeting Minutes

- a. Motion to approve the 3/4/25 minutes made by Patricia Lee; Second by Will Roy
- b. Votes:
 - i. Yes: Chief Miller, Will Roy, Liz Jackson-Simpson, Kisai Henriquez, Jessica Mateu-Newsome, Patricia Lee, Rachel Noto, Judge Roger Chan.
(Monifa Willis, La'Dajah Mark, and Ron Stueckle were not present during this motion.)
- c. Motion passed.

- d. Motion to approve the 4/15/25 minutes made by Chief Miller; Second by Jessica Mateu-Newsome
- e. Votes:
 - ii. Yes: Chief Miller, Will Roy, Liz Jackson-Simpson, Kisai Henriquez, Jessica Mateu-Newsome, Patricia Lee, Rachel Noto, Judge Roger Chan.
(Monifa Willis, La’Dajah Mark, and Ron Stueckle were not present during this motion.)
- f. Motion passed.

4. DJJ Realignment Updates – See attached Presentation

Presented by Emily Fox

- a. Ms. Fox provided a brief overview of milestones in programming implementation in the last four years, resulting from gap analysis and funding prioritization. She mentioned the Credible Messenger and Life Coaches programs as well as the recent roll-out of RISE (a new behavior development program pilot, which will be rolled out to the full facility) and the reentry work that is happening, identifying less restrictive programs for housing for young people. Ms. Fox also spoke of the continuing work to refine the Career Technical Education program, including the CTE Urban Agriculture Program that was launched this fall. In the Spring the updated DJJ Realignment Annual Plan will be submitted to OYCR, and reporting on less restrictive programs will also be required.
- b. She outlined the current SF JPD Probation caseload as 74 youth with prior sustained 707 (b) petitions. There are currently 10 young people in the Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) with two young persons in the Less Restrictive Program. In Juvenile Hall there are currently no young people with 707 (b) offenses.
- c. Programmatic Updates: Sunset Youth Services and Sharp Circle have intensive programs, building relationships with young people and working with Probation Officers, as well as with young people’s circles of support to help them connect with further resources after release. They also support youth with system navigation, integration, and emotional support.
- d. SF JPD is also partnering with less restrictive programs and developing a policy for furloughs that allows SYTF youth to have different levels of supervision (this might be with Probation Officers, as well as with the young person’s family members). Furloughs may be granted for visiting the DMV for example, as well as being an opportunity to visit with family before the youth transitions out.
- e. SF JPD is working with the San Francisco Treasure’s Office to open bank accounts for all SYTF youth under 18. For young people over 18 they can do it themselves. As the young person gets close to re-entry, they get more opportunities to get regular assistance from financial counselors.
- f. Q&A
 - i. Judge Chan asks if the culinary art program will happen
 - 1. Emily Fox confirms that it will start in January
 - ii. Kisai Henriquez asks why we cannot remove some of the pavement outside in our yard to enlarge the garden area for young people’s use.
 - 1. Emily Fox answers that we are in conversation with DPW and are looking at grants to get some of this work done.
 - iii. La’Dajah Mark asks if the CTE certification programming is only for youth in SYTF.

1. Emily Fox answers, yes, but both the instructors are funded in a way where we might be able to do some additional level of programming. Chief Miller adds that young people do apply to participate in the CTE program, and it has been a great experience to be able to read the reasons why they want to participate in the program.
- iv. Patricia Lee asks how many youths have been accepted in the CTE program?
 1. Emily Fox responds that there are 4 (two young people from each unit right now)
- v. Liz Jackson-Simpson asks if the fire camp is still an option?
 1. Emily Fox answers that we have one young person interested - though not currently eligible, but we do have a contract with Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp and the program continues to be an option on the table ready to activate if there is a fit with the young person.
- vi. Patricia Lee asks if young people earn money in these programs.
 1. Emily Fox answers that they can and then have direct deposited into their accounts to make it easier for them to access the funds before they leave.
 2. Chief Miller adds that at the time when SF JPD engaged in a yearlong Juvenile Hall Replacement Concept Design to develop an alternative concept for our current site, young people worked with architects, and they got paid.
 3. Chief Miller also lauded the work that went into creating the bank accounts opportunity, there was a lot of work that went into it. It was in partnership with Financial Justice Project and with assistance from the city's Treasurer's Office.
- vii. Will Roy asks if Roca is still happening.
 1. Emily Fox answers that yes, we are doing our 5th rewire cohort with Roca. Also, Roca is helping us develop our behavioral development program.
 2. Chief Miller adds that we will create a class version for young people as well.
- g. Public Comment
 - i. No public comment.

5. Girls in the DJJ Realignment Population

Presented by Emily Fox

- a. The meeting today will have two presentations focusing on two different programs for girls. Currently girls represent 23% of JPD's total active caseload, 63% Black/African American, 28% Latinx, and 9% AAPI, White, or Other. 16% of girls on JPD's caseload have a prior sustained 707(b) offense. To date, no girls have been ordered to Secure Youth Treatment Facility Commitment or Juvenile Hall commitment for a 707(b) offense.
- b. Q&A
 - i. Patricia Lee asks how many cases are active today .
 1. Chief Miller answers there are 298 current active cases, which encompasses all girl cases, including AB12.
 - ii. Liz Jackson-Simpson comments that we use to send girls out of county
 1. Emily Fox offers that in SF the dispositions for girls in the DJJ Realignment Population with sustained 707(b) offenses might be in-home on probation, or out of home placements, such as Resource Families (RFAs)

or Short-Term Residential Therapeutic Placements(STRTPs). Other dispositions for girls with 707(b) offenses in other counties include ranches or camps. Another disposition is Juvenile Hall/Secure Detention Commitments, or SYTFs, where girls sleep on a female unit, but participate in programs with male SYTF youth throughout the day so they are not alone if there is only one girl in the facility.

