



RESOLUTION No. 21-525

OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF NEVADA

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE SB823 JUVENILE JUSTICE REALIGNMENT BLOCK GRANT ANNUAL PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021/2022 AND AUTHORIZING THE CREATION OF A SPECIAL REVENUE FUND

WHEREAS, the Senate Bill 823, passed in 2020, requires the County of Nevada to establish, and renew each year, a Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Annual Plan and requires the Plan to be approved by a subcommittee of the Multiagency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, and accepted by the County of Nevada Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the statutorily prescribed sub-committee of the Multiagency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council reviewed and unanimously approved the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Annual Plan for 2021-2022; and

WHEREAS, the County of Nevada will adhere to the requirements of the DJJ Realignment Act regarding the submission of the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Annual Plan to the Office of Youth and Community Restoration, expenditure of funds and submission of required reports.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors, of the County of Nevada, accepts the County of Nevada 2021-2022 Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Annual Plan in the amount of \$250,000 and directs the Auditor-Controller to create an interest bearing special revenue fund for the purpose this program.


PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Nevada at a regular meeting of said Board, held on the 14th day of December, 2021, by the following vote of said Board:

- Ayes: Supervisors Heidi Hall, Edward Scofield, Dan Miller, Susan K. Hoek and Hardy Bullock.
- Noes: None.
- Absent: None.
- Abstain: None.

ATTEST:

JULIE PATTERSON HUNTER
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: 


Dan Miller, Chair



Nevada County
Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant
Annual Plan

FY 2021/2022

Contents

<u>Executive Summary</u>	3
<u>Part 1: Subcommittee Composition (WIC 1995(b))</u>	3
<u>Part 2: Target Population (WIC 1995((1))</u>	4
<u>Part 3: Programs and Services (WIC 1995(c)(2))</u>	7
<u>Part 4: Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Funds (WIC 1995(3)(a))</u>	11
<u>Part 5: Facility Plan</u>	13
<u>Part 6: Retaining the Target Population in the Juvenile Justice System</u>	14
<u>Part 7: Regional Effort</u>	15
Part 8: Data	15

Executive Summary

Senate Bill 823, passed in 2020, established a Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant program to provide county-based custody, care, and supervision of youth who were realigned from the Division of Juvenile Justice or who would have otherwise been eligible for commitment to the division. The bill appropriated moneys from the General Fund for these purposes.

Welfare & Institutions Code Section(s) (WIC) 1990-1995 established this program and stipulated that to be eligible for funding allocations associated with this grant program, counties shall create a subcommittee of the multiagency juvenile justice coordinating council to develop a plan describing the facilities, programs, placements, services, supervision and reentry strategies that would be needed to provide appropriate rehabilitative services for realigned youth.

County plans are to be submitted and revised in accordance with WIC 1995, and may be posted, as submitted, to the Office of Youth and Community Restoration website.

Part 1: Subcommittee Composition (WIC 1995(b))

Agency	Name and Title	Email	Phone Number
Chief Probation Officer (Chair)	Jeff Goldman; Chief Probation Officer	Jeff.Goldman@co.nevada.ca.us	530-265-1211
District Attorney's Office Representative	Jesse Wilson; District Attorney	Jesse.Wilson@co.nevada.ca.us	530-265-1432
Public Defender's Office Representative	Keri Klein; Public Defender	Keri.Klein@co.nevada.ca.us	530-265-1400
Department of Social Services Representative	Nicholas Ready; Child Protective Services	Nicholas.Ready@co.nevada.ca.us	530-265-1654
Department of Behavioral Health	Phebe Bell; Director of Behavioral Health	Phebe.Bell@co.nevada.ca.us	530-470-2784
Office of Education Representative	Scott Lay; Nevada County Superintendent of Schools	Slay@nevco.org	530-478-6400
Court Representative	Tonya Clark; Court Operations	Tonya.Clark@nccourt.net	530-362-5288
Community Member	Melinda Douros; Juvenile Justice Commission	Melinda@caofnc.org	530-263-4506

