

Date of Hearing: June 30, 2026
Deputy Chief Counsel: Stella Choe

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
Nick Schultz, Chair

SB 1157 (Archuleta) – As Amended June 22, 2026

As Proposed to be Amended in Committee

SUMMARY: Requires a court, when determining whether to place a ward in a particular less restrictive program (LRP) that includes congregate residential care, to consider specified information provided by probation, and requires program providers to provide information to the probation department for purposes of providing this information to the court. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires the court to consider the following information provided by probation in determining whether a particular LRP is an appropriate placement for a ward:
 - a) Whether the program has current general liability insurance, professional liability insurance, and workers' compensation insurance policies that satisfy any legal requirement to have insurance that is applicable to the program;
 - b) Whether the program has conducted criminal background checks on staff who have direct contact with wards or as otherwise required by law;
 - c) Whether the program has a plan for adhering to wards' case plans and applicable accountability measures;
 - d) Whether the program has proof of notice submitted to the city and county in which it operates; and,
 - e) Whether the program has a rate structure.
- 2) Specifies that the bill's provisions do not apply to either of the following LRPs:
 - a) A program operated by a juvenile facility subject to oversight and regulation by the Board of State and Community Corrections applicable regulations; or,
 - b) A program in the home of the ward's parent or a supportive relative recognized by the county probation department and agreed to by the court.
- 3) States that the court shall state on the record the reason for placing a ward in a particular LRP that is a program in which the ward resides in congregate residential care.
- 4) Clarifies that nothing in this bill's provisions shall be construed to limit the court's discretion pursuant to existing law.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Provides that, any minor who is between 12 and 17 years of age that violates any law of this state or of the United States or any ordinance of any city or county other than an ordinance establishing a curfew based solely on age, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, and may be adjudged to be a ward of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602, subd. (a).)
- 2) Provides that a peace officer may, without a warrant, take into temporary custody a minor when there is reasonable cause for believing that the minor will be adjudged a ward of the court or charged with a criminal action, or that the minor has violated an order of the juvenile court or escaped from any commitment ordered by the juvenile court, or the minor is found in any street or public place suffering from any sickness or injury which requires medical treatment, hospitalization, or other remedial care. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 625.)
- 3) Provides that if it appears upon the hearing that the minor has violated an order of the juvenile court or has escaped from a commitment of the juvenile court, or that it 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 that the minor be detained or that the minor is likely to flee to avoid the jurisdiction of the court, and that continuance in the home is contrary to the minor's welfare, the court may make its order that the minor be detained in the juvenile hall or other suitable place designated by the juvenile court for a period not to exceed 15 judicial days. Requires the court to enter the order together with its findings of fact in support in the records of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (a).)
- 4) Requires the probation officer to submit to the court specified documentation if the probation officer is recommending that the minor be detained. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (c).)
- 5) Requires the court, in all cases in which a minor is adjudged a ward or dependent child of the court, to limit the control to be exercised over the ward or dependent child by any parent or guardian and requires the court, in its order, to clearly and specifically set forth all those limitations. Prohibits a ward or dependent child from being taken from the physical custody of a parent or guardian unless the court finds one of the following facts:
 - a) That the parent or guardian is incapable of providing or has failed or neglected to provide proper maintenance, training, and education for the minor;
 - b) That the minor has been tried on probation while in custody and has failed to reform; or,

That the welfare of the minor requires that custody be taken from the minor's parent or guardian. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 726, subd. (a).)
- 6) Authorizes the court, if a minor or nonminor is adjudged a ward of the court, to make any reasonable orders for the care, supervision, custody, conduct, maintenance, and support of the minor or nonminor, including medical treatment, subject to further order of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 727, subd. (a).)
- 7) Authorizes the court, when a minor is adjudged a ward of the court, to order one of several specified types of treatment. Provides that as an additional alternative, the court may commit the minor to a juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp. Specifies that if there is no

county juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp within the county, the court may commit the minor to the county juvenile hall. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 727, subd. (a).)

