

**MHSA-FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES**

**March 18, 2021 - FINAL**

Agenda Item / Discussion	Action /Follow-Up
<p><b>I. Call to Order / Introductions</b>            Chair, Cmsr. Douglas Dunn, District III called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.</p> <p><u>Members Present:</u>            Chair, Cmsr. Douglas Dunn, District III            Cmsr. Barbara Serwin, District II</p> <p><u>Absent:</u>            Cmsr. Leslie May, District V            Cmsr. Graham Wiseman, District II</p> <p><u>Presenters:</u>            Dan Batiuchok, Psy.D., Program Manager, Mental Health &amp; Probation Services            Gerold Loenicker, CCBHS Children and Adolescent Program Chief</p> <p><u>Other Attendees:</u>            Cmsr. Joe Metro, District V            Cmsr. Alana Russaw, District IV            Cmsr. Gina Swirsding, District I            Angela Beck            Steve Blum            Jennifer Bruggeman            Dom Pruett, Supervisor Candace Andersen’s Office</p>	
<b>II. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None</b>	
<b>III. COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS: None</b>	
<b>IV. CHAIR COMMENTS: None</b>	
<p><b>V. APPROVE minutes from March 18, 2021 MHSA-Finance Committee meeting:</b>            Cmsr. Douglas Dunn moved to approve the minutes as written. Seconded by Cmsr. Barbara Serwin.</p> <p><b>Vote:</b> 2-0-0  <b>Ayes:</b> D. Dunn, B. Serwin.</p>	
<p><b>VI. DISCUSS Plans and issues involved for a state mandated and funded phased county takeover of all previous state juvenile justice functions between July 1, 2021-July 1, 2025: Gerold Loenicker, CCBHS Children and Adolescent Program Chief, and Dr. Dan Batiuchok, Juvenile Hall Behavioral Health Program Supervisor</b></p> <p>On Aug. 31, 2020, legislators voted to pass Senate Bill (SB) 823. The bill establishes a process for realigning the state’s juvenile system by shifting responsibilities from DJJ to local systems. On Sept. 30, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom signed SB 823 into law. This will close the Department of Juvenile</p>	DJJ Realignment PowerPoint presentation screenshare during meeting.

Justice (DJJ), which is the state-run juvenile detention facilities. It is not a binary closure date, as there is a process. The general plan is:

- July 1, 2021:
  - DJJ will stop receiving new commitments. After this date, the county will no longer have the options to commit youth to DJJ. Any youth will be the responsibility of the county of origin.
  - From that point forward, as the youth currently with DJJ will continue to stay until June 30, 2023.
- June 30, 2023:
  - DJJ will officially close and cease operations.
    - ◇ Remaining youth will be transferred back to their county of origin or transferred to the California Department of Correction and Rehabilitation (CDCR), if indicated in the original commitment.
    - ◇ Between July 1, 2021-June 30, 2023 – efforts made to start population reduction at DJJ for ease of transition, plans are in process.

There are budget projections associated with this proposal. Budget allocations will progressively increase over the next several years (starting with \$1.4 million for FY 21-22) based on the following data points:

- Current DJJ commitments – Number of youth the counties have currently at DJJ.
- Census projections – The number of youth they currently have at Juvenile hall and how much of a change will it be when DJJ youth become part of the population.
- Population of 707B offenders served at the county-level (not at DJJ) – High level offenses (armed robbery, murder, carjacking) and the number of youth with those levels of offenses currently provided services at the county level.

Current Contra Costa (CC) County DJJ Data:

- 21 total youth currently serving commitments at DJJ.
- Six of these youth are committed for sexually related offenses.
- Most, if not all, are male offenders.
- Age of jurisdiction for DJJ ends at 25.
  - Age at county-level juvenile facilities, the jurisdiction ends at age 21.