Community Member	Charles Covert; Juvenile Justice Commission	Chuck@coovert.net	530-913-8775
Community Member	Tim Reid; Juvenile Justice Commission	Treid@njuhsd.com	530-520-1820

Part 2: Target Population (WIC 1995(c)(1))

Part 2 of this plan addresses the following statutory requirements:

- Briefly describe the County's realignment target population supported by the block grant,
- Demographics of identified target population, including anticipated numbers of youth served, disaggregated by factors including age, gender, race or ethnicity, and offense/offense history,
- Describe any additional relevant information pertaining to identified target population, including programs, placements and/or facilities to which they have been referred.

Nevada County has historically had very few commitments to the Department of Juvenile Justice. Though commitments are low, it is imperative for the community to consider the number of youths that commit eligible offenses which could land them in secure custody commitment. This relatively small number of especially egregious offenses can have disproportionate impacts on a small community like Nevada County with offenders and victims potentially attending the same schools, shopping at the same store, and seeking services in the same places from the same providers.

Those youth that are not committed to custody commitments are granted probation by the Court and supervised by the Probation Department with the goal of addressing the underlying causes of their criminal behavior. Our primary goal of our local juvenile justice system is providing every service possible, given our resources, to assist system involved youth in becoming successful members of our community. Following are some of the statistics that we have considered in identifying this population.

When considering the number of youths that might fall into this category, we have considered not only those youth who were adjudicated as wards of the court, but also those youth who were referred for prosecution. We have done so with the recognition that given slightly different circumstances some of these cases might have proceeded through the juvenile criminal system and resulted in different outcomes.

The data included herein is somewhat limited in scope since the Probation Department only implemented an electronic trackable case management system in the last several years. Although it is possible that further detail might be revealed if a deeper dive were to occur, it is unlikely because earlier cases, if not purged, are sealed.

The information below provides both a high-level overview of demographic information for all WIC 707(b) qualifying referrals that have been made in the last ten years and a more specific look at those cases that are adjudicated as wards of the court, which is the primary target population.

Below is illustrated the total number of referrals that were made for WIC 707(b) offenses during the years of 2011-2020, generally categorized into crime categories.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Totals
Assault	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	73
Drug/Other	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Property	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Sex Offense	■	■	■	■	13	■	17	■	■	■	79

As can be seen from this data, Nevada County has approximately 18 cases per year with qualifying WIC 707(b) offenses. Almost 45% of these cases are sex offenses, with 41% of cases related to some kind of assault, ■ are property offenses and ■ are drug/other.

Further information gleaned from this high-level overview reveals that 90% of all qualifying referrals are committed by males with only 10% committed by females. 60% of all referrals are for youth between the ages of 15-17, while 32% are for youth between the ages of 14 and under, and 8% are 18 and older. Additionally, the chart below compares the approximate racial demographic data of Nevada County with that of these 176 youth.

	White	American Indian	Hispanic	Asian	African American	Other/Unknown
--	-------	-----------------	----------	-------	------------------	---------------

Nevada County	85%	█	10%	█	█	█
WIC referrals	707(b) 72%	█	19%	█	█	█

While this data provides an overarching picture of all qualifying referrals, many of these cases are either not filed on by the District Attorney or dismissed for a variety of reasons after filing. Of the 176 cases that are considered here, only 32 {18%} were adjudicated as 602 wards of the court. Several cases came from the local congregate care settings where the youth are not residents of Nevada County and are already receiving on of the highest levels of care.

There is no indication that there have been significant shifts within the juvenile criminal cases that we have seen between 2011-2020, and it is estimated this number will remain at the average of 18 eligible cases per year. It is also logical to conclude we will continue to see an average of 3 of these adjudicated.

If it is determined that remaining in the home is contrary to the youth's welfare and all reasonable efforts have been made for the youth to remain the home, their needs and risks are assessed which are primary drivers for where youth are placed. As Nevada County is considered a rural county, proximity to their home is given great weight. The Probation Department has always encouraged and supported youth and their families to remain in contact and involved in the youth's program as much as the placement allows. Youth and families need to be within a reasonable distance to ensure visitation was more easily feasible.

