

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
JUVENILE PROBATION COMMISSION**



**FULL COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

**Wednesday, June 11, 2025,**

**5:30 pm**

**Meeting held hybrid with public  
comment at:**

**City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,  
Hearing Room 408 San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Recording link:**

<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/ldr.php?RCID=68a4c2a68f47d48bd22979f00a28b6ce>

**Full Commission:**

Margaret Brodtkin, President  
Linda Martley-Jordan, Vice President  
Johanna Lacoe  
Allison Magee  
Toye Moses  
Manuel Rodriguez

**Meeting Minutes**

Hybrid meeting. Comments would have to be from the public sitting in the audience or by using the meeting link listed above.

**The meeting was called to order at 5:35 pm.**

**1. Roll Call:**

1. Margaret Brodtkin, President – Present
2. Linda Martley-Jordan, Vice-President – Present
3. Johanna Lacoe – Present
4. Allison Magee – Absent
5. Toye Moses – Present
6. Manuel Rodriguez – Present

**2. Land Acknowledgement Reading**

**3. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda**

- a. No public comment.

**4. Expert Presentations on Juvenile Transfers – see attached [PowerPoint](#).**

**a. Dr. Johanna Folk, UCSF Presentation: “Adolescent Development and Juvenile Transfer Decisions” Key Scientific Highlights:**

- a. Youth possess adult-level cognitive reasoning in “cold” (non-emotional) situations by ~age 16, but remain highly susceptible to impulsivity, peer influence, and poor emotional regulation — especially in “hot” contexts.
- b. The brain's executive function areas (working memory, impulse control, decision-making) are underdeveloped until the mid-20s due to continued synaptic pruning and myelination.
- c. Youth behavior is often trauma-influenced, and neurodevelopmental immaturity explains poor judgment or decision-making during adolescence.
- d. Application to Transfer Criteria (WIC 707):
- e. Criminal Sophistication: Youth actions may be impulsive rather than premeditated.
- f. Gravity of Offense: Behavior may seem extreme but arises from immature emotional regulation.
- g. Rehabilitative Potential: Youth are highly responsive to intervention and positive supports.
- h. Prior Delinquency: Patterns often reflect instability and trauma, not future risk.
- i. Other Factors: Youth vulnerability to peers and their environments must be weighed carefully.
- j. Dr. Folk concluded that transfer decisions should incorporate developmental science, emphasizing the critical opportunity for rehabilitation and transformation during adolescence.

**b. Johanna Rasmussen, Chair, JJDP Commission – San Mateo County Presentation: “Juvenile Transfers in California: Policy, Process, and Local Action”:**

- a. Policy Timeline:
  1. Historical shifts included WIC 707(b), Prop 57, and SB 1391, with increasing protections for youth.
  2. SB 823 restructured state juvenile justice and SB 545 raised the evidentiary standard for transfers to “clear and convincing.”
- b. Current Concerns in San Francisco:
  1. Twelve youth were transferred to adult court in 2023 — a notable increase.
- c. Transfer cases involve:
  1. DA motion to transfer,
  2. Court-ordered probation report,
  3. A hearing (often 1–2 weeks),
  4. Final judicial determination.

d. Adverse Impacts:

1. Youth in SYTF pending transfer decisions receive no credit for time served.
2. Transfers are emotionally traumatic, delay adjudication, and are resource-intensive.
3. Youth are often placed in facilities without trauma-informed programming or support.

e. Recommendations:

1. Rasmussen encouraged San Francisco to follow San Mateo's lead by passing a resolution opposing youth transfers.
2. She advocated for regular SYTF oversight, public education campaigns, and systemwide training on court-ordered transfer reports.

c. **J. Vasquez, Policy & Legal Services Manager, CURYJ:**

a. Mr. Vasquez offered deeply personal and compelling testimony grounded in his lived experience. At 16, he was transferred to adult court and sentenced to 31 years to life. He described the harsh and traumatizing reality of entering adult prison as a youth during the "superpredator" era, including being placed on Level IV yards with minimal programming and facing a culture of violence and survival.