DJJ Services/Programming

- Mental Health (MH)/Psychiatric services
  - Juvenile Hall
    - ◇ Program Manager, three (3) full-time MH clinicians, one psychiatrist (12 hours/week).
    - ◇ MH Clinicians coverage = Seven days/week, 9:00am-7:30pm
    - ◇ Current population is approximately 45 youth
  - Orin Allen Youth Rehabilitation Facility (OAYRF aka “The Ranch”)
    - ◇ Two full-time licensed MH Clinicians
    - ◇ Coverage = Seven days/week, 9:00am-5:30pm
    - ◇ Current population 17 or 18 youth
  - Probation Field Offices (MH Liaisons) – Community link/transition of MH services for youth leaving Juvenile hall or the Ranch. In addition, they help provide prevention and early intervention for ‘at risk’ youth.
    - ◇ One full-time licensed MH clinician in each of the regional offices
    - ◇ One 90% Family Partner in Richmond Probation Office

◇ Coverage = Seven days/week, 9:00am-5:30pm

- Specific sexual offender treatment program – Youth committed for sexual offenses can be referred directly into this program and in a separate unit. Provides in-custody treatment specifically for sexual offense behaviors.
- Institutional programs – very similar to what is provided at Juvenile Hall.
  - Anger management groups.
  - Social skills groups.
  - Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) ‘Thinking for a Change’.
  - Vocational training:
    - ◇ Computer repair/tech training program,
    - ◇ (Wild)fire prevention program.
- Specialized Mental Health Unit – for more serious MH disorders and youth are screened for that unit when initially committed to DJJ.

#### In Custody MH Services

- Psychiatry (Psychiatrist on site Tuesday/Thursdays) – fills orders, provides assessment, Rx management for youth at both Juvenile Hall and the ranch (currently, approximately 10 youth currently on psychotropic Rx).
- Individual Therapy.
- Family Therapy.
- Trauma-Focused Therapy.
- Coordination with outside providers:
  - All services are performed in accordance with MediCal standards.

Potential Service Gaps as this transition happens, services provided at DJJ, the county currently does not provide and will need to address.

- In-custody sexual offender treatment.
  - No clinicians at Juvenile Hall are trained in the treatment of sexual offenders. Specialized area of training and will need consider. Will we contract with other counties or keep the youth in county, but do not have that capacity at present.
- Services for severely and persistently mentally ill (SPMI) offenders – if we start serving DJJ committed youth, we will be serving those that are older (than typical for Juvenile Hall). Up to the age of 25 and often Schizophrenia, Bi-Polar disorder, psychotic disorders, tend to emerge in late teens, early 20’s and we need to be ahead of the curve and anticipate this population may increase.
- Emergency medication – Along those lines, we cannot provide emergency medication at Juvenile Hall. We do not have the medical staff to legally provide this, no 24-hour physician on-call. MDF does have that capacity, potentially able to administer in the facility. Will need to explore further.

#### Transition Oversight Process

- Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC)
  - Oversight Board that advises the Board of Supervisors (BoS) for specific funding streams that go to probation. The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and Youth Offender Block Grant (YOBG) are two specific funding streams allocated to probation and legislature that stipulates that every county must have a JJCC Oversight Board that makes recommendations for this funding.
    - ◇ Run by Probation and consists of: Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE), Behavioral Health Services (BHS), Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD), District Attorney (DA), Public Defender (PD),

Community-based Organization representatives (CBOs), Community Members, and the JJC.

- ◇ Consultation partnership with Resource Development Associates (RDA) that help and assist in conversations and help draft recommendations submitted to the BoS.

- JJCC – DJJ Realignment subcommittee
  - Subcommittee of JJCC tasked with developing plan for meeting the needs of DJJ youth at the county level. Currently meets weekly.
  - Consultation partnership with Impact Justice to help facilitate and drive process.

This is where the process stands. There are not firm recommendations and are still in process of assessing needs, conducting a gap analysis, gathering input and information. The goal is to come up with a preliminary plan providing recommendations for the first-year transition process at minimum.

