



CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS  
OF CALIFORNIA



August 24, 2023 [UPDATED]

TO: The Honorable Anthony Portantino  
Chair, Senate Appropriations Committee

FROM: California State Association of Counties  
Urban Counties of California  
Rural County Representatives of California  
Chief Probation Officers of California  
Counties of Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Fresno, Lassen, Marin, Monterey, Napa,  
Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara,  
Stanislaus, and Ventura

RE: **AB 505 (Ting) – The Office of Youth and Community Restoration: OPPOSE as amended 8/14/2023**  
**Set for hearing 8/28/2023 – Senate Appropriations Committee**

On behalf of the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the Urban Counties of California (UCC), the Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), the Chief Probation Officer of California (CPOC), and the Counties of Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Fresno, Lassen, Marin, Monterey, Napa, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, and Ventura, we write in respectful opposition to AB 505, by Assembly Member Phil Ting, which seeks to make changes to several key provisions of SB 823, the 2020 legislation that realigned full responsibility for the juvenile justice continuum to county governments.

While we acknowledge the efforts to narrow the scope of AB 505 and appreciate recent amendments, counties remain concerned with several provisions that disrupt the vital governance principle that responsibility must be accompanied by the authority to implement. The Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) realignment framework enacted in SB 823 is explicit with respect to realigning responsibility from the state to county governments for the population of young people who previously were eligible for placement in a DJJ facility and under the state’s

jurisdiction. AB 505 would erect barriers to counties' efforts to thoughtfully and successfully carry out DJJ realignment by fracturing the important link between the *responsibility* for addressing the needs of youth previously under state jurisdiction and the *authority* to develop, guide, implement, and support a responsive local plan.

Counties' opposition centers on provisions related to boards of supervisors' authority to make local expenditure decisions (Welfare and Institutions Code [WIC] Section 1991) along with changes in WIC Section 1995 to the subcommittee of the multiagency juvenile justice coordinating council. Counties find it wholly inappropriate that the subcommittee charged with developing a plan to support and treat the young people in our care and custody could be deprived of the leadership and guidance of the county department head responsible and fully accountable for carrying out the realigned responsibilities. Additional revisions to WIC Section 1995 around counties' submission of local plans to the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR) and the OYCR's subsequent review are ambiguous and unnecessary.

From a fiscal perspective, AB 505 continues to contemplate considerable and newly mandated state and local costs associated with all of the following: expanded inspections of local juvenile detention facilities; new processes and responsibilities for local planning subcommittees, including mandated meeting frequency, mandated plan updates annually versus every three years, and newly required elements in the local plan; potential funding delays given interactions between WIC Section 1995 (e) and (f); and, finally, broadened OYCR responsibilities given required annual site visits and added requirements to accessing the expansive list of county records defined in the bill, all of which will have an impact on county staffing and resources.

Regrettably, the undersigned counties and county associations must continue to oppose AB 505 given that it could disrupt the DJJ realignment funding stream; inappropriately weaken county oversight and administrative authority; and create additional barriers to local implementation efforts. The proposed changes would not, in our view, advance what certainly are our shared goals – to ensure that trauma-informed, evidence-based care and treatment are provided to the youth and young adults in counties' care and to create strong and sustainable pathways for successful youth outcomes in our communities. Please feel free to reach out if there are any questions. Thank you.

cc: The Honorable Phil Ting, Member of the Assembly  
Members and Consultants, Senate Appropriations Committee