

A photograph of the California State Capitol dome, featuring a large black dome with a white base and columns, set against a blue sky with some clouds. The image is framed by a white curved border at the bottom.

State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

2020 Compliance Monitoring

Annual Report

July 2021



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.)
- Amanda Ayala** Co-Director, A Way Home America
- Dr. B.J. Davis**..... Clinical Director and Co-Director, Strategies for Change
- Dr. Carly Bailey Dierkhising**..... Assistant Professor, California State University, Los Angeles
- Miguel Garcia**Advocacy Coordinator, Anti-Recidivism Coalition
- Juan Gomez** Executive Director, Motivating Individual Leadership for Public Advancement
- Michelle Guymon** Director, Child Trafficking Unit, Los Angeles County Probation Department
- Susan Harbert** Special Legislative Counsel, Center for Juvenile Law and Policy, Loyola Law School
- Elliott Houseman-Turrubiate**..... Youth Victim Advocate, Native American Health Center
- Gordon Jackson** National Director of PROTECT, 3Strands Global Foundation
- Ramon Leija**Constituent Affairs Representative, Office of Governor Gavin Newsom
- Kent Mendoza** Manager of Policy and Community Organizing, 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**..... Assistant Public Defender, Los Angeles County Public Defender’s Office
- Dr. Mimi Silbert** Chief Executive Officer, Delancey Street Foundation
- Dante Williams** Student, Juvenile Justice Chaplain, Sacramento County Probation

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 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.¹ 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 of an annual report from the state's juvenile justice advisory group to the Governor and Legislature, with recommendations regarding compliance with the first three of the four JJDP core requirements (those specifically related to compliance monitoring).² 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 Offenders³ (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. Separation⁴

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 Removal⁵

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.

¹ 34 U.S.C. §§ 11131-11134.

² 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(3)(D)(ii).

³ 34 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(11).

⁴ *Id.* at (a)(12).

⁵ *Id.* at (a)(13).

COMPLIANCE WITH CORE REQUIREMENTS

BSCC staff monitors 1,177 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 data for the 2020 federal fiscal year (FY) reporting period, which runs from October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020. Attachment B is a summary of the FY 2020 compliance monitoring violations. Attachment C is a summary chart of violations of the core requirements since 2003.

California maintains compliance with the core requirements so long as its 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.

The OJJDP has established the following compliance standards for the FY 2020. Data from the FY 2020 reporting period verifies that California remains in de minimus compliance with all three core requirements.

Core Requirement	Federal Standard	California 2020 Rates
DSO	4.57	0.15
Separation	2.54	0.00
Jail Removal	1.10	0.72

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). Overall, the total number of violations has reduced from 109 to 75.

Core Requirement	FY 2019 Violations	FY 2020 Violations
DSO	9	13
Separation	0	0
Jail Removal	100	62

In comparing the first core requirement, the number of DSO violations slightly increased by 44 percent from nine to 13 violations. These violations occurred in four local juvenile hall and camp facilities. The most common reasons reported to the BSCC were:

- Holding California runaways; and
- Holding runaways from out of state, where states did not have an Interstate Compact with California.

Whereas detaining runaways was just one of many reasons in the previous year, it is now the sole reason in FY 2020. Taking a deeper look into where and when these DSO incidents occurred revealed that all 13 incidents occurred before a state of emergency was declared in California. That is, these incidents occurred prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. Once a state of emergency was proclaimed, all juvenile detention facilities stopped accepting status offenders and nonoffenders for the remainder of FY 2020.

In FY 2020, Separation violations remained at zero.

Finally, for the last core requirement, the number of Jail Removal violations decreased by 29 percent from 100 to 62 violations. For these violations, the most common reasons reported to the BSCC were:

- Waiting for Live Scan delays;
- Conducting interviews; and
- Holding youth for release

The number of violations due to live scan delays decreased to 18 from 33, and the number of violations due to interviews decreased to 12 from over 30. Live Scan delays remain the source of the largest number of violations from one county. Because the local law enforcement agencies have no control or authority over the live scan process, the delays and thus, the violations will continue to occur. Eight youth were held in excess of six hours while waiting for a parent, guardian, or relative. Normally, waiting to be released to family would qualify as an exception to the core requirement if it is the sole reason for being detained. However, these youth were held and cited for an offense as well.

Overall, California's rates of JJDPA violations have been on a downward trend since 2003. While Jail Removal violations decreased by 28 percent, DSO violations increased by 44 percent. These annual fluctuations occur at a local level and reinforce the notion that continued compliance with the JJDPA requires continued outreach and technical assistance. The BSCC must continue to work with local county and city law enforcement agencies 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.