**Questions and Comments:**

- (Cmsr. Barbara Serwin) Do you know the cost per person, currently? (RESPONSE) Unknown. DJJ is very guarded regarding information.
- (Cmsr. Alana Russaw) Due to COVID restrictions, how are youth allowed to contact family, since face-to-face visits are not allowed? (RESPONSE) All family contact is via ZOOM. This is done during normal visiting hours/time.
- (Cmsr. Alana Russaw) Along the lines of the SPMI, what about the provisions for the intellectually developmentally disabled (IDD)? I do not know the numbers, but I want to ensure that is being considered, as well. (RESPONSE) Probation is actually really good at partnering with regional center for those cases. When there is indication there might be some intellectual disability (identified or not), regional center will assess to determine eligibility for services. Yes, that is something we need to stay focused and ensure their needs are met.
- (Cmsr. Alana Russaw) Is there any involvement of RYSE (Center, Richmond)? They are doing wonderful things in the community. Are they doing any work in the institution of the youth? (RESPONSE) They are not doing any work in the institution, but have strong representation on the JJCC and JJCC/DJJ realignment subcommittee. One of the sub-chairs of the realignment subcommittee, Stephanie Medley from RYSE and is heavily involved. RYSE is partnered with more in transition planning and lot of the youth coming out of treatment programs from West county are connected with RYSE upon release for case management and to connect with services. Not involved with in-custody services but transition services and are heavily involved in this this realignment.
- (Cmsr. Gina Swirsding) RYSE also works with the school district, when someone has been in custody, they connect with the school.
- (Cmsr. Alana Russaw) RYSE takes great care of our West county youth, but East and Central county lack that resource (are left out). (RESPONSE) There is actually an East county CBO that Probation has a contract with and provides similar type services (RYSE counterpart in East county "People Who Care"). I agree there are fewer CBO in East county. It is a challenge.
- (Cmsr. Barbara Serwin) What is the philosophy driving this realignment? Is it just the ongoing thinking that people are best served in their community? Those being moved from the DJJ, is the assumption they will

be moved into another facility or some will be going back home and treated? Does the budget go to Juvenile Hall and increased funding or going to CBOs? (RESPONSE) Really good questions. The idea of closing DJJ aligns with a general trend of de-incarcerating youth and realization that youth incarceration is not the answer (and incarceration, in general). There is more of a push to serve youth, even if they do need to be incarcerated for (hopefully) briefer periods of time, to do that at the local/county level to have more access to local community resources and family members. As for the budget allocation and how / what it will look like, anything and everything is on the table. I believe it is likely there will be some need to detain some youth at Juvenile Hall if it is determined there is too much risk to the community or to the individual. I also believe it is not just to move them all to Juvenile Hall, but a strong exploration of all options and, in some cases, they will be able to be served in the community. Also, utilizing the Ranch, as well. That is a facility that is very under-utilized and is more of an open facility. This is a reassessment of better options for everyone

- (Cmsr. Douglas Dunn) There has been talk of larger counties ability to contract the smaller counties to absorb their juvenile justice population and operate their programs. Is CCC looking to do this? Have they thought about it yet? Have other counties approached CCC? These are the questions that come to my mind... (RESPONSE) Basically, every county has to make a decision of one of three options: Are we outsourcing services to another county? Smaller counties that just don't have the resources to have their own facility and that is one option, to outsource to the closest larger county. The second option is we are just going to handle our own populations by ourselves. The third options is we are going to handle our county but also going to offer to handle other counties, as well, that might not have the resources or the population to justify their own facilities. I believe CCC is in the second or third category. I do not know if there has been a firm decision made and would be a better question for the Probation Chief Esa Ehmen-Krauss.
- (Cmsr. Douglas Dunn) I think there are opportunities for CCC, based on the facilities that we have, could justify being kept open if CCC does decide to pursue opportunities with other smaller counties. I am aware of the amount of realignment funding over the next few years. Do you feel the funding can fill in some of the gaps you spoke about is adequate? Or do you think there is more funding needed? If you feel there is more needed, let us know and we can advocate with our state legislatures and let them know the \$209mil is not enough. (RESPONSE) I honestly can't answer that questions. What Esa has stated in our DJJ realignment meetings is the algorithm they are using to determine the county allocation actually works very favorably with CCC and just the variables of our population, it seems to bode pretty well for us from a budgetary standpoint, relative to other counties. However, it is hard for me to say for sure. I feel there are a lot of opportunities for collaboration and partnership with probation and behavioral health. Historically, since I have been involved with probation and mental, we have been very excellent partners and collaborators. I am trying to think of ways BHS can come to the table and be a true partner. This is something I feel should continue to be pursued after I am gone.

