



CALIFORNIA REDUCING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITY

TITLE II 2018-2021 PLAN

February 2018



Board of State & Community Corrections
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento CA 95833
www.bsc.ca.gov

**PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE REDUCING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITY (R.E.D.)
CORE PROTECTION**

Phase I: Identification

1. Updated R.E.D.¹ Identification Spreadsheets

In this final update to California's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015-2017 R.E.D. Three Year Plan, which overlaps with the beginning of the FFY 2018-2020 State Plan, the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) has included the Relative Rate Index (RRI) Analysis Tracking Sheets for California (statewide) as well as for four counties with Title II grant funded focused R.E.D. efforts: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Santa Barbara, and Mono. Corresponding data has also been entered into the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) DMC Web-Based Data Entry System and uploaded into OJJDP's on-line Compliance Tool.

R.E.D. Data Discussions

California is divided into 58 counties that have 114 juvenile detention facilities including 56 camps, 54 juvenile halls and 4 special purpose juvenile halls (small facilities designed for short periods of detention). 45 counties have at least one juvenile hall and 27 counties have at least one camp. Los Angeles County, with the largest general population, has 3 juvenile halls and 18 camps. At a point in time average across California, nearly 13,576 juveniles are housed in local juvenile detention facilities. Another 3,254 juveniles are "detained" (i.e., receiving custody credits) in home detention or another form of alternative confinement (e.g., work programs, day schools and special purpose juvenile halls).

RRI data is collected by the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and distributed upon request to the BSCC and annually to Chief Probation Officers. DOJ's Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) collects a variety of juvenile statistical data, including information regarding R.E.D. from 58 county probation departments on a yearly basis. Each year, there is a difference between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as "referred to juvenile court and probation" via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). The differences are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the California DOJ. Two primary differences are:

- Probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests.
- The JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the California DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other "community based" programs. As a result, many juveniles who

¹ The State of California refers to DMC as R.E.D. – Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities

are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported in JCPSS.

When reviewing and interpreting RRI results, there are several things to consider. Different jurisdictions may interpret the definitions of various data elements and decision points differently or use different sources of information to collect them based on their available data. To help combat this, both the JCPSS manual and the BSCC R.E.D. grantee Progress Report guidelines provide a set of definitions for counties to use. In addition, the data are based on an “event” within the juvenile system so counts along the continuum at each decision point cannot be interpreted as a count of the number of youth as a single youth may have multiple events during the reporting periods. Therefore, the RRI values provided cannot be directly compared to those reported by other government agencies nor can they be exclusively relied upon to shape California’s R.E.D. compliance plan.

This RRI data informs local decision-makers, and the state responds accordingly by providing continued guidance, monitoring, and evaluation.

All four of the current county probation departments receiving Title II funds to undertake the reduction of disparity and disproportionality continue to use a data-driven process to guide their efforts. In addition to the RRI data collected through the California DOJ, the BSCC also requires R.E.D. grantees to submit the following local data disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender on a quarterly basis:

- Juvenile Arrests
- Juvenile Hall Bookings
- In-Custody Holds for Detention Hearings
- Petitions Filed
- Petitions Sustained
- Institutional Commitments

BSCC’s R.E.D. Coordinator continues to monitor progress within the four R.E.D. grantee sites. This year’s focus is largely on monitoring and best practices. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Quality assurance when addressing R.E.D.
- Gender impacts
- Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) specifically for race, gender, and culture
- Decision-point analyses

California: Statewide Relative Rate Index Comparison

2013 National RRIs are roughly equal to those of 2015 California for ‘All Minorities,’ with the exception of cases transferred to adult court where California is higher (1.3 National. vs. 1.85 California). From 2011 to 2015, California has had a steep decrease in cases transferred to adult court (see row 10). However, this is not the case for ‘Black/African American’ where California’s RRI exceeds the national RRI for cases for juvenile arrests

(4.1 to 1.8, respectively), cases involving secure detention (1.6 vs. 1.3, respectively), and cases transferred to adult court (1.9 vs. 1.3, respectively), all of which show substantial volume (number of occurrences) and magnitude (percent of total occurrences by race/ethnicity). Ethnicity data for 'Hispanic/Latino' is not available for 2013 at the national level; however, it is important to note that 2015 California 'Hispanic/Latino' RRI's for decision points with substantial volume and magnitude are still greater than those for 'Whites' held constant at 1.0 (arrests 1.3, secure detention 1.3, cases petitioned 1.2, and cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities 10).

