

Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

SB 1009 (Becker) – As Amended June 25, 2026

Policy Committee: Public Safety

Vote: 5 - 2

Urgency: No

State Mandated Local Program: No

Reimbursable: No

SUMMARY:

This bill prohibits a court from ordering a minor detained in a juvenile hall, whether at a detention hearing or as a disposition, unless the court finds that a less restrictive alternative is unsuitable.

This bill also requires a court, upon request, to reconsider whether continued detention in the juvenile hall is necessary based on current information, replaces the “reasonably necessary” standard for detention for the protection of a person or property with an “immediate and urgent necessity” standard, and requires a court ordering removal of a minor from parental custody to state the reasons for the removal decision on the record and, in specified circumstances, in a written order.

FISCAL EFFECT:

- 1) Court cost pressures of approximately \$100,000 to \$260,000 annually (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), General Fund (GF)) to conduct reconsideration hearings and to make and document the required findings. According to the Judicial Council, costs reflect additional hearing time as well as judicial and clerk workload associated with the new requirements the bill places on juvenile courtrooms. The magnitude of new workload depends on how frequently reconsideration is requested and whether the required findings lengthen hearings. Where proceedings are not recorded or reported, the requirement to enter reasons in a written order would create new workload. Although courts are not funded on a workload basis, an increase in workload could create a demand for increased court funding. The state budget provides annual GF backfills to the TCTF to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in 2025-26.
- 2) Potential costs of an unknown amount to the extent the bill results in the release of youth who cannot return to a parent or guardian and who instead enter foster care. Although these are state-mandated costs, they are not reimbursable, but are potentially required to be funded by the state General Fund pursuant to Proposition 30.
- 3) Potential costs of an unknown amount to county probation departments to identify, evaluate, and document alternatives to detention for each youth within the detention-hearing timeline of roughly 48 to 72 hours. Whether these costs are borne by counties, reimbursable, or required to be funded by the state General Fund pursuant to Proposition 30 depends on whether the workload increases the cost of a program or level of service mandated by realignment.

COMMENTS:1) **Purpose.** According to the author:

For too long, California's juvenile justice system has relied on locked doors and high walls as our first response to youth behavior, rather than our last resort... By prioritizing community-based alternatives such as counseling and supervision, we are investing in solutions that reduce recidivism and save taxpayer dollars.

2) **Background.** Existing law requires a court to release a minor from custody at a detention hearing unless specified criteria are met, including that detention is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor or reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another. Existing law requires a less-restrictive-alternative finding for commitment to a secure youth treatment facility, the most restrictive placement. This bill extends a similar finding requirement to detention in the juvenile hall and to removal from parental custody at disposition, and codifies a court's authority to reconsider detention upon request. Supporters, including the bill's public defender and youth advocacy sponsors, argue that probation reports rarely identify the specific community-based alternatives available or explain why those alternatives are inadequate. Opponents, including the Chief Probation Officers of California and the California Judges Association, argue that juvenile detention rates have declined over 70% in the past decade, that detained youth are charged with the most serious offenses, and that the required findings could inhibit necessary detention decisions. Opponents further contend that the bill would create significant workload for probation departments within the 48-to-72-hour detention-hearing deadline, as probation must assemble and present less-restrictive-alternative information for every detained youth in that window, and that the bill assumes released youth can return home when, for some youth, no safe home exists — with the practical result that those youth would be redirected into the child welfare system rather than released to a parent or guardian.

Analysis Prepared by: Shiran Zohar / APPR. / (916) 319-2081