Most out-of-home placements for eligible youth were within the greater Sacramento area and northern California. Some youth in out-of-county placement were youth who committed sex offenses and were often placed in Sacramento County at group homes which specifically focused on and provided sex offender treatment as well as life skills, employment opportunities, community work service, and evidence based cognitive behavioral therapy groups. Other youth placed in out-of-county placement were youth who needed more intensive drug and alcohol treatment, as well as mental health treatment. All group home placements offered life skills, employment opportunities, community work service and evidence-based cognitive behavioral therapy groups, targeted to the specified needs of the youth.

Part 3: Programs and Services (WIC 1995(c)(2))

Part 3 of this plan addresses the following statutory requirements:

- Provide a description of the facilities, programs, placements, services and service providers, supervision, and other responses that will be provided to the target population.

For those youth that are committed by the Court to secure track, Nevada County will utilize partnerships with other counties to securely house youth, such as Placer County. Prior to any youth requiring a custody commitment we will make every effort to identify and establish agreements with willing counties and/or county-based entities that have the available capacity and appropriate services to meet the needs of our youth. Given the scarcity of juvenile custody facilities in Northern California which have these capacities, we will be creative in cultivating relationships with other jurisdictions in order to meet the needs of this population. Nevertheless, we will make every effort to find facilities that are as geographically close as possible in order to facilitate family visitation throughout the custody commitment and to facilitate successful reentry services.

For those youth that do not receive a custody commitment but rather are placed on probation, a variety of services and supports will be offered through normal case management. Typically, the least restrictive placement is sought which still meets the needs of the youth. This has become increasingly challenging in recent years due to demand for placement and the decrease in options as a result of the ongoing restrictions on these types of placements through the Continuum of Care Reform. Though foster homes and therapeutic foster homes are ideal, they either are difficult to find or are not appropriate placements due to the lack of needed services. Therefore, it is likely that STRTPs will continue to be utilized to provide the required services for these youth determined in need of removal from the home. A general description of where the Department has been able to secure placements for eligible youth is included in the previous section.

Typical services provided locally to this population include counseling through Granite Wellness and Victor Community Support Services, local partners, mental health and therapeutic services through Nevada County Behavioral Health. Additionally, educational services are closely monitored by the Probation Department as part of case management and a close partnership with the County Office of Education results in steady, if not always successful, educational progress by most youth. Continuing adult education is also sourced through the school district.

One identified need is for more substantial cognitive behavioral programming for local youth, which encompasses this target population as well. The Probation Department has established more robust programming facilitated by staff in recent years, however partnerships with other

entities, whether they be the traditional county partners or scarce CBOs, will be needed to expand these opportunities for CBT, basic living skills, and other prosocial programming.

With a Juvenile Services Unit staffed at 1 program manager, 1 supervisor, 4 officers, Probation Department resources are never voluminous but have proved effective. Traditionally the bulk of the target population has been supervised by Probation for the past 10 years. The high needs of this population are identified and often, though more difficult with the recent Continuum of Care Reform due to program scarcity, appropriate placements are secured with a fairly high successful completion rate for this demographic. Those youth that remain local receive regular supervision by the Juvenile Unit commensurate with the needs of the youth and their families.

A likely scenario for qualifying youth will be not only receiving case management and programmatic services out of custody on probation, but also being incarcerated for periods of time in Juvenile Hall. Many of these services and programs already mentioned are also offered for the local in-custody population as well. Additionally, Juvenile Hall staff facilitate other evidence-based programming for in-custody youth such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) for social skill competence and moral reasoning, Aggression Replacement Training (ART) for better managing anger and reducing aggressive behavior, an interactive life skills program, and others. Other programs are also available for qualifying youth both in and out of custody such as WRAP Services, parenting skills, crisis intervention and psychiatric services. Semi-structured programming is also a regular component of the Juvenile Hall experience.

