

Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

SB 1157 (Archuleta) – As Amended July 2, 2026

Policy Committee: Public Safety

Vote: 7 - 0

Urgency: No

State Mandated Local Program: Yes

Reimbursable: Yes

SUMMARY:

This bill requires a court, when determining whether to place a ward committed to a secure youth treatment facility (SYTF) in a less restrictive program (LRP) in which the ward would reside in congregate residential care, to consider specified information about the program and to state on the record the reason for the placement.

Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Requires the court to consider whether the program has current general liability, professional liability, and workers' compensation insurance policies satisfying any applicable legal requirement; has conducted criminal background checks on staff who have direct contact with wards or as otherwise required by law; has a plan for adhering to wards' case plans and applicable accountability measures; has proof of notice submitted to the city and county in which the program operates; and has a rate structure.
- 2) Requires program providers to submit this information to the county probation department for purposes of providing the information to the court.
- 3) Requires the court, after considering the information, to state on the record the reason for placing a ward in a particular congregate residential care LRP.
- 4) Exempts a program operated by a juvenile facility subject to Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) oversight under Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations, and 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.

FISCAL EFFECT:

- 1) Potential reimbursable state mandate costs (General Fund) of an unknown amount, likely exceeding this committee's threshold of \$150,000, for county probation departments to receive program provider submissions and transmit the information to the court. The Chief Probation Officers of America (CPOC), the bill's sponsor, indicates the added duty would be minor. Notably, the bill's mandate applies across all 58 counties, and the information at issue—insurance coverage, staff background check, and a rate structure—is time-sensitive, requiring collection current to each placement of a ward rather than once per provider. These costs are potentially reimbursable by the state, subject to a determination by the Commission on State Mandates.

- 2) Potential court cost pressures of an unknown, but potentially significant amount (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) for the additional judicial time required to consider the five enumerated program criteria. The Judicial Council indicates the added requirements would extend each hearing by a few minutes and anticipates no notable workload impact given the expected number of affected placements. Notably, the Judicial Council estimate turns on placement volume, and data from the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR) shows a significantly growing rise in LRP placements. The bill also requires the court to state reasons on the record, which may generate more contested hearings, which may in turn consume more judicial time.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Purpose.** 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... 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.

- 2) **Background.** SB 823 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 337, Statutes of 2020, phased out the state Division of Juvenile Justice and realigned responsibility for youthful offenders to counties. SB 92 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 18, Statutes of 2021, authorized counties to establish SYTFs for wards age 14 or older adjudicated for an offense listed in Welfare and Institutions Code Section 707(b). A court may, on motion of the probation department or the ward, transfer a ward from an SYTF to an LRP — such as a halfway house, camp or ranch, or community residential or nonresidential service program — upon finding the ward has made substantial progress toward the goals of the individual rehabilitation plan and that placement is consistent with rehabilitation and community safety. Existing law requires the court to consider the probation department's recommendations and the programming and transition services the LRP would provide, but establishes no framework specific to congregate residential settings not otherwise regulated by a public entity. This bill reaches only a subset of LRPs — congregate residential care — and does not apply to a program operated by a juvenile facility subject to oversight and regulation by the Board of State and Community Corrections, or to a program in the home of the ward's parent or a supportive relative recognized by the probation department and agreed to by the court. According to OYCR's 2024 AB 102 Report, 100 wards were placed in LRPs in 2022-23, up from fewer than 12 in 2021-22, with the data indicating a significant expansion in the use of LRPs.
- 3) **Support and Opposition.** The sponsor, CPOC, and supporters of this measure, including county boards of supervisors and probation labor organizations, argue LRPs serving the highest-need youth operate without basic statutory criteria for insurance, background checks, and pricing, creating safety and fiscal inconsistencies across counties. Opponents, including ACLU California Action, the Youth Justice Coalition, and numerous youth advocacy organizations, argue the bill duplicates the court's existing duty to consider probation

recommendations, creates de facto statewide standards with no agency authorized to interpret or enforce them, and may discourage courts from making LRP placements that fit wards' rehabilitative needs; opponents recommend instead directing OYCR to study LRP models and recommend a licensing and regulatory structure.

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