Because data from 2016 has not yet been processed, the data provided in the 2018 State Plan is the same data submitted in the prior State Plan. The BSCC anticipates providing the 2016 data and comparative discussion in the 2019 State Plan updates.

California is a large and diverse state with 58 different counties that maintain relatively high levels of autonomy. Consequently, coordination and standardization of efforts is challenging. We will continue to prioritize coordination and joint decision making amongst stakeholders and partners.

See next page.

**California: Statewide Relative Rate Index
Comparison of Statewide Rates for 2011 and 2015
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

| Race/ Ethnicity | African- American | | Hispanic/ Latino | | Asian | | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander* | | American Indian/ Alaska Native* | | Other/ Mixed | | All Minorities | |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | 2015 | 2011 | 2015 | 2011 | 2015 | 2011 | 2015 | 2011 | 2015 | 2011 | 2015 | 2011 | 2015 | 2011 |
| 1. Population at Risk (10-17) | 225K 5.5% | 265K 6.0% | 2.1mil 51.2% | 2.1mil 50.4% | 439K 10.8% | 430K 10% | 14.8K 0.4% | 16K 0.4% | 16.6K 0.4% | 26K 0.6% | 171K 4.2% | --- | 2.9mil 72.6% | 2.9mil 67.6% |
| 2. Juvenile Arrests | 4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K | 3.81 S=Yes M=16% V= 25K | 1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K | 1.54 S=Yes M=54.8% V= 85K | 0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K | 0.38 S=Yes M= 2.6% V= 4140 | * | 1.72 S=Yes M= .5% V= 708 | * | 0.86 S=Yes M= .4% V= 576 | 0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K | --- S= - M=2.4% V= 3.8K | 1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K | 1.62 S=Yes M= 77% V= 120K |
| 3. Referrals to Juvenile Court | 1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K | 3.85 S=Yes M= 17% V=23K | 1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K | 1.46 S=Yes M=53.9% V=71K | 0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K | 0.31 S=Yes M= 3.015 | * | 1.53 S=Yes M= .4% V=557 | * | 1.32 S=Yes M= .6% V= 779 | 0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K | --- S - M=1.7% V=2,248 | 1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K | 1.54 S=Yes M= 76% V= 101K |
| 4. Cases Diverted | 0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K | 0.72 S=Yes M=16% V=2.0K | 0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K | 0.72 S=Yes M=49% V=6,320 | 0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94 | 1.06 S=No M= 3% V=391 | * | 0.45 S=Yes M= .2% V=31 | * | 0.53 S=Yes M= .4% V=51 | 1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141 | --- S= - M=2.1% V= 280 | 0.65 S=Yes M=71% V=4.9K | 0.73 S=Yes M= 70% V= 9,089 |
| 5. Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K | 1.71 S=Yes M=23% V= 6.8K | 1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K | 1.31 S=Yes M=55% V=16K | 0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237 | 0.92 S=No M= 1.6% V=481 | * | 1.55 S=Yes M= .5% V=149 | * | 1.84 S=Yes M= .8% V= 248 | 0.84 S=Yes M=.9% V=176 | --- S= - M=1.5% V=441 | 1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K | 1.39 S=Yes M= 82% V= 24K |
| 6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed) | 1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K | 1.34 S=Yes M= 20% V=13K | 1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K | 1.19 S=Yes M= 55% V= 35K | 1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571 | 1.02 S=No M= 10% V= 1,269 | * | 1.40 S=Yes M= .5% V= 322 | * | 1.34 S=Yes M= .7% V= 432 | 1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442 | --- S= - M=1.6% V=1,034 | 1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K | 1.22 S=Yes M= 80% V=51K |
| 7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings | 1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K | 1.03 S=Yes M= 20% V= 9.9K | 1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K | 1.07 S=Yes M= 56% V= 29K | 0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382 | 0.93 S=Yes M= 1.8% V= 892 | * | 1.08 S=Yes M= .5% V= 262 | * | 1.13 S=Yes M= .7% V= 370 | 0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317 | --- S= - M=1.5% V=766 | 1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K | 1.06 S=Yes M= 81% V=41K |
| 8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K | 1.16 S=Yes M= 22% V= 6.3K | 1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K | 1.02 S=No M=55% V=16K | 0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205 | 0.94 S=No M= 1.6% V=457 | * | 1.36 S=Yes M= .7% V=194 | * | 1.07 S=No M= .8% V=216 | 1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201 | --- S= - M=1.5% V=425 | 1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K | 1.05 S=Yes M= 81% V= 23K |
| 9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities | 1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K | 1.10 S=Yes M=17% V=2.3K | 1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K | 1.41 S=Yes M= 63% V= 8.5K | 1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105 | 1.21 S=Yes M= 1.7% V= 229 | * | 0.69 S=Yes M=.3% V=38 | * | 1.35 S=Yes M= .8% V= 106 | 0.70 S=Yes M=.6% V=44 | --- S= - M=1.4% V=188 | 1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K | 1.32 S=Yes M= 85% V=11K |
| 10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court | 1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124 | 3.55 S=Yes M= 29% V= 226 | 1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305 | 2.59 S=Yes M= 56% V=456 | 1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | 5.51 S=Yes M= 4.4% V=35 | * | 0.62 S=No M=0.1% V=1 | * | 0.46 S=No M=0.1% V=1 | 1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | --- S= - M=1.0% V=8 | 1.85 S=Yes M=90% V=442 | 2.85 S=Yes M= 92% V=727 |