- 8) Authorizes a court to order commitment of a minor to a juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp, or to juvenile hall if the county does not have a juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp, when the minor is adjudged a ward of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 730, subd. (a)(1).)
- 9) Authorizes a court to order a ward who is 14 years of age or older to be committed to a secure youth treatment facility (SYTF) for a period of confinement if the ward meets all of the following criteria:
 - a) The juvenile is adjudicated and found to be a ward of the court based on an offense listed in subdivision (b) of Section 707 that was committed when the juvenile was 14 years of age or older.
 - b) The adjudication is the most recent offense for which the juvenile has been adjudicated.
 - c) The court has made a finding on the record that a less restrictive, alternative disposition for the ward is unsuitable. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (a)(1)-(3).)
- 10) Requires the court, in determining whether a less restrictive disposition is suitable, to consider all relevant and material evidence, including the recommendations of counsel, the probation department, and any other agency or individual designated by the court to advise on the appropriate disposition of the case. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (a)(3)(A)-(E).)
- 11) Requires the court, in making its order of commitment for a ward, to set a baseline term of confinement for the ward that is based on the most serious recent offense for which the ward has been adjudicated. Requires the court to additionally set a maximum term of confinement for the ward. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subds. (b)(1), (c)(1).)
- 12) Requires the court, within 30 judicial days of making an order of commitment to an SYTF, to receive, review, and approve an individual rehabilitation plan (IRP) that meets specified requirements for the ward that has been submitted to the court by the probation department and any other agencies or individuals the court deems necessary for the development of the plan. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (d)(1).)
- 13) Requires an IRP to do all of the following:
 - a) Identify the ward's needs in relation to treatment, education, and development, including any special needs the ward may have in relation to health, mental or emotional health, disabilities, or gender-related or other special needs.
 - b) Describe the programming, treatment, and education to be provided to the ward in relation to the identified needs during the commitment period.
 - c) Reflect, and be consistent with, the principles of trauma-informed, evidence-based, and culturally responsive care.

- d) Requires the ward and their family to be given the opportunity to provide input regarding the needs of the ward, and requires the opinions of the ward and the ward's family to be included in the IRP report to the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (d)(2).)
- 14) Requires the court to schedule and hold a progress review hearing for the ward not less frequently than once every six months during the term of commitment, including any term spent in an LRP. Requires the court to evaluate the ward's progress in relation to the IRP and determine whether the baseline term of confinement is to be modified in the review hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(1)(A).)
- 15) Provides that the court may order, at the conclusion of each review hearing and upon making a finding on the record, that the ward remain in custody for the remainder of the baseline term, or may order that the ward's baseline term or previously modified baseline term be modified downward by a reduction of confinement time not to exceed six months for each review hearing. Authorizes the court to additionally order that the ward be assigned to an LRP. Provides that the determination of whether the baseline term will be modified, or whether a youth will be assigned to an LRP, is a judicial decision and the juvenile court's discretion may not be limited by stipulation of the parties at any time. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(1)(A).)
- 16) Authorizes the court, if the ward is already assigned to an LRP, to order a reduction in the length of time the ward is to remain in the LRP prior to a probation discharge hearing, based on the ward's progress. Authorizes the court, if it determines that ward has failed materially to comply with the court-ordered conditions of placement in the LRP, to modify the order of placement in the LRP. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(1)(B).)
- 17) Prohibits the ward's confinement time, including time spent in an LRP, from being extended beyond the baseline confinement term, or beyond a modified baseline term, for disciplinary infractions or other in-custody behaviors. Requires that any infractions or behaviors be addressed by alternative means, which may include a system of graduated sanctions for disciplinary infractions adopted by the operator of an SYTF and subject to any relevant state standards or regulations that apply to juvenile facilities generally. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(2).)
- 18) Requires the court to hold a probation discharge hearing for the ward at the conclusion of the baseline confinement term, including any modified baseline term. Requires the probation discharge hearing to occur at the end of the period, or modified period, of placement that has been ordered by the court for a ward who has been placed in an LRP. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(3).)
- 19) Requires the court to review the ward's progress toward meeting the goals of the IRP and the recommendations of counsel, the probation department, and any other agencies or individuals having information the court deems necessary at the discharge hearing. Requires the court to order that the ward be discharged to a period of probation supervision in the community under conditions approved by the court at the conclusion of the hearing unless the court finds that the ward constitutes a substantial risk of imminent harm to others in the community if released from custody. Provides that if the court finds that the ward constitutes a substantial risk of imminent harm to others in the community if released from custody, the ward may be

retained in custody in an SYTF for up to one additional year of confinement, subject to review hearing and probation discharge hearings and to the maximum confinement provisions of law. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(3).)

