

A photograph of the California State Capitol dome, featuring a large, dark, ribbed dome atop a white, classical-style building with columns. The dome is set against a clear blue sky with a few wispy clouds. Green trees are visible on the left and right sides of the frame. The image is partially obscured by a white, curved graphic element that sweeps across the middle of the page.

# State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: 2019 Compliance Monitoring

Annual Report  
July 2020



This page left intentionally blank.

**BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE  
AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION**

**Rachel Rios** ..... **Chair**  
**Carol Biondi**..... **Vice Chair**  
**The Honorable Brian Back** .....Ventura County Superior Court Judge (Ret.)  
**Probation Chief Michelle Scray Brown** .....San Bernardino County Probation Department  
**Amanda Clifford** ..... Policy and Advocacy Associate, Bill Wilson Center  
**Dr. B.J. Davis**..... Adjunct Professor, Alliant International University  
**Dr. Carly Bailey Dierkhising** .....Assistant Professor, California State University, Los Angeles  
**Miguel Garcia** ..... Youth Member, Western Region Representative, Coalition for Juvenile Justice  
**Juan Gomez**.....Director, Motivating Individual Leadership for Public Advancement  
**Michelle Guymon**..... Director, Child Trafficking Unit, Los Angeles County Probation Department  
**Susan Harbert** ..... Staff Attorney, Juvenile Innocence and Fair Sentencing Clinic, Loyola Law School  
**Elliott Houseman-Turrubiate** ..... Youth Victim Advocate, Native American Health Center  
**Gordon Jackson**..... Sr. Policy Advisor to the State Superintendent, California Dept. of Education  
**Sharon King**..... Regional Compliance Manager, Walmart  
**Ramon Leija**.....Juvenile Justice Reform Advocate, Anti-Recidivism Coalition  
**Kent Mendoza**..... Youth Member, Anti-Recidivism Coalition  
**Amika Mota**.....Prison Reentry Director, Young Women’s Freedom Center  
**Vanessa Najar** ..... Youth Member, Peer Mentor, Puente Project, Sacramento City College  
**District Attorney Nancy O’Malley**..... Alameda County  
**Winston Peters**..... Los Angeles County Public Defender’s Office  
**Dr. Mimi Silbert**... President, Delancey Street Foundation  
**Dante Williams** ..... Youth Advocate Manager, Stanford Youth Solutions

**BSCC Staff**

**Kathleen T. Howard**.....Executive Director  
**Tracie Cone** ..... Communications Director  
**Allison Ganter** ..... Deputy Director, Facilities Standards & Operations and Research  
**Ricardo Goodridge** ..... Deputy Director, Corrections Planning & Grant Programs  
**Eloisa Tuitama**..... Compliance Monitor, Facilities Standards & Operations  
**Ginger Wolfe**..... Staff Services Manager I, Facilities Standards & Operations

This page left intentionally blank.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is the State Administering Agency that receives and disburses federal Title II formula grants to support state and local efforts in delinquency prevention and juvenile justice system improvement. To remain eligible for such funds, the BSCC must maintain compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974 (as amended in 2002 and 2018), which is the enabling legislation for both the Title II formula grants and the state's juvenile justice advisory group.<sup>1</sup> California's state advisory group is the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP). The SACJJDP is a governor-appointed group of subject-matter experts.

A requirement for compliance with the JJDP is submission to the Governor and Legislature an annual report from the state's juvenile justice advisory group with recommendations regarding compliance with the first three of the four JJDP core requirements (those specifically related to compliance monitoring).<sup>2</sup> The fourth core requirement (Racial and Ethnic Disparities) is addressed separately and is not a part of the annual report to the Governor and Legislature.

The core requirements relative to compliance monitoring are:

1. Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders<sup>3</sup> (DSO)

Prohibits, with specific exceptions, juveniles who are charged with or who have committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult (status offenders, truants, in-state runaways) from being held in secure detention.

2. Separation<sup>4</sup>

Prohibits youth who are under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court from having sight and/or sound contact with adult inmates while in secure detention.

3. Jail Removal<sup>5</sup>

Prohibits the secure detention of youth in a lock-up or jail for longer than six (6) hours.

This report will provide the Governor and Legislature with the most recent data submitted to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), as well as the SACJJDP's recommendations regarding compliance with the core requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup> 34 U.S.C. §§ 11131-11134.

<sup>2</sup> 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(3)(D)(ii).