2015 Statewide Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

| Area of Concern | Decision Stages or Contact Points | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | African-American | Hispanic/Latino | Asian | Native HI/PI | Native American | All Minorities |
| More than 1.00 | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court | 6. Cases Petitioned 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court |
| Less than 1.00 | 4. Cases Diverted | 4. Cases Diverted | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement | 4. Cases Diverted 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court | 4. Cases Diverted | 4. Cases Diverted |

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: San Joaquin County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
Comparison of County and Statewide Rates for 2015
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

San Joaquin County 2015 RRI values for five of the nine decision points are lower than the State values for 'African American,' 'Hispanic/Latino,' and 'Asian'. 'African American' juvenile arrest values are three times higher than 'White' held constant at 1.0 while 'Hispanic/Latino' values are two times lower than 'White' held constant at 1.0. 'Hispanic/Latino' referrals to juvenile court values are two times higher than 'White' held constant at 1.0.

| Race/ Ethnicity | African-American | | Hispanic/ Latino | | Asian | | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | | American Indian/ Alaska Native | | Other/ Mixed | | All Minorities | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | SJ | CA | SJ | CA | SJ | CA | SJ | CA | SJ | CA | SJ | CA | SJ | CA |
| 1. Population at Risk (10-17) | 6,299 7% | 225K 5.5% | 45,013 51.1% | 2.1mil 51.2% | 12,077 13.5% | 439K 10.8% | 412 0.5% | 14.8K 0.4% | 370 0.4% | 16.6K 0.4% | 4,269 4.8% | 171K 4.2% | 69,272 77.2% | 2.9mil 72.6% |
| 2. Juvenile Arrests | 3.05 S=Yes M=29% V=631 | 4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K | 0.52 S=Yes M=34% V=785 | 1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K | 0.23 S=Yes M=4.1% V=93 | 0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K | * | * | * | * | 0.30 S=Yes M=2% V=42 | 0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K | 0.71 S=Yes M=71% V=1,618 | 1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K |
| 3. Referrals to Juvenile Court | 1.6 S=Yes M=19% V=1,122 | 1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K | 2.02 S=No M=45% V=1,688 | 1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K | 1.83 S=Yes M=4.8% V=181 | 0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K | * | * | * | * | 1.14 S=Yes M=1% V=51 | 0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K | 1.78 S=Yes M=81% V=3,071 | 1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K |
| 4. Cases Diverted | 1.27 S=No M=12% V=18 | 0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K | 1.98 S=No M=56% V=42 | 0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K | 2.19 S=No M=6.7% V=5 | 0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141 | 1.71 S=No M=88% V=66 | 0.65 S=Yes M=71% V=4.9K |
| 5. Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.20 S=No M=20% V=153 | 1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K | 0.86 S=No M=40% V=164 | 1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K | 0.68 S=No M=3.4% V=14 | 0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.84 S=Yes M=0.9% V=176 | 0.96 S=No M=81% V=334 | 1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K |
| 6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed) | 1.13 S=No M=19% V=356 | 1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K | 0.97 S=No M=43% V=462 | 1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K | 0.81 S=No M=3.8% V=41 | 1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571 | * | * | * | * | 0.63 S=No M=1% V=9 | 1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442 | 1.01 S=No M=81% V=874 | 1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K |
| 7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings | 0.97 S=No M=19% V=216 | 1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K | 0.98 S=No M=43% V=283 | 1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K | 0.74 S=No M=2.9% V=19 | 0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317 | 0.96 S=No M=81% V=526 | 1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K |