Functional Family Probation (FFP)

FFP was created as a case management practice for juvenile justice workers who are charged with supervision of youth in a community setting. FFP can be utilized in custody and out of custody. FFP is an evidence-based approach to supervision. It is informed by the four decades of scientific investigation about how we can engage and motivate high risk teens and their families to reduce youth recidivism. It has been implemented on a statewide and county basis in many communities.

Traditional supervision models are also commonly organized to monitor and intervene with *only* the adjudicated or identified youth. A strength of FFP is that it employs the support of family and/or community members. By strengthening family functioning and creating broader working relationships, we greatly increase the likelihood for long term success with the youth we're charged to supervise. The data show that by enlisting the support of the essential people in a youth's life and having them work together we can begin to alter the context from which problem behaviors occur.

The Functional Family Probation process includes protocols, practices, services and supports to:

- Treat the juvenile, family and community as a whole.
- Increase protective factors with the juvenile and family.
- Reduce high risk factor with the juvenile and family.
- Reduce juvenile criminal recidivism.

FFP Protocols were implemented in 2019. The FFP process may include a social worker, probation officer and system partners who meet with the youth and their family to identify their needs and strengths and leverage available services in the community. Based on the needs identified, youth may be referred to mental health treatment or community services to prevent further involvement in juvenile justice.

Community Based Organizations

Probation has a strong history of working closely with Community Based Organizations throughout Nevada County to support its goals and the success of justice involved youth. Such as Bright Futures for Youth, Big Brother/Big Sisters, Sierra Forever Families, Family Resource Center, Common Goals and Granite Wellness.

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) is a short-term form of behavioral treatment. It helps people problem solve. CBT also reveals the relationship between beliefs, thoughts and feelings and the behaviors that follow. Probation is a proponent of and actively employs the use of cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) programming throughout the department.

Trauma-Informed Care

In recent years' Probation has trained with and become involved with the use of trauma informed care in how we provide services and work with justice involved youth. A trauma informed care approach strives to understand the whole of an individual seeking or needing services. When a trauma occurs, it can affect one's sense of self, their sense of others and their beliefs about the world. These beliefs can directly impact an individual's ability to connect with and utilize support services.

Children's System of Care (CSOC)

The Probation department and local allied agencies participate in a System of Care approach in supervising and managing justice involved youth. It can be described as effective, community-based services and supports for youth who are considered at risk or other challenges within the family dynamic. The organized and coordinated network builds meaningful partnerships with families and youth and addresses any cultural needs, to better thrive and function in home, school and the community.

On August 24, 2021, the Nevada County Board of Supervisors passed resolution 21-372 creating a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in response to Assembly Bill 2083 (2018). The parties in the MOU include the Probation Department, Department of Public Health, Social Services, Behavioral Health, Superintendent of Schools and Alta California Regional Center.

CSOC partners seek to ensure that all public programs for children, youth and families shall provide services in an integrated, comprehensive, culturally responsive, trauma informed, evidence-based/best practice manner, regardless of the agency door by which children and families enter. This mission includes an awareness of and a commitment to incorporate the voices and experience of youth and family into county level collaborations and partnerships that manage or oversee the delivery of services affecting children and youth.

Part 4: Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Funds

(WIC 1995(c)(3)(a))

Part 4 of this plan addresses the following statutory requirements:

- Describe how the County plans to apply grant funds to address the mental health, sex offender treatment, or related behavioral or trauma-based needs of the target population,
- Describe how the County plans to apply grant funds to address support programs or services that promote healthy adolescent development for the target population (WIC 1995(c)(3)(B)),
- Describe how the County plans to apply grant funds to address family engagement in programs for the target population (WIC 1995(c)(3)(C)),
- Describe how the County plans to apply grant funds to address reentry, including planning and linkages to support employment, housing and continuing education for the target population (WIC 1995(c)(3)(D)),
- Describe how the County plans to apply grant funds to address evidence-based, promising, trauma- informed and culturally responsive services for the target population (WIC 1995(c)(3)(E)),
- Describe whether and how the County plans to apply grant funds to include services or programs for the target population that are provided by nongovernmental or community-based providers (WIC 1995(c)(3)(F)).