- (Cmsr. Gina Swirsding) RYSE received federal and state grants. Now that all this is going on, is that still feasible in getting grants to help? (RESPONSE) That is always an option. Probation is well structured to apply for grants. Probation is very vested in that.
- (Cmsr. Douglas Dunn) You have laid out, with CCC taking over all the functions the state provides for CCC through the DJJ, the additional behavioral health services that will need funding at both Juvenile Hall and the Ranch. However, it looks like (with the sexual offenders) that is going to be one of the hardest areas to deal with, do you have an idea of the additional funding that is needed to get the personnel and such that will be needed for that program? If you have an idea, let us know. We can advocate for that through our state representative. (RESPONSE) We have six youth at DJJ right now, that are there for sexual offenses. We do have outpatient CBO that does work with sexual offenders that probation often contracts with. If we were to expand capacity by one clinician, that is potentially enough to serve that population; or, alternatively, to train our clinicians in that service modality, that could be an option as well. If we had one clinician trained to handle those youth, it would be sufficient.
- (Gerold Loenicker) With respect to the last component, if patients can be treated on an outpatient basis where a residential treatment program is necessary, often those serious sexual type of offenses, it requires residential programming and can be very expensive to set up and can only be successful if there is a collaboration between counties. I am hearing counties expressing interest in a regional approach between CC, Alameda, Santa Clara counties to pool funding to create a residential program for this type of population.
- (Cmsr. Douglas Dunn) I am also aware of some counties are thinking, for those over 21 but not age 25 (due to the criminal justice situation involved with certain clients), turning them over to the adult criminal justice system and the adult behavioral health system and that system provides the care moving forward. I don't like that option, but have read that other counties – that's their 'short-answer' and it may not be a good answer but their default answer. I get the feeling CCC are electing to avoid that scenario, if at all possible. Is that correct? (RESPONSE) Speaking from my experience, the JJCC will not allow this to happen. The chances of that in CCC are almost zero.
- (Cmsr. Barbara Serwin) The forces that drive a youth through our various institutions, who need mental health support, and end up at Juvenile Hall. Are they the same forces that drive an adult through various institutions that need mental health care and end up in detention? Is there any distinguishing factor (Adult vs Juvenile) or are there just less mental health resources for youth? (RESPONSE) That is a really complicated question and I believe there are a lot of systemic factors that drive youth into the system. A lot has to do with institutionalized racism, lack of economic opportunities, criminalizing behavior in youth of color that shouldn't necessarily be criminalized. There are so many factors along those lines that end up funneling youth into the criminal justice system, based on their circumstances or the color of their skin... it is definitely a big issue.
- (Cmsr. Douglas Dunn) Can you estimate how many youth are of non-Caucasian currently in Juvenile Hall? (RESPONSE) I don't have an exact number but the estimate is likely upwards of 80%.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Cmsr. Barbara Serwin) New funding resources, is the budget for MH services for the Ranch and Juvenile Hall, all those stable right now? Not looking at cuts. (RESPONSE) There are assurances it is stable and they are not going to be cutting mental health services. (Gerold Loenicker) Majority is MHSA funding, especially the Ranch and the liaisons. It is stable and do not see any cuts. We are very proud of our collaboration with Probation, it has been very successful and well received. We have had very favorable reviews publicly and has been so form many years, under prior leadership as well. The positive of this DJJ realignment is so many other system partners are pooling to this effort; Office of Education, RYSE, DA, PD, etc. There is a very creative dialogue going on and can be very positive.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>VII. Adjourned</b> at 3:07 pm.</p>	