<sup>3</sup> 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at (a)(12).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at (a)(13).

## **COMPLIANCE WITH CORE REQUIREMENTS**

BSCC staff monitors 1,171 law enforcement facilities for compliance with the core requirements. Through data collection and inspection, the BSCC annually determines the number of violations of core requirements at these facilities, and in accordance with the JJDP, submits an annual report on compliance to OJJDP.

Attachment A contains the BSCC's annual compliance monitoring report for the 2019 federal fiscal year reporting period, which runs from October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019. Attachment B is a summary of violations of the core requirements since 2003.

California maintains compliance with the core requirements so long as the rate of violations does not exceed the "de minimus" number of violations as established by OJJDP. OJJDP recalculates standards for compliance annually using a process described in federal regulation. States that report a rate at or below the standard are in compliance. States that report a rate exceeding the year's standards are out of compliance.

Data from the 2019 reporting period verifies that California remains in de minimus compliance with all three core requirements.

<b>Core Requirement</b>	<b>Federal Standard</b>	<b>California 2019 Rates</b>
<b>DSO</b>	4.87	0.10
<b>Separation</b>	2.56	0.00
<b>Jail Removal</b>	5.40	1.10

*Note: OJJDP develops standard rates of compliance per 100,000 juvenile population.*

California has remained in compliance because its number of JJDP violations decreased from the previous year (see Attachment B). In comparing the 2018 and 2019 reporting periods, DSO violations decreased by 70 percent from 30 violations to nine. This sharp decrease occurred in local juvenile hall and camp facilities. The most common reasons reported to the BSCC were:

- Holding California runaways;
- Holding youth who posed a danger to self or others; and
- Applying 5150 holds.

In fact, these three most common reasons were also reported to the BSCC in the previous year. Taken together, the continued occurrence of DSO violations in juvenile halls for these reasons indicate the local need for training and technical assistance on dealing with youth who are California runaways or who pose a danger to themselves or others.

In FY 2019, Separation violations remained zero.

Between FY 2018 and FY 2019, the number of Jail Removal violations decreased by 3 percent; specifically, by 3 violations from 103 to 100. There were 80 violations that occurred in adult jails and lockup facilities. For these violations, the most common reasons reported to the BSCC were:

- Waiting for Live Scan delays;
- Conducting extensive interviews; and
- Holding youth who posed a danger to self or others.

A closer look at these violations show that there were 33 jail removal violations due to Live Scan delays in a single county whereas over 30 violations were due to extensive interviews in two other counties. Put differently, three counties accounted for most of the Jail Removal violations in the whole state. The consistent occurrence of violations indicates the need for specific and targeted training and technical assistance for agencies in the three counties.

Overall, California's rates of JJDP A violations have been on a downward trend since 2003. DSO violations have decreased by 86 percent and Jail Removal violations by 25 percent, whereas Separation violations remain isolated incidents with zero occurrences since 2014. (see Attachment B). Even as the number of law enforcement facilities continues to increase each year, the rates continue to decline. Nevertheless, the BSCC must continue its efforts to maintain compliance.

**BARRIERS TO COMPLIANCE AND STRATEGIES TO OVERCOME THEM**

To maintain compliance, the BSCC identifies barriers to compliance and develops strategies on an on-going and annual basis.

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
<p><b>The volume of admissions to juvenile detention facilities, adult jails and lockups makes it difficult for the BSCC to review all appropriate data outside of the biennial inspection cycle.</b></p>	<p>The BSCC reviews and improves its data collection process annually.</p>
<p><b>The sheer number of facilities in California (nearly 1,200) makes it difficult to verify all appropriate data annually on-site.</b></p>	<p>The SACJJDP approved an increase in funds allocated to compliance monitoring, and the BSCC hired an additional retired annuitant to conduct compliance monitoring, bringing staff to three plus support.</p>
<p><b>The turnover in local correctional staff creates a gap of knowledge with respect to core requirements in some facilities; constant training is required.</b></p>	<p>Because of the BSCC’s strategies from the previous year, some local agencies have taken the initiative to inform the BSCC when local staff changes and have supplied BSCC with updated contact information.</p> <p>The BSCC continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to law enforcement agencies and probation departments, both general and targeted.</p> <p>The BSCC staff continues to provide pre-inspection briefings to law enforcement agencies and probation departments; all information relevant to the upcoming inspection is provided, including detailed information on core requirements and essential data.</p>