For those youth in this target population that are granted 602 wardship and probation, the vast majority already qualify for funding which pays for needed services and programs. It is a rare occurrence that a youth or family does not qualify for funding that can be drawn down to pay for services or appropriate placements, such as Title IV-E funding. As a result, it is forecasted that

there will be limited demand on the block grant funding to provide for services for these youth that are on probation supervision.

The County intends to earmark a portion of the funding received annually to assist in reentry of our young adults after a custody commitment and other locally based services. This amount may need to be flexible depending on the number of youths currently in custody and available resources and will be evaluated on a year-by-year basis.

Additionally, funds utilized to pay for custody commitments will support appropriate mental health, sex offender, or related behavioral or trauma-based programs as needed by the youth.

It is clear given the nature of the offenses which place a youth into this category more robust programming options may be needed for this population. Setting aside the programs available while in a custody commitment which will be provided by the hosting county, those youth on probation supervision will continue to need and receive all available support and direction that can be provided at the local level.

In line with the conception of how funding will be utilized for our youth, it is believed that supporting the family's engagement with the youth, whether in custody or reentry, will be a primary demand on funding. As housing for the custody commitment will likely be out of the region, regular financial support for the family to maintain contact with the youth would be a reasonable usage of this funding. This might take the form of providing for fuel, lodging, or other travel expenses. Funding also might support the ability of the family to maintain electronic or phone contact with the youth by paying for phone or internet connections.

As the County intends to annually earmark a portion of the funds received for reentry assistance, this funding will also be utilized to facilitate family engagement during both the custody commitment and reentry period.

Reentry after a custody commitment or an out-of-county placement will likely require funding for supervision and services provided through standard case management. For those that are on probation and reentering the community after placement other funding streams may be used to pay for needed services, though there may be specific circumstances which would require financial support from the block grant.

These young adults, likely on parole, will typically be coming back to the community with limited resources and limited funding available to pay for services for them. Though service providers and treatment resources will remain scarce in the county, the ability to utilize this funding stream may provide opportunity to meet the needs of this population upon reentry into the community. This could include housing support, connection with local employment resources and job-finding, as well as the possibility for engagement with adult education services.

For those youth that receive custody commitments, careful coordination with the housing county to ensure that available programming will match the needs of the youth will be a priority. This will include the availability of evidence-based programming and culturally responsive services. As juvenile halls across the state are mandated to provide such services along with utilizing trauma-informed practices in day-to-day operations, any custody commitment will offer an adequate baseline provision of all these services. If we have a choice of possible housing counties, then refinement of commitment choice will be guided by what specific needs the youth has and if one county has any particular program or service that more closely matches that need than another.

Grant funds will primarily be utilized to pay for the custody commitment. We recently closed our detention facility due to underutilization. This came about from a change in philosophy. We used secure detention for youth that posed a public safety risk that could not be managed in the community. That approach resulted in the facility being totally empty at times. Given the cost of disposition, one or two secure track commitments could use all our expected funding from this grant. That is why the majority of the funds will be secured for such instances.

As Nevada County will be utilizing partnerships with housing counties for custody commitments, the availability of local services will be outside of our local control. However, funding may be used to provide services for eligible youth on probation through the minimally available community-based service providers locally present. As stated previously, the need for such financial support will be heavily influenced by the availability of other funding streams that are typically used for youth on probation. Grant funding would be utilized to fill gaps in services when a community-based organization (CBO) can be identified which would provide an appropriate program or service.

Part 5: Facility Plan

Part 5 of this plan addresses the following statutory requirements:

- Describe in detail each of the facilities that the County plans to use to house or confine the target population at varying levels of offense severity and treatment need, and improvements to accommodate long-term commitments. Facility information shall also include information on how the facilities will ensure the safety and protection of youth having different ages, genders, special needs, and other relevant characteristics. (WIC 1995(4)).