Barrier	Strategy
The turnover in local correctional staff creates a gap of knowledge with respect to core requirements in some facilities; constant training is required.	<p>During the pandemic, the BSCC observed a greater number of local correctional staff turnover, whether for transfer, retirement, sick leave, or other reason.</p> <p>The BSCC continues to provide on-going 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>
The addition of new BSCC staff.	<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 on-going basis.</p> <p>The BSCC encourages new staff to observe compliance monitoring inspections as part of the orientation and training process. The opportunity to observe or conduct joint compliance monitoring inspections remains available to current staff.</p>

<p>The state advisory group is comprised of subject-matter experts from across the state. Members' ability to join and observe compliance monitoring inspections would greatly enhance their understanding of the JJDP and core requirements. Yet there was not a clear process in place for members to learn about upcoming compliance monitoring inspections.</p>	<p>The BSCC developed a policy and procedure for SACJJDP to be stay informed of ongoing CM inspections and process for members to join and observe them. The implementation was delayed due to the ongoing pandemic.</p>
<p>The FY2020 data shows increased DSO violations in juvenile halls and camps. Specifically, four counties held runaways securely prior to the pandemic.</p>	<p>The BSCC will provide technical assistance and training to the specific facilities in the four counties with higher numbers DSO violations. The BSCC will also inquire how these facilities have modified their practices during the pandemic.</p>
<p>The FY 2020 data shows decreased Jail Removal violations during the pandemic. Efforts must be made, and measures put in place, to ensure that violations do not sharply increase post-pandemic.</p>	<p>The BSCC should collaborate with local juvenile justice commissions to ensure that the number of violations continue to trend downward.</p>
<p>OJJDP announced new requirements that apply to court holding facilities, which will apply the Jail Removal core requirement to the secure detention of adjudicated juveniles in court holding facilities. These new requirements will impact our policies and procedures for those facilities.</p>	<p>The BSCC must develop a plan to provide outreach and education to counties on the application of core requirement for court holding facilities. The BSCC also must develop a new data collection tool for these facilities and methods of BSCC staff to document reported data.</p> <p>The BSCC will modify its internal training to staff on how this change will impact compliance monitoring inspections for court holding facilities.</p> <p>The BSCC will also seek the input and expertise of the SACJJDP.</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 highlight California's effort and commitment to maintaining compliance with the core requirements through outreach and collaboration with state and local entities.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A: OJJDP California Compliance Data Collection FY 2020
- B: OJJDP California Compliance Data Summary Report FY 2020
- C: Summary of California Violations of JJDPA Since 2003

**California Compliance Data Collection - 2020
Detailed Report**

Metric	Value
STATE PROFILE	
STATE JUVENILE POPULATION DATA	
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.	8894641
Total population under the age of 18.	8894641
FEDERAL DEFINITIONS	
During the State's monitoring effort, were Federal definitions (under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act or its implementing regulations) used?	Yes
FACILITY SUB-TYPE - SECURE DETENTION or CORRECTION FACILITIES	
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type).	48
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	48
Percent of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	100%
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	21
Percent of Juvenile Detention Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	44%
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type).	42
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	38
Percent of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that reported data.	90%
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	15
Percent of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	36%
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).	517
Number of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that reported data.	500
Percent of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that reported data.	97%
Number of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	210
Percent of Adult Lockups (facility sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	41%
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).	726
Total number of facility sub-types that reported data (Note: this sum excludes prisons and other secure residential facilities).	705
Percent of facility sub-types that reported data.	97%
Total number of facility sub-types that received onsite inspections (Note: this sum excludes prisons and other secure residential facilities).	285
Percent of facility sub-types that received onsite inspections.	39%
FACILITY SUB-TYPE - INSTITUTIONS	
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (institution sub-type).	48
Number of Juvenile Detention Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	21

**California Compliance Data Collection - 2020
Detailed Report**

Percent of Juvenile Detention Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	44%
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (institution sub-type).	42
Number of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	15
Percent of Juvenile Correctional Facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	36%
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).	517
Number of Adult Lockups (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	210
Percent of Adult Lockups (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	41%
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).	118
Number of Court Holding facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	40
Percent of Court Holding facilities (institution sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	34%
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.	879
Total number of institution sub-types that received onsite inspections.	325
Percent of institution sub-types that received onsite inspections.	37%
FACILITY SUB-TYPE - ADULT JAIL or LOCKUP	
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).	517
Number of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data..	500
Percent of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data..	97%
Number of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	210
Percent of Adult Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	41%
Total number of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type).	636
Total number of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data..	619
Percent of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that reported data.	97%
Total number of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	249
Percent of Adult Jails and Lockups (adult jail or lockup sub-type) that received onsite inspections.	39%
FACILITY SUB-TYPE - COLLOCATED	
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
Percent of secure Juvenile Detention or Correctional Facilities that are Collocated with an Adult Jail or Lockup that received onsite inspections.	100%
SUMMARY OF FACILITIES REQUIRED TO REPORT COMPLIANCE DATA - 85% RULE	
Cumulative percent of facilities reporting data that are required to report compliance data (85% rule).	97%

DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO)	
STATUS OFFENDERS AND NON-OFFENDERS PLACED IN SECURE DETENTION OR CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES	
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.	32
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.	0
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.)	19
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.	13
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.	13
DSO SUMMARY	
Calculated total number of DSO violations adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	13.39
RATE of non-compliance with DSO per 100,000 juvenile population.	0.15
RATE of non-compliance with DSO per 100,000 juvenile population, adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	0.15
SEPARATION	
POLICY IMPACTING SEPARATION	
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
SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION in SECURE JUVENILE DETENTION or CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES	
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
SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION in ADULT JAILS, ADULT LOCKUPS, or PRISONS	
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
SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION in COURT HOLDING FACILITIES	
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

**California Compliance Data Collection - 2020
Detailed Report**

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
SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION SUMMARY	
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
JAIL REMOVAL	
POLICY IMPACTING JAIL REMOVAL	
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
FACILITIES IN WHICH JUVENILES WERE DETAINED OR CONFINED	
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
JUVENILES DETAINED WITHIN SIGHT OR SOUND CONTACT OF ADULT INMATES	
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
JUVENILES ACCUSED OF DELINQUENT OFFENSES OR ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT	
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.	57
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
JUVENILE STATUS AND NONOFFENDERS	
Number of accused or adjudicated status offenders detained or confined for any length of time in Adult Jails or Adult Lockups.	3
Number of juvenile non-offenders detained or confined for any length of time in Adult Jails or Adult Lockups.	2
JAIL REMOVAL SUMMARY	
Total instances of non-compliance with the Jail removal requirement as a result of juveniles detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups.	62.00
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

**California Compliance Data Collection - 2020
Detailed Report**

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.	63.70
Rate of non-compliance with jail removal per 100,000 juvenile population at and below the age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends.	0.70
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.	0.72

Secure Facility On-Site Inspection Compliance - Planning Cycle 10/01/2019 - 09/30/2022

	Year	Total Number Secure Facilities	Number Facilities Receiving On-Site Inspections	Percent Facilities Receiving On-Site Inspections
	1	844	325	38.51 %
	2			
	3			
		844	325	38.51 %

Metric	Value			
STATE PROFILE				
STATE JUVENILE POPULATION DATA				
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.	8894641			
Total population under the age of 18.	8894641			
DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO)				
DSO SUMMARY				
Calculated total number of DSO violations adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	13.39			
RATE of non-compliance with DSO per 100,000 juvenile population.	0.15			
RATE of non-compliance with DSO per 100,000 juvenile population, adjusting for non-reporting facilities.	0.15			
SEPARATION				
SIGHT and SOUND SEPARATION SUMMARY				
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			
JAIL REMOVAL				
JAIL REMOVAL SUMMARY				
Total instances of non-compliance with the Jail removal requirement as a result of juveniles detained or confined in Adult Jails and Adult Lockups.	62.00			
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.	63.70			
Rate of non-compliance with jail removal per 100,000 juvenile population at and below the age at which original juvenile court jurisdiction ends.	0.70			
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.	0.72			
Secure Facility On-Site Inspection Compliance - Planning Cycle 10/01/2019 - 09/30/2022				
	Year	Number of Secure Facilities	Number of Facilities Receiving On-Site Inspections	Percent of Facilities Receiving On-Site Inspections
	1	844	325	38.51 %
	2			
	3			
Planning Cycle Summary:		844	325	38.51 %
Planning Cycle Summary: 1. If the number of secure facilities increases or decreases, percent of on-site inspections are calculated using the most recent change 2. In recognition that on-site inspections may exceed the number of secure facilities, percentages are capped at 100%				

California Violations of JJDPA Since 2003

Attachment C

	2020	% change	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	13	44%	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	5	79%	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)	18	45%	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	0.15	50%	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	0%	0	-100%	1	100%	0	-100%	2	200%	0	0%	0	-100%	1	0%	1	0%	1	-97%	33	-25%	44	100%	0	0%	0	
Jail Removal Total (6 hr Rule)	57	29%	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)	62	38%	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	0.72	35%	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.

-92% percentage change between 2003 total DSO and 2020 (page 3 of the Gov/Leg Report)

-46% percentage change between 2003 Jail Removal and 2020 (page 3 of the Gov/Leg Report)