<p><b>The addition of new BSCC staff</b></p>	<p>The BSCC continues to provide general and tailored training to FSO staff, focusing on the applicability of core requirements at different facilities.</p> <p>BSCC revises its compliance monitoring manual on an annual and ongoing basis.</p> <p>BSCC formalized its policy and procedures regarding collocated facilities.</p> <p>BSCC formalized an enhanced inspection process.</p>
<p><b>The FFY 19 data shows decreased DSO violations in juvenile halls and camps. However, many runaway youth and youth who posed a danger to self and others were still held securely.</b></p>	<p>The BSCC should provide technical assistance to juvenile facilities dealing with youth who are California runaways or who pose a danger to themselves or others.</p> <p>While the BSCC does not have authority over local alternatives to secure detention, the BSCC should collaborate with subject-matter experts, including its SACJJDP, to determine useful training tools for juvenile facility staff and possible alternatives to holding youth securely, as well as other strategies.</p>
<p><b>The FFY 19 data shows increased Jail Removal violations of status offenders and nonoffenders in lockups and continued violations in three counties</b></p>	<p>The BSCC should provide specific and targeted technical assistance to the three counties that continue to violate core requirements.</p> <p>The BSCC should collaborate with local juvenile justice commissions.</p>

## **SACJJDP RECOMMENDATIONS**

The SACJJDP recommends that the Governor and Legislature continue to support the BSCC's approach to compliance monitoring, including strategies to overcome the barriers mentioned above. The SACJJDP bases its recommendation on the decreasing violation rates and the continuous training and technical assistance BSCC provides to the field.

The SACJJDP also recommends that BSCC update the 3-Year Plan for the application of the federal Title II Formula Grants program, highlighting California's effort and commitment to maintaining compliance with the core requirements.

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

- A: OJJDP California Compliance Data Collection FFY 2019
- B: Summary of California Violations of JJDPA Since 2003



Data Collection Reporting Period:

Report types available:

Metric	Value
<b>STATE PROFILE</b>	
<b>STATE JUVENILE POPULATION DATA</b>	
Age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends (upper age at which a person is still classified as a juvenile).	17
Total population, at and below the age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends.	9116168
Total population under the age of 18.	9116168
<b>FEDERAL DEFINITIONS</b>	
During the State's monitoring effort, were Federal definitions (under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act or its implementing regulations) used?	Yes
<b>FACILITY SUB-TYPE - SECURE DETENTION or CORRECTION FACILITIES</b>	
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type).	52
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	52
Percent of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	100%
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	5
Percent of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	10%
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type).	43
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	41
Percent of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	95%
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	5
Percent of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	12%
Number of Adult Jails (facility sub-type).	119
Number of Adult Jails (facility sub-type) that reported data.	119
Percent of Adult Jails (facility sub-type) that reported data.	100%
Number of Adult Jails (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	39
Percent of Adult Jails (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	33%
Number of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type).	515
Number of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that reported data.	515
Percent of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that reported data.	100%
Number of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	115
Percent of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	22%
Number of Prisons (facility sub-type).	35
Number of Prisons (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	0
Percent of Prisons (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	0%
Number of other secure residential facilities (facility sub-type) used for the placement of individuals accused or adjudicated/convicted of a criminal offense.	0
Number of other secure residential facilities (facility sub-type) used for the placement of individuals accused or adjudicated/convicted of a criminal offense that received onsite inspections.	0
Percent of other secure residential facilities (facility sub-type) used for the placement of individuals accused or adjudicated/convicted of a criminal offense that received onsite inspections.	0%
Total number of facility sub-types (Note: this sum excludes prisons and other secure residential facilities).	729