As discussed in Parts 3 & 4, in assessing local resources it has been determined that Nevada County cannot adequately provide an appropriate custody setting and programming for our eligible youth in our local Juvenile Hall due to its closure in 2021. As a result of this and our yet

to be established partnerships, it is impossible to describe specific housing facilities outside of stating the obvious fact that all juvenile facilities in the State of California are required to meet state standards and regulations in order to continue to serve juvenile populations. For any custody commitment, the considerations of how to ensure the safety and protection of our youth given their ages, genders, special needs, and other relevant characteristics will be of paramount importance for the Probation Department in choosing an appropriate partner county for the commitment.

If currently contracted facilities cannot be utilized as the most appropriate facility for the targeted youth, it is anticipated that other specialized facilities will be used through the developing consortium of counties. Nevada County does not have oversight or control of how contracted facilities are designed or operated. However, Nevada County will be diligent in monitoring contracted facilities for the safety and protection of all potential local youth. Contracts will not be renewed to facilities that do not ensure these standards. Decision making on whether target population youth would be best served in an existing contracted juvenile hall or in a consortium based Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) will be based upon the least restrictive option that provides care, treatment and guidance that is consistent with the best interests of the youth and the public as required by Section 202(b) of the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC). Considerations for the safety and protection of all youth in the facilities will take on additional importance given the probability of older (up to and including age 24) and more sophisticated target population youth now remaining in local commitment for extended periods. Youth will continue to be classified for specific housing based on requirements contained in Title 15 and the policies and procedures of the hosting county facility. These requirements are intended to provide for the safety of youth, facility staff and the public by placing youth in the least restrictive housing and program settings that can meet their needs.

Part 6: Retaining the Target Population in the Juvenile Justice System

Part 6 of this plan addresses the following statutory requirements:

- Describe how the plan will incentivize or facilitate the retention of the target population within the jurisdiction and rehabilitative foundation of the juvenile justice system, in lieu of transfer to the adult criminal justice system: (WIC 1995(5)).

Youth in this target population have committed serious offenses. The existence of this local plan, which provides the Court with an alternative to retain the youth in the juvenile justice system, is in itself an incentive. There is a long-standing belief, whether warranted or not, that State operated facilities did not have the best interest of youth in mind. This created a hesitancy to

dispose youth to either the adult and/or juvenile systems. However, as illustrated by our lack of juveniles in state care, juveniles in the adult system, and out transitional aged youth program, our local system needs little convincing as to the appropriate handling of youth and young adults. The practices of California Probation Departments since juvenile realignment in 2007 to provide youth with the very best services and rehabilitation possible has resulted in a precipitous decline in juvenile incarceration and crime. Now, the realignment of this most serious population of juvenile offenders to county responsibility, while posing many challenges, provides justice partners like the District Attorney, Public Defender, and most importantly the Court the option of adjudicating these youth to a system with a proven track record of rehabilitation.

This plan which emphasizes local control and solutions provides the best incentive possible in these difficult cases. Outside of the mere existence of this plan there remains little to incentivize other independent entities within the juvenile justice system who have their own roles and mandates to consider in their determinations. Each of these extremely difficult cases must be judged upon its own merits given the impacts to the victims, the community, and the offender at the time.

Part 7: Regional Effort

Part 7 of this plan addresses the following statutory requirements:

- Describe any regional agreements or arrangements supported by the County's block grant allocation: (WIC 1995(6)).

For those youth that are committed by the Court to custody commitments Nevada County will utilize partnerships with other counties to securely house youth, such as Placer County. Prior to any youth requiring a custody commitment we will make every effort to identify and establish agreements with willing counties and/or county-based entities that have the available capacity and appropriate services to meet the needs of our youth. Given the scarcity of juvenile custody facilities in Northern California which have these capacities, it is possible that we will solicit partnerships in other local jurisdictions. Nevertheless, we will make every effort to find facilities that are as geographically close as possible in order to facilitate family visitation throughout the custody commitment and to facilitate successful reentry services.