- iii. Ron Stueckle asks what placements we have in San Francisco.
 - 1. Chief Miller answers that we have not had a girl committed yet here, but we want to find out what is available and what we want to be ready for, what arrays of possibilities there may be to make sure we would have services. We do have some girls on our caseload, some are with relatives or with professional non-relative foster homes, and some girls are in-home across the state – but now we no longer do out of state group home placements. We mostly use Central Valley area.
- iv. Judge Chan adds that in terms of understanding the population, we need to look at the age and how many are coming out of the child welfare system. Girls with 707 (b) offences are almost all for aggravated assault – typically in a group, what we see is robbery where there is a lot of violence on the victim. Post-COVID, there has been a lot of anger with young women, and girls have experienced a lot of trauma; there are several themes that can help us understand their needs and what a proper disposition might be.
- v. Will Roy, asks if this means that young people who normally would be sent home on probation would now go to a program?
 - 1. Judge Chan answers that we will look at options, and there may be less restrictive alternatives.
 - 2. Chief Miller adds that we are looking at what is available that would be less restrictive, but that we don't yet have available.
- vi. Rachel Noto asks what is available for gender nonconforming youth.
 - 1. Chief Miller answers that it depends.
- c. Public Comment
 - i. No public comment.

6. Presentation from San Luis Obispo County's Coastal Valley Academy - See attached Presentation

Presented by Adam Chambers and Megan Howard of Coastal Valley Academy

- a. An overview of the history and services provided by the Coastal Valley Academy was provided. The academy opened in 2017 and is a custody commitment program committed to affecting positive change in youth by providing a safe and supportive environment, intensive case management, health and mental health services, and engaging youth in pro social activities both in facility and outside the facility. Commitment ranges from 6 months to a year. A short video outlining the program is embedded in the presentation provided.
- b. Q&A
 - i. Judge Chan asks if the youth are still in high school.
 - 1. Answer: Ideally yes, and they can transition into college, it depends on what they are interested in.

- ii. Monifa Willis asks if programs are tailored-based on cognitive behavioral therapy programming.
 - 1. Answer: Clinicians are trained to respond according to the needs of each youth.
 - iii. Ron Stueckle asks if the unit is secure?
 - 1. Answer: It is, but that there is a lot of freedom, and it does not look and feel like a juvenile hall.
 - iv. La’Dajah Mark asks what is the success rate for people completing the program and what would cause youth to get kicked out?
 - 1. Answer: The success rate is very high and they will reaccept the youth as many times as needed – if there are significant new charges they may risk getting kicked out of the program.
 - v. La’Dajah Mark asks if there is transitional housing offered if a youth does not have family
 - 1. Answer: Foster care is a path out and they will look at options based on jurisdiction.
 - vi. Will Roy asks how staff are connected to the community where the youth come from.
 - 1. Answer: Most staff are from the county, and some of the community partners have lived experience having been formerly incarcerated.
 - vii. Rachel Noto asks how the youth are evaluated.
 - 1. Answer: Youth get points based on what and how they participate.
 - viii. Chief Miller indicates that she would like to move forward with Coastal Valley Academy. However, there has not been enough time today for a full discussion and members of the DJJ Subcommittee need more time to review the information; the group will need to reconvene before making a decision.
- c. Public Comment
- i. No public comment.

7. Presentation from Beloved Village - See attached Presentation

Presented by Desiree Victor and Domonique Lindsey of Beloved Village

- a. An overview of the services provided by Beloved Village was provided. Their work focuses on building a thriving future for youth, including addressing rising homelessness and lack of housing sustainability which are prime contributors to the cycle of incarceration. They also focus on financial- and network-building for youth and reducing recidivism. Their core services are centered on interconnectedness with innovative support – looking at what is needed for stabilization – as well as comprehensive reentry planning. This might include helping youth and families with housing, groceries, providing extensive access to resources, connecting with system and community partners, and providing parent support groups and workshops on education.
- b. Q&A
 - i. Chief Miller asks if they also serve kids coming out of Santa Clara County.
 - 1. Answer: Yes they do.
 - ii. La’Dajah Mark asks what is the age range and the participation requirements.
 - 1. Answer: They do prioritize impacted youth, they prioritize the incarcerated – they can accept up to age 21 and youth can get served up to 24 years of age.

- iii. Emily Fox comments that Beloved Village does partner with RAMP LA which is another amazing program, focusing on less restrictive programs, including housing, mentorship and is grounded in restorative practices.
- iv. Monifa Willis asks if this is an alternative program to incarceration.
 - 1. Answer: The program is an alternative to incarceration.
- v. Liz Jackson-Simpson comments on the level of sophistication of older youth who might be in secure track as opposed to younger people who may have different needs and might need a less restrictive structure.
- vi. Ron Stueckle asks if we can visit Central Valley Coastal Academy.
 - 1. Answer: Emily Fox can work to organize a tour.
- c. Chief Miller concludes that this DJJ Subcommittee will need to review and discuss all the information provided to get a stronger idea of the full array of services that would be available for young people, specifically for the DJJ Realignment population, that is the 707 (b) youth group.
- d. Public Comment
 - i. No public comment.

8. Future Scheduling & Agenda Items

- a. Due to time constraints today, future agenda items should be sent to Emily Fox.

9. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 5:13 pm.