<b>Metric</b>	<b>Value</b>
Total number of facility sub-types that reported data (Note: this sum excludes prisons and other secure residential facilities).	727
Percent of facility sub-types that reported data.	100%
Total number of facility sub-types that received onsite inspections (Note: this sum excludes prisons and other secure residential facilities).	164
Percent of facility sub-types that received onsite inspections.	22%
<b>FACILITY SUB-TYPE - INSTITUTIONS</b>	
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (institution sub-type).	52
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	5
Percent of Juvenile Detention Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	10%
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (institution sub-type).	43
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	5
Percent of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	12%
Number of Adult Jails (institution sub-type).	119
Number of Adult Jails (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	39
Percent of Adult Jails (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	33%
Number of Adult Lockups (institution sub-type).	515
Number of Adult Lockups (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	115
Percent of Adult Lockups (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	22%
Number of Prisons (institution sub-type).	35
Number of Prisons (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	0
Percent of Prisons (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	0%
Number of Court Holding facilities (institution sub-type).	112
Number of Court Holding facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	33
Percent of Court Holding facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	29%
Number of other secure residential facilities (institution sub-type) used for the placement of individuals accused or adjudicated/convicted of a criminal offense.	0
Number of other secure residential facilities (institution sub-type) used for the placement of individuals accused or adjudicated/convicted of a criminal offense that received onsite inspections.	0
Percent of other secure residential facilities (institution sub-type) used for the placement of individuals accused or adjudicated/convicted of a criminal offense that received onsite inspections.	0%
Total number of institution sub-types.	876
Total number of institution sub-types that received onsite inspections.	197
Percent of institution sub-types that received onsite inspections.	22%
<b>FACILITY SUB-TYPE - ADULT JAIL or LOCKUP</b>	
Number of Adult Jails (adult jail or lockup sub-type).	119
Number of Adult Jails (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data.	119
Percent of Adult Jails (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data.	100%
Number of Adult Jails (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	39
Percent of Adult Jails (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	33%
Number of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type).	515
Number of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data..	515
Percent of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data..	100%
Number of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	115
Percent of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	22%
Total number of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type).	634
Total number of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data..	634
Percent of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data.	100%
Total number of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	154
Percent of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	24%
<b>FACILITY SUB-TYPE - COLLOCATED</b>	
Number of secure Juvenile Detention or Correctional Facilities that are Collocated with an Adult Jail or Lockup.	6
Number of secure Juvenile Detention or Correctional Facilities that are Collocated with an Adult Jail or Lockup that received onsite inspections.	6

<b>Metric</b>	<b>Value</b>
Percent of secure Juvenile Detention or Correctional Facilities that are Collocated with an Adult Jail or Lockup that received onsite inspections.	100%
<b>SUMMARY OF FACILITIES REQUIRED TO REPORT COMPLIANCE DATA - 85% RULE</b>	
Cumulative percent of facilities reporting data that are required to report compliance data (85% rule).	100%
<b>DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO)</b>	
<b>STATUS OFFENDERS AND NON-OFFENDERS PLACED IN SECURE DETENTION OR CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES</b>	
Number of accused status offenders who were placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities (both juvenile and adult facility types). Include status offender Valid Court Order violators (where applicable) and out of state runaways. Do not include juveniles held in violation of the Youth Handgun Safety Act or similar state law.	31
Number of adjudicated status offenders who were placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities (both juvenile and adult facility types). Include status offender Valid Court Order violators (where applicable) and out of state runaways. Do not include juveniles held in violation of the Youth Handgun Safety Act or similar state law.	1
Number of accused and adjudicated status offenders who were placed in secure juvenile detention or secure juvenile correctional facilities who were charged with or committed a violation of a valid court order. (Note: This is a statutory exception to the total number of instances of non-compliance with DSO.)	0
Number of accused and adjudicated status offenders who were placed in secure juvenile detention or secure juvenile correctional facilities in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the State. (Note: This is a statutory exception to the total number of instances of non-compliance with DSO.)	23
Calculated total number of status offenders placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities that do not meet one of the statutory exceptions and therefore result in instances of non-compliance with DSO.	9
Number of non-offenders who are aliens or who were alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused, who were placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities.	0
Calculated total number of DSO violations.	9
<b>DSO SUMMARY</b>	
Calculated total number of DSO violations adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	9.02
RATE of non-compliance with DSO per 100,000 juvenile population.	0.10
RATE of non-compliance with DSO per 100,000 juvenile population, adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	0.10
<b>SEPARATION</b>	
<b>POLICY IMPACTING SEPARATION</b>	
Does the state have a policy in effect that requires individuals who work with both juveniles and adult inmates to have been trained and certified to work with juveniles?	Yes
<b>SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION in SECURE JUVENILE DETENTION or CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES</b>	
Number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent detained or confined in secure juvenile detention and secure juvenile correctional facilities who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates, including inmate trustees.	0
Number of juvenile status offenders and juvenile non-offenders who were aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, abused, detained or confined in secure juvenile detention and secure juvenile correctional facilities who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates, including inmate trustees.	0
TOTAL number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, juvenile status offenders, and juvenile non-offenders who are aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, abused, detained or confined in secure juvenile detention and secure juvenile correctional facilities who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates, including inmate trustees.	0
<b>SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION in ADULT JAILS, ADULT LOCKUPS, or PRISONS</b>	
Number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, detained or confined in jails or lockups for adults or adult prisons who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates.	0
Number of juvenile status offenders and juvenile non-offenders who are aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused, detained or confined in jails or lockups for adults or adult prisons, without sight and sound separation from adult inmates.	0
TOTAL number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, juvenile status offenders, and juvenile non-offenders who are aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused, who were detained or confined in jails or lockups for adults or adult prisons without sight and sound separation.	0
<b>SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION in COURT HOLDING FACILITIES</b>	