- 20) Requires the court, if the ward is discharged to probation supervision, to determine the reasonable conditions of probation that are suitable to meet the needs of the ward and to facilitate the ward's successful reentry into the community. Requires the court to periodically review the ward's progress and to make any additional orders deemed necessary to modify the program of supervision in order to facilitate the provision of services or to otherwise support the ward's successful reentry into the community. Authorizes the court, if it finds that the ward has failed materially to comply with the reasonable orders of probation imposed by the court, to order that the ward be returned to a juvenile facility or to an LRP for a period not to exceed either the remainder of the baseline term, including any court-ordered modifications, or six months, whichever is longer, and in any case not to exceed the maximum confinement limits. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(4).)
- 21) Authorizes the court, upon a motion from the probation department or the ward, to order that the ward be transferred from an SYTF to an LRP. Requires the court to consider the recommendations of the probation department on the proposed change in placement. Requires approval of the request for an LRP to be made only upon the court's determination that the ward has made substantial progress toward the goals of the IRP and that placement is consistent with the goals of youth rehabilitation and community safety. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(1).)
- 22) Requires the court, in making its determination to approve a transfer request to an LRP, to consider both of the following factors:
- a) The ward's overall progress in relation to the rehabilitation plan during the period of confinement in an SYTF.
 - b) The programming and community transition services to be provided, or coordinated by the LRP, including, but not limited to, any educational, vocational, counseling, housing, or other services made available through the program. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(1).)
- 23) Authorizes the court, in any order transferring the ward from an SYTF to an LRP, to require the ward to observe any conditions of performance or compliance with the program that are reasonable and appropriate and that are within the capacity of the ward to perform. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(2).)
- 24) Authorizes the court, if it determines that the ward has materially failed to comply with the court-ordered conditions of placement in the LRP, to modify the terms and conditions of placement in the program or to order the ward to be returned to an SYTF for the remainder of the baseline term, or modified baseline term, and subject to further periodic review hearings and to the maximum confinement provisions of law. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(2).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Sponsor:** Chief Probation Officers of California
- 2) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, “Despite the establishment of LRPs as an option for courts to consider upon progress of a youth, statute does not establish a framework when the program is for a residential setting when that setting is not otherwise governed or regulated by a government or public entity. Because these programs are part of the term of secure detention, and not a part of post jurisdiction or release, it’s critical that there is a framework in place to set programming expectations and safety considerations for programs serving the highest risk and highest need youth and young adults in the state.

“This has resulted in significant program offering and administration variations across counties, creating fiscal and service delivery inconsistencies and giving rise to program integrity and public safety concerns. Examples of this are programs with no background checks for employees, no coordination with county probation for on-going supervision or violations, no parameters for mixed-gender staff/staff family members living on-site, and no metrics for pricing. This is inconsistent with other residential or congregate care settings for youth. As these programs are part of the baseline term for the highest risk and highest need youth and young adults in the state it is critical to establish statutory guidance setting program administration and public safety expectations.”

- 3) **Juvenile Court Jurisdiction:** As a general rule, any person between the age of 12 and 17 who commits a crime falls within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602.) This extends to a youth alleged to have committed a crime before their 18th birthday, even if they were an adult at the time of arrest or commencement of proceedings. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 603.) For example, if someone commits a crime at age 17, but it is not discovered or tried until the person is 20, the person can still be tried in juvenile court. The jurisdiction of the juvenile court generally continues until the youth is 21 years old, unless the youth committed a 707(b) offense, then the court may retain jurisdiction until the person attains 23 years of age. Additionally, if the youth would have, in criminal court, faced an aggregate sentence of 7 years or more, the juvenile court’s jurisdiction continues until the youth turns 25. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 607.)

The creation of the juvenile court, now over 100 years old, was rooted in the idea that adolescents, who are not fully developed or mature, are less culpable than adults. Accordingly, the focus of the juvenile court was rehabilitation, not punishment. (See, e.g., *In re Gault* (1967) 387 U.S. 1, 15-16.) The purpose of the juvenile law is to provide for the protection and safety of the public and each minor under the jurisdiction of the court and to preserve and strengthen family ties when possible. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 202, subd. (a).) Minors under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court as a consequence of delinquent conduct receive care, treatment, and guidance that is consistent with their best interest, that holds them accountable for their behavior, and that is appropriate for their circumstances. This may include punishment that is consistent with rehabilitative objectives. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 202, subd. (b).) The juvenile court has a wide range of options available for placing its wards, including probation, placement in a relative's home, foster home, licensed community care facility, or group home, and commitment to “a juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp” or “the county juvenile hall.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 727, subd. (a); 730, subd. (a)(1).)