The statewide county consortium which provides a stable and unified system provides secure housing options for custody commitments without the need for multiple individuals, county-to-county agreements. The statewide consortium offers the opportunity to

- Remove or mitigate barriers presented by county borders for the deepest end of the juvenile justice continuum,

- Ensure program capacity is available to replace the loss of the state level of the continuum
- Increase predictability in planning for population and staffing needs,
- Leverage joint resources to provide similar level of service delivery backed by research and technical assistance, and
- Enhance the benefits of the economies of scale planning.

It is envisioned that a statewide consortium could possibly fill the following functions:

- Track and manage available capacity across the state
- Coordinate information regarding secure placement options based on region, gender, program needs, and other agreed-upon criteria
- Coordinate the delivery of pooled, specialized programs to youth in their home communities when possible
- Develop common use of legal instruments to facilitate collaboration across counties
- Provide training and technical assistance to ensure high quality, consistent programming
- Consider the establishment of fiscal mechanisms to support efficiencies and robust service
- Consider the establishment of shared or additional liability options

A combination of responses which include county-to-county agreements and participation in a statewide consortium will be utilized in order to provide the best possible custody commitment options to the county in order to meet the needs of each individual youth.

Part 8: Data

Describe how data will be collected on youth served by the block grant: (WJC 1995 (7))

Absent a significant anomaly, the amount of eligible youth the Nevada County justice system will become involved with will be low enough that existing staff will be able to record data through existing case management systems. The demographics of the youth served will address age, gender, ethnicity, neighborhood, family status, and offense details. Data other than demographics that will be collected will consist of:

- Assessment information- risk/ need.
- Custody time - days spent in custody at juvenile detention facilities.
- New law violations - subsequent adjudications and/or convictions for misdemeanor or felony offenses after becoming a target population youth.
- Treatment programming - programs referred to and completion status.
- High school and secondary education status.
- Employment and/or employment skills training participation.
- Housing status.

Describe outcome measures that will be utilized to determine the results of the programs and interventions supported by block grant funds: (WIC 1995 (7))

The completion rate of eligible youth will be measured as well as the completion rates for programs utilized. Youth, families, and other partners will be given the opportunity to provide feedback on programs and the methods used to manage this population. Recidivism will also be monitored.



Nevada County
Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant
Annual Plan Addendum

May 2022

Contents

[Addendum](#) **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

After meeting with the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR) staff there were a few questions regarding the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Plan submitted by Nevada County. This addendum is respectfully submitted to answer those questions and provide additional context regarding the target youth population and our ongoing efforts to best meet the needs of the youth and our community.

Addressing the question regarding the demographics of those adjudicated for certain offenses we pulled data in a way that we felt would not compromise the confidentiality of the youth. In the years 2019, 2020, and 2021 there were [REDACTED] youth adjudicated for 707(b) and/or 290.008 offenses. All [REDACTED] youth were [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] were for 290 Offenses. [REDACTED] were dispositioned to short term residential therapeutic programs, [REDACTED] were placed on deferred entry of judgement, and one was transferred to adult court given the age of the accused once the offense came to the attention of the criminal legal system.

There was also a question from OYCR regarding culturally responsive programming. Despite Nevada County being one of the least culturally diverse counties in California, there has been an identified need for culturally responsive programming. This need is particularly apparent on the eastern side of the county. We continue to gather criminal legal system population data so that we can best serve our clients and match to their individual needs. This is difficult at times as we lack the economy of scale present in more populous counties. We started with the recruitment of a bi-lingual staff member and document translation. Our next step is working with local providers to offer programming that is both effective and culturally responsive. We are also having discussions with agencies that make system referrals about some disparities and overrepresentation that have been identified.

Lastly, OYCR had a question around program outcomes. In the next year Nevada County intends to explore the concepts around the positive youth development (PYD) framework. The belief being that recidivism alone does not give a complete picture of the growth and potential of the youth that we serve. We have already begun to explore how the PYD framework can fit into our existing Functional Family Probation case management model. We are excited the possibilities of highlighting even more ways that youth in the community are thriving.