b. He reflected on:

1. The lack of mental health support or developmental accommodations in adult prison;
2. The compounding trauma of solitary confinement;
3. The missed opportunity to heal and take accountability during adolescence.

c. Vasquez emphasized that true rehabilitation requires introspection, mental health support, and structured opportunities for growth — none of which were available to him until nearly two decades into his incarceration.

d. He credited changes in law (e.g., Senate Bill 260) and evolving neuroscience as giving him a second chance. Today, he works on youth justice legislation and policy reform. His central message: no youth should have to endure what he experienced. He urged the Commission to:

1. Oppose youth transfers,
2. Support trauma-informed, youth-centered alternatives,
3. Ensure that the system recognizes the developmental differences and potential for transformation among young people.

d. **Comments & Questions from the Commissioners:**

1. **Commissioner Lacoe** asked Mr. Vasquez to share more details about the types of services and supports he finally received later in his incarceration that contributed to his transformation. She was particularly interested in what made those interventions effective,

given the lack of earlier access to rehabilitation.

- a. She also raised a broader systems-level concern about sentencing flexibility. Referencing comments made previously by District Attorney Jenkins, Lacoe noted that one of the DA's primary arguments in favor of juvenile transfers is that the juvenile system imposes limits on the length of confinement available—even in serious cases. From the DA's or a judge's perspective, she acknowledged, this perceived lack of sentencing discretion might seem like a barrier to ensuring public safety or accountability.
  - b. Lacoe suggested that the Commission and presenters consider how to thoughtfully respond to this position, as it is a recurring justification for seeking adult transfer in high-profile or severe cases.
2. **Commissioner Rodriguez** expressed deep appreciation to all three presenters for their insights and contributions. He acknowledged the importance of the developmental science presented by Dr. Folk, the policy context shared by Commissioner Rasmussen, and the powerful personal narrative offered by Mr. Vasquez. He emphasized that their combined perspectives were both informative and moving.
  - a. Noted that the Commission is being looked to for leadership, particularly in response to concerns raised by District Attorney Jenkins during the March 2025 meeting. He stressed the importance of acting with accountability and transparency.
  - b. He posed two broad questions regarding the disparity in the number of juvenile transfer motions filed in San Francisco compared to San Mateo County and asked why San Francisco is seeing an increase in these motions despite statewide reform efforts.
  - c. In closing, he asked Commissioner Rasmussen for clarification on San Mateo's resolution process—specifically, whether public education and stakeholder engagement were conducted before or after the resolution was drafted and adopted. He expressed interest in following a similarly strategic approach in San Francisco.
3. **Chief Katherine Miller** responded to the discussion by acknowledging the depth and importance of Mr. Vasquez's testimony. She expressed appreciation for the list of recommendations he shared and indicated a strong interest in continuing the conversation more directly. She noted that San Francisco currently has 13 young men in long-term care — a significantly higher number than anticipated following recent changes in state law.
  - a. Chief Miller emphasized that the department takes the **five legal transfer criteria** seriously and applies them individually to each case. She clarified that, in her interpretation, those

criteria are distinct from outcomes experienced by youth who have exited the system and should be evaluated accordingly.

- b. She reiterated the department's commitment to building the strongest possible rehabilitative programming for youth in custody and invited Mr. Vasquez to engage in further dialogue to inform improvements in care and services.

#### 4. **Public Comment:**

- a. **Commissioner Paul Bocanegra**, member of the San Mateo County Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission and co-author of the resolution opposing juvenile transfers, offered deeply personal testimony in support of the resolution being proposed for replication in San Francisco.