Existing law provides that any person whose case originated in juvenile court shall remain, if the person is held in secure detention, in a county juvenile facility until the person attains 25 years of age, unless the probation department petitions the court to house a person who is 19 years of age or older in an adult facility, including a jail or other facility established for the purpose of confinement of adults. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 208.5.)

- 4) **Juvenile Justice Realignment:** In 2020, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 823 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) which established a process for realigning California's juvenile system by phasing out the state's youth prison system, the Division of Juvenile Justice, and transferring the responsibility for managing all youthful offenders to local jurisdictions.¹

Among other things, SB 823 stated the intent of the Legislature to establish a separate dispositional track for higher-need youth by March 1, 2021. In order to implement Senate Bill 823, in 2021, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 92 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) which authorized counties to establish SYTFs for the placement of wards who were adjudicated for specified serious offenses when the juvenile was age 14 or older, as specified. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875.) At the conclusion of a baseline confinement term as determined by the court, a ward could be discharged to a period of probation supervision in the community under conditions approved by the court, unless the court finds that the ward constitutes a substantial risk of imminent harm to others in the community if released from custody. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(3).) The court could also discharge a ward to a program of probation supervision. The court would determine the reasonable conditions of probation that are suitable to meet the developmental needs and circumstances of the ward and to facilitate the ward's successful reentry into the community. If the ward was discharged to a program of probation supervision, the court would be required to periodically review the ward's progress and make any additional orders deemed necessary in order to facilitate the provision of services or to otherwise support the ward's successful reentry into the community. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (e)(4).) If the ward failed to materially comply with the reasonable orders of probation imposed by the court, the court could order that the ward be returned to custody in the SYTF for the remainder of the presumptive term initially ordered by the court, subject to review hearings. (*Ibid.*)

- 5) **LRPs:** The court may, upon the motion of the probation department or ward, order that the ward be transferred from a SYTF to an LRP, such as a halfway house, a camp or ranch, or a community residential or nonresidential service program. The purpose of an LRP is to facilitate the safe and successful reintegration of the ward into the community. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(1).) The court shall consider the recommendations of the probation department on the proposed change in placement. Approval of the request for a LRP shall be made only upon the court's determination that the ward has made substantial progress toward the goals of the IRP and that placement is consistent with the goals of youth rehabilitation and community safety. (*Ibid.*)

¹ See Sen. Comm. on Budget and Fiscal Review, Floor Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 823 (2019-2020 Reg. Sess.) as amended August 28, 2020, p. 1.

In making its determination, the court must consider the youth's overall progress in relation to the IRP during the period of confinement in an SYTF as well as the programming and community transition services to be provided or coordinated by the LRP, including any educational, vocational, counseling, housing, or other services made available through the program. (Welf & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(1)(A) & (B).)

In transferring a ward to an LRP, the court may require the ward to observe reasonable conditions and shall set the length of time the ward is to remain in LRP, not to exceed the remainder of the baseline or modified baseline term. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 875, subd. (f)(2).) If, after placement in an LRP, the court determines that the ward has materially failed to comply with the court-ordered conditions of placement in the program, the court may modify the terms and conditions of placement in the program or may order the ward to be returned to an SYTF for the remainder of the baseline term, or modified baseline term, and subject to further periodic reviews and to the maximum confinement set by the court. (*Ibid.*)

This bill would require a court, in determining whether to place a ward in a particular LRP that includes congregate residential care, to consider the following information, which is to be provided by probation: 1) whether the program has current general liability insurance, professional liability insurance, and workers' compensation insurance policies that satisfy any legal requirement to have insurance that is applicable to the program; 2) whether the program has conducted criminal background checks on staff who have direct contact with wards or as otherwise required by law; 3) whether the program has a plan for adhering to wards' case plans and applicable accountability measures; 4) whether the program has proof of notice submitted to the city and county in which it operates; and, 5) whether the program has a rate structure. The bill requires the court to state on the record the reason for placing a ward in a particular LRP that is a program in which the ward resides in congregate residential care.