<b>Metric</b>	<b>Value</b>
Number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, detained or confined in court holding facilities who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates.	0
Number of juvenile status offenders and juvenile non-offenders who are aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused detained or confined in court holding facilities who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates.	0
TOTAL number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, juvenile status offenders, and juvenile non-offenders who are aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused detained or confined in court holding facilities who were not sight and sound separated from adult inmates.	0
<b>SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION SUMMARY</b>	
TOTAL number of juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, juvenile status offenders, and juvenile non-offenders who are aliens or alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused, not sight and sound separated from adult inmates in Secure Juvenile Detention Facilities, Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities, Adult Jails, Adult Lockups, Prisons, and Court Holding Facilities.	0
RATE of non-compliance with separation per 100,000 juveniles at and below the age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends.	0.00
<b>JAIL REMOVAL</b>	
<b>POLICY IMPACTING JAIL REMOVAL</b>	
Is there a state policy in effect requiring individuals who work with both adult inmates and juveniles to be trained and certified to work with juveniles?	Yes
<b>FACILITIES IN WHICH JUVENILES WERE DETAINED OR CONFINED</b>	
Number of Adult Jails and Adult Lockups in which juveniles were detained or confined that meet rural exception criteria (pursuant to Section 223(a)(13)(B)(ii)(I) of the JJDP Act) and for which approval has been granted by OJJDP.	0
<b>JUVENILES DETAINED WITHIN SIGHT OR SOUND CONTACT OF ADULT INMATES</b>	
Number of juveniles accused of delinquent offenses detained or confined in Adult Jails or Adult Lockups 6 hours or less for processing or release, awaiting transfer to a juvenile facility, or prior to/following a court appearance, but who had contact with adult inmates (pursuant to Section 223(a)(13)(A) of the JJDP Act).	0
<b>JUVENILES ACCUSED OF DELINQUENT OFFENSES OR ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT</b>	
Number of juveniles accused of delinquent offenses detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups in excess of 6 hours, and not pursuant to a valid use of the rural, travel conditions or safety exceptions, as detailed in Section 223(a)(13)(B) of the JJDP Act.	80
Number of juveniles accused of delinquent offenses detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups, for 6 hours or less for purposes other than processing or release, while awaiting transfer to a juvenile facility, or periods during which such juveniles are making court appearances (pursuant to Section 223(a)(13)(A) of the JJDP Act).	0
Number of juveniles accused of delinquent offenses who were detained or confined in excess of 6 hours but less than 48 hours (not including weekends and legal holidays) awaiting an initial court appearance in an Adult Jail or Adult Lockup approved by OJJDP for use of the rural exception, provided that during this time there was no contact with adult inmates (pursuant to Section 223(a)(13)(B)(ii)(I) of the JJDP Act) (Note: This is a statutory exception to the total number of instances of non-compliance with jail removal.)	0
Number of juveniles accused of delinquent offenses who were detained or confined in excess of 48 hours but less than 96 hours (not including weekends and legal holidays) awaiting an initial court appearance in an Adult Jail or Adult Lockup due to conditions of distance to be traveled or the lack of highway, road, or transportation, provided that during this time there was no contact with adult inmates (pursuant to Section 223(a)(13)(B)(ii)(II) of the JJDP Act) (Note: This is a statutory exception to the total number of instances of non-compliance with jail removal.)	0
Number of juveniles accused of delinquent offenses awaiting an initial court appearance in an Adult Jail or Adult Lockup where conditions of safety existed (e.g., severe adverse, life-threatening weather conditions that do not allow for reasonably safe travel) and who were detained or confined for in excess of 6 hours but not more than 24 hours after the time that such conditions allowed for reasonably safe travel, provided that during this time there was no contact with adult inmates (pursuant to Section 223(a)(13)(B)(ii)(III) of the JJDP Act) (Note: This is a statutory exception to the total number of instances of non-compliance with jail removal.)	0
Number of juveniles adjudicated of delinquent offenses who were detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups for any length of time.	0
<b>JUVENILE STATUS AND NONOFFENDERS</b>	
Number of accused or adjudicated status offenders detained or confined for any length of time in Adult Jails or Adult Lockups.	4
Number of juvenile non-offenders detained or confined for any length of time in Adult Jails or Adult Lockups.	16
<b>JAIL REMOVAL SUMMARY</b>	