Bocanegra shared that he is a survivor of the school-to-prison pipeline and was condemned to life without parole as a youth under the now-repealed felony murder rule. He credited his eventual release to **Senate Bill 9**, which outlawed life without parole for juveniles in California. Despite never having killed or ordered harm to anyone, he was sentenced at age 17 and spent more than 25 years incarcerated — including over 12 years in solitary confinement.

He explained that incarceration in adult prison stripped him of the developmental and rehabilitative supports he needed as a youth. Instead, he was absorbed into a prison culture shaped by violence, gang politics, and the absence of accountability structures tailored to adolescents. He reflected on how young people are often sentenced and transferred before they are given access to meaningful services — a cycle that fails to account for trauma, abuse, or systemic neglect experienced prior to their offenses.

Bocanegra urged the San Francisco Commission to act as a check against the failures of other branches of government and support the proposed resolution to prevent further injustice. He framed this action as essential in restoring community trust and honoring the developmental needs and rights of youth.

- b. **Dinky Enty**, Deputy Director at the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice and Co-Chair of the Juvenile Justice Providers Association, praised the depth and clarity of the presentations. She contrasted the thoughtful discussion with what she described as misinformation presented by the District Attorney during the March 2025 Commission meeting. Enty expressed optimism that the Commission

could meaningfully respond to what she characterized as a crisis in San Francisco — where youth are being politicized and subjected to adult transfers.

She concluded her comment with a direct question to the Commission: For the five cases — and one pending — in which the San Francisco District Attorney's Office has filed motions to transfer youth to adult court, does the Juvenile Probation Department disagree with those transfer recommendations?

**5. Action Item: Motion to Adopt Resolution Opposing Juvenile Transfers**

- a. Commissioner Manuel Rodriguez moved for the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Commission to adopt Sample Resolution No. 2022-02, originally authored by the San Mateo County Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission, with two amendments:
  - i. First Paragraph – Replace the reference to “Mission” with “San Francisco Juvenile Probation Commission” to reflect the local body adopting the resolution.
  - ii. Final Paragraph – Revise the language to clarify that the resolution applies to cases involving youth who were under the age of 18 at the time the alleged offense occurred.
- b. Commissioner Johanna Lacoë seconded the motion.
- c. Votes: Yes – Brodtkin, Martley-Jordan, Lacoë, Moses, Rodriguez.
- d. Motion passed.

**5. Chief's Report - PowerPoint is [attached](#).**

- a. Transformation Update: CARC/JSCC Model
- b. Monthly Data Report Highlights
- c. Workforce Update
- d. Budget Update
- e. Key Highlights:

**1. Program Transformation & Model Progress**

- a. The CARC/JSCC model launched in October 2024 to support youth and families from first system contact through the juvenile court process.
- b. Youth diverted by JPD or the District Attorney are primarily served through CARC; those not diverted are referred to JSCCs for ongoing support and community planning.
- c. Oversight meetings with partner agencies and quarterly justice partner feedback sessions have been implemented to improve coordination and ensure effectiveness.

**2. CARC Expansion**

- a. **Expanded Hours:** CARC now operates Monday–Friday from

10 AM to 10 PM and Saturdays 10 AM–6 PM, with a goal of extending hours until midnight.

- b. **In-Custody Assessments:** CARC began conducting assessments for in-custody youth six days a week.
- c. **Hiring Updates:** Recruitment underway for two Justice Navigator roles and one therapist position.

### 3. **Key Metrics & Data**

- a. From July 1, 2024 to June 10, 2025, 148 youth were assessed by CARC.
- b. 191 youth were referred to JSCC CBOs, broken down as:
- c. CJCJ: 41 | SYS: 51 | MNC: 37 | YCD: 34 | BACR: 28
- d. CARC assessments occurred in community locations (113) and at Juvenile Hall (35).