This bill, as proposed to be amended in committee, would also clarify that its provisions are not to be construed to limit the court's discretion as outlined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 875 which gives the court broad discretion to make determinations on whether a ward should be placed in an LRP. Thus, the information that may be provided to the court by probation about a particular LRP pursuant to this bill shall be considered by the court but the court's discretion under Welfare and Institutions Code section 875 is not limited in any way.

Proponents of the bill argue that, because what constitutes an LRP varies widely both in operation and availability depending on each individual county, counties have experienced fiscal and service delivery inconsistencies and operational issues that raise both safety concerns for the ward and the public.

Opponents believe that this bill improperly regulates residential LRPs without any agency oversight and that this will result in courts opting not to place youth in LRPs that may otherwise fit their rehabilitative needs. Opponents argue that more data on LRPs are needed and have recommended instead to require the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR)² to conduct an analysis of existing and potential community-based residential LRPs

² OYCR was established in 2021 as part of juvenile justice realignment measures to guide the transition from state-run youth incarceration to county care. OYCR also collects and shares juvenile justice data and practices to develop

designed to effectively meet the service needs of youth transferring from SYTFs, and to provide the Legislature with a report recommending if any additional program models and licensing categories that should be developed and the standards or regulatory structure necessary to establish them.

- 6) **Data on Step Downs to LRPs:** With respect to transfers to LRPs, 100 youths were stepped down to an LRP during fiscal year 2022-23, and 161 youths were stepped down to an LRP during fiscal year 2023-24.³ Notably, 14 counties transferred youth from an SYTF to an LRP during fiscal year 2022-23, and 26 counties did the same during fiscal year 2023-24. Among those counties, half were in Northern California, 27% were in Southern California, 23% were in Central California.⁴ Three-quarters of those stepped down to an LRP in fiscal year 2023-24 were age 19 or older, and the most commonly adjudicated offenses for those who were stepped down to LRPs were homicide, robbery, assault, and attempted homicide.⁵
- 7) **Argument in Support:** According to *Chief Probation Officers of California*, the sponsor of this bill, “Despite the establishment of LRPs as an option for courts to consider upon progress of a young adult, statute does not establish a framework when the identified program is a congregate residential setting not otherwise governed or regulated by a government or public entity. Because these programs are part of their custodial term, which, prior to SB 823 would have been served entirely at DJJ and not a part of post jurisdiction or release, it’s critical that there is a framework in place. Without these most basic criteria, counties, courts and other stakeholders may not have the confidence necessary to utilize this tool.

“SB 1157 simply establishes a framework for providing information to the courts in making decisions to transfer a youth to a congregate residential program as to whether an LRP adheres to the young person’s case plan and accountability measures, performs staff background checks, obtains appropriate insurance, and has provided notice to the city and county in which it operates. Having these types of criteria is an important aspect as it relates to the use of taxpayer funds, particularly as no parameters have been established to date for the costs of these programs when created as part of the DJJ closure.

“These criteria are necessary as LRPs are serving individuals who are the highest need, have committed the most serious offenses within the juvenile justice system, and as previously stated, would have otherwise been serving the entirety of their custodial time at a secure state DJJ facility but for SB 823 (2020). This is a significant design flaw in the closure of DJJ and without SB 1157 we risk not only the safety of the community but also endangering the youth and young adults placed in our care.”

- 8) **Argument in Opposition:** According to *Youth Justice Coalition*, “While we support the goal of ensuring that youth are served by programs capable of meeting their needs, SB 1157 is not the appropriate mechanism for accomplishing that goal.

strong county-level programs and consistent treatment of youth to meet their individualized needs. (See <https://oycr.ca.gov/about/>).

³ OYCR, *AB 102 Report* (Sept. 2025), p. 27 available at https://oycr.ca.gov/wpcontent/uploads/sites/346/2025/09/2025-AB-102-Report_FINAL.pdf.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Id.* at pp. 28-29.