Metric	Value
Total instances of non-compliance with the Jail removal requirement as a result of juveniles detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups.	100.00
Total instances in which the state used the rural, travel conditions, or conditions of safety exceptions to detain or confine juveniles in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups in excess of 6 hours.	0
Total instances of non-compliance with the Jail removal requirement as a result of juveniles detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	100.00
Rate of non-compliance with jail removal per 100,000 juvenile population at and below the age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends.	1.10
Rate of non-compliance with jail removal per 100,000 juvenile population at and below the age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends, adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	1.10

---

For technical assistance, contact the OJJDP Compliance Monitoring  
 Tool Help Desk at:  
[ojjdp-compliance@usdoj.gov](mailto:ojjdp-compliance@usdoj.gov) or call, toll-free, (844) 884-2505

---

California Violations of JJDPA Since 2003

Attachment B

	2019	% change	2018	% change	2017	% change	2016	% change	2015	% change	2014	% change	2013	% change	2012	% change	2011	% change	2010	% change	2009	% change	2008	% change	2007	% change	2006	% change	2005	% change	2004	% change	2003	
DSO JH	9	70%	30	88%	16	7%	15	-6%	16	-60%	40	-7%	43	13%	38	-22%	49	-39%	80	-20%	75	11%	90	70%	53	-47%	100.6	-63%	270	28%	211	-11%	237	
DSO LOCKUPS	24	0%	24	-11%	27	-27%	37	0%	37	-31%	54	20%	45	-48%	87	43%	61	177%	22	-12%	25	-38%	40	-13%	46	n/a								
DSO TOTAL (JH + LU)	33	39%	54	26%	43	-17%	52	-2%	53	-44%	94	7%	88	-30%	125	14%	110	8%	102.00	2%	100	-23%	130	31%	99.37	-1%	100.6	-63%	270	28%	211	-11%	237	
DSO TOTAL RATE	0.10	84%	0.62	32%	0.47	-34%	0.71	0%	0.71	-30%	1.01	6%	0.95	-29%	1.34	14%	1.18	8%	1.09	2%	1.07	-23%	1.39	36%	1.02	-2%	1.04	-64%	2.86	28%	2.23	-11%	2.51	
Separation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	-100%	1	100%	0	-100%	2	200%	0	0%	0	-100%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	-97%	33	-25%	44	100%	0	0%
Jail Removal Total (6 hr Rule)	80	38%	58	-21%	73	-4%	76	15%	66	-7%	71	25%	57	-17%	69	6%	65	-13%	75	-17%	90	18%	76.21	-29%	107	-52%	225	185%	79	0%	79	-25%	106	
Jail Removal Rate																																		
Jail Removal (total with SO)	100	3%	103	3%	100	-12%	113	10%	103	-18%	125	23%	102	-35%	156	24%	126	30%	97.12	-16%	115	-1%	116	-25%	154.2									
Jail Removal Rate	1.10	3%	1.14	3%	1.1	-11%	1.24	12%	1.11	-17%	1.34	22%	1.1	-35%	1.68	24%	1.36	32%	1.03	-16%	1.23	-1%	1.24	-22%	1.59									

In 2006, we increased our lockup universe and also began to clean up status offender reporting methods and training. In 2007, we began reporting status offenders held in lockups, therefore increasing the DSO TOTAL and the JAIL REMOVAL TOTAL numbers. In 2016 the reporting period changed from a 12-month calendar year to a 12-month federal fiscal year beginning October 1st and ending September 31st.

-86% percentage change between 2003 total DSO and 2019 (page 3 of the Gov/Leg Report)

-25% percentage change between 2003 Jail Removal and 2019 (page 3 of the Gov/Leg Report)