### 4. **2024 Youth and Family Survey**

- a. The department conducted an anonymous and incentivized survey to assess youth and guardian experiences with probation.
- b. **Response Rate:** 181 responses (26% of those contacted); 67 from youth and 114 from guardians.
- c. **Key Findings:**
  - i. Overall favorability was 88%.
  - ii. Youth from District 10 and Spanish-speaking respondents showed some lower levels of agreement in certain areas.
  - iii. Highest-rated items included families' ability to contact probation officers (95% agreement).
  - iv. Lower-rated areas included connection to community support services (80%).

### 5. **Workforce & Budget Updates**

- a. **May Employee of the Month:** Emily Fox, Principal Program & Policy Analyst.

### 6. **Budget Highlights:**

- a. \$4.1M increase in projected state revenue.
- b. Funding allocations include \$3.3M for JJC security system upgrades and \$800K for overtime.
- c. Three major capital projects funded: boiler, elevator, and HVAC upgrades.
- d. Budget presentation scheduled with the Board of Supervisors on June 13 and 20.

### f. **Comments & Questions from the Commissioners:**

- 1. **Vice President Martley-Jordan** commended Chief Miller and her

team for their work on the CARC/JSCC care coordination model. She reflected on how the initiative had grown from a conceptual conversation into a fully developed and intentional program that addresses a critical need in San Francisco. Martley-Jordan noted the significant progress made since the program's early stages and acknowledged its value to youth and families.

She asked whether the department had successfully secured the necessary funding to support the continued operation and expansion of the program, referencing previous updates in which funding remained uncertain.

2. **Commissioner Johanna Lacoe** inquired about the volume of referrals being made to community-based organizations (CBOs) through the JSCC framework. She asked whether the number of referrals to partner agencies was manageable and aligned with expectations. Specifically, she was interested in whether the department and providers found the current caseload sustainable — or if it was exceeding or falling short of projected capacity.
3. **Commissioner Manuel Rodriguez** echoed previous praise for the CARC/JSCC program and emphasized the value of interagency collaboration. He recalled the early stages of the initiative, when the Commission and Program Committee were questioning the efficacy and oversight of nonprofit partnerships and demanding stronger data accountability. He commended the department for establishing a structure that reduces youth re-traumatization and duplication of assessments across systems.

Commissioner Rodriguez expressed hope that, moving forward, the department could draw a direct connection between program data and youth outcomes. He suggested that articulating how specific referrals lead to measurable progress — particularly in alignment with the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) justice-related goals — would be a powerful way to demonstrate the model's value, effectiveness, and long-term necessity.

4. **Commissioner Moses** thanked the department for its inspiring presentation and sought clarification regarding the identification of support systems within the CARC/JSCC framework. Specifically, she asked how the department tracks and defines individuals in a youth's circle of support and how it determines who serves as the youth's primary caregiver — whether that be a parent, grandparent, or other guardian.

g. No public comment

## 6. Consent Calendar:

- a. Submission of request to amend the current Sharp Circle agreement for Reentry Support Services to revise the staffing structure for two Case Manager positions,



changing from two full-time positions (1.0 FTE each) to one full-time (1.0 FTE) and one half-time position (approximately 0.463 FTE).

- a. No public comment.
- b. Commissioner Lacoë moves approve the consent calendar.
- c. Commissioner Moses seconds.
- d. Votes: Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoë, Martley-Jordan, Moses, and Rodriguez
- e. Motion passes.

**7. Future Agenda Items**

- a. Report on Secure Track – **A status update and discussion on San Francisco's implementation and use of Secure Track, including capacity, youth served, and outcomes.**
- b. Planning for Future Community Meetings – **Consideration of potential community-based meetings to increase public engagement and transparency.**
- c. No public comment.

**8. Review and Approval of the Commission Meeting Minutes for April 9, 2025 and May 14, 2025:**

- a. Vice President Martley Jordan moves to approve the minutes.
- b. Commissioner Moses seconds the motion.
- c. **Votes: Yes: Brodtkin, Lacoë, Martley-Jordan, Moses, and Rodriguez**
- d. No public comments.

**9. Adjournment:**

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.