“First, the bill is duplicative of existing law. Courts are already required to consider the probation department’s recommendations on LRP transfers. Welfare and Institutions Code section 875(f) expressly provides that “(t)he court shall consider the recommendations of the probation department on the proposed change in placement” and further requires courts to evaluate the youth’s progress toward their rehabilitative plan and the programming and community transition services the LRP will provide. In practice, probation departments already evaluate proposed LRPs and routinely take positions regarding their appropriateness. SB 1157 does not fill a gap in existing law; rather, it creates a new layer of review that duplicates responsibilities probation departments already exercise under existing statutory authority.

“Second, the bill effectively creates a system of statewide standards without identifying any entity authorized to develop, interpret, or enforce those standards. If the criteria identified in SB 1157 are intended to function as meaningful standards, someone must determine what compliance requires. Yet the bill does not designate a regulatory agency, establish a rulemaking process, or create any mechanism for resolving disputes about interpretation.

“This leaves only two possibilities, and neither is workable. If probation departments are expected to determine what the criteria require, the result will be 58 counties developing inconsistent standards independently, undermining the statewide uniformity the bill presumably seeks. If the criteria are instead treated as a bare checklist, they function as paperwork rather than protection, providing no meaningful assurance that a proposed LRP actually meets the needs of the youth being considered for transfer.

“Probation departments are not regulatory agencies. They are not equipped or authorized to promulgate statewide standards governing insurance requirements, employment practices, staff qualifications, proof of notice, or program operations. Nor are they positioned to make authoritative determinations regarding compliance with complex legal and regulatory frameworks that often fall within the jurisdiction of entirely different agencies. For example, whether a program maintains the types and levels of insurance required by law depends on the nature of the program and the regulatory framework that applies to it. Similar issues arise with the bill’s other requirements, including whether staff background checks satisfy applicable legal requirements and whether a program’s accountability measures are sufficient. These are highly specialized inquiries that fall well outside the traditional expertise and authority of probation departments.”

9) **Related Legislation:** None

10) **Prior Legislation:**

- a) SB 824 (Menjivar), of the 2025-2026 Legislative Session, would have required Individualized Rehabilitation Plans (IRP) for youth committed to an SYTF to contain a roadmap for their successful return to their community and requires judges to assess the juvenile’s progress at each six-month review hearing. SB 824 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee suspense file.
- b) AB 102 (Ting), Chapter 38, Statutes of 2023, required county probation departments to provide the OYCR with specific juvenile justice data related to the realignment of DJJ.

- c) SB 92 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 18, Statutes of 2021, allowed counties, commencing July 1, 2021, to establish SYTFs for wards who are 14 years of age or older who have been adjudicated and found to be a ward of the court based on an offense that would have resulted in a commitment to the DJJ, as provided.
- d) SB 823 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 337, Statutes of 2020, established a process for realigning California's juvenile system by phasing out the state's youth prison system, DJJ, and transferring the responsibility for managing all youthful offenders to local jurisdictions.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Chief Probation Officers' of California (CPOC) (Sponsor)
 Contra Costa County
 County of Fresno
 County of Kern
 Inyo County Board of Supervisors
 Kern County Board of Supervisors
 League of California Cities
 Los Angeles County Deputy Probation Officers Afscme Local 685
 Marin County Board of Supervisors
 Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)
 Shasta County Board of Supervisors
 Shasta; County of
 Teamsters Local 986

Opposition

ACLU California Action
 Alianza for Opportunity
 Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
 California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
 California Coalition for Women Prisoners
 California Public Defenders Association
 California Youth Defender Center
 Californians United for a Responsible Budget
 Cancel the Contract Antelope Valley
 Care First California
 Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
 Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
 Community Justice Center
 Community Works
 Courage California
 Felony Murder Elimination Project
 Fresh Lifelines for Youth
 Friends Committee on Legislation of California
 Glide Foundation

Hang Out Do Good
Haywood Burns Institute
Justice2jobs Coalition
L.i.f.e. 2.0 INC.
LA Defensa
Latinojustice
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union
National Center for Youth Law
National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform
Peace and Justice Law Center
Prisma Legal Center for Youth Justice
Restoring Hope California
San Francisco Public Defender's Office
Silicon Valley De-bug
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
Starting Over Strong
The California Youth Justice Project
The Children's Initiative
The Collective for Liberatory Lawyering
The David's Harp Foundation
The Place4grace
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
Young Women's Freedom Center
Youth Justice Coalition
Youth Law Center

Analysis Prepared by: Stella Choe / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744