| 8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.63 S=Yes M=31% V=44 | 1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K | 0.46 S=Yes M=32% V=42 | 1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K | 0.32 S=Yes M=1.5% V=2 | 0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201 | 0.53 S=Yes M=69% V=90 | 1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K |
| 9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities | 1.49 S=Yes M=14% V=146 | 1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K | 1.57 S=Yes M=48% V=201 | 1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K | 1.51 S=Yes M=3.1% V=13 | 1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.70 S=Yes M=0.6% V=44 | 1.53 S=Yes M=86% V=363 | 1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K |
| 10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court | ** | 1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124 | ** | 1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305 | ** | 1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | ** | 1.85 S=Yes M=90% V=442 |

2015 San Joaquin County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

| Area of Concern | Decision Stages or Contact Points | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | African-American | Hispanic/Latino | Asian | Native HI/PI | Native American | All Minorities |
| More than 1.00 | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court | 3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court | 4. Cases Diverted 8. Placement 10. Adult Court | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent | 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Det. 8. Placement | 3. Court Referrals 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine 10. Adult Court |
| Less than 1.00 | 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Det. | 2. Juvenile Arrests 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Det. 8. Placement | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Det. 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine | 5. Secure Det. 6. Cases Petitioned 9. Secure Confine | 2. Juvenile Arrests 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent | 2. Juvenile Arrests 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Det. 8. Placement |

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: Stanislaus County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
Comparison of County and Statewide Rates for 2015
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

Stanislaus County 2015 RRI values for six of the nine decision points are similar to the State for 'All Minorities'. With exceptions for the County secure detention RRI value is higher than the State; the RRI value for cases diverted from entry to the juvenile justice system are two times higher than the State; and confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities is two times lower than the State. The RRI values for arrests, secure detention, and cases petitioned are higher than 'White' held constant at 1.0 for both 'African American' and 'Hispanic/Latino.' The highest RRI value was arrest for 'African American' at 5.1.

| Race/ Ethnicity | African-American | | Hispanic/ Latino | | Asian | | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | | American Indian/ Alaska Native | | Other/ Mixed | | All Minorities | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Stan. | CA | Stan. | CA | Stan. | CA | Stan. | CA | Stan. | CA | Stan. | CA | Stan. | CA |
| 1. Population at Risk (10-17) | 1,604 2.5% | 225K 5.5% | 36,533 56.6% | 2.1mil 51.2% | 2,827 4.4% | 439K 10.8% | 323 0.5% | 14.8K 0.4% | 238 0.4% | 16.6K 0.4% | 2,243 3.5% | 171K 4.2% | 43,768 67.8% | 2.9mil 72.6% |
| 2. Juvenile Arrests | 5.12 S=Yes M=11% V=131 | 4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K | 1.28 S=Yes M=60% V=744 | 1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K | 0.49 S=Yes M=1.8% V=22 | 0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K | * | * | * | * | 0.36 S=Yes M=1% V=13 | 0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K | 1.32 S=Yes M=73% V=918 | 1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K |
| 3. Referrals to Juvenile Court | 1.04 S=Yes M=11% V=156 | 1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K | 1.02 S=Yes M=60% V=868 | 1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K | ** | 0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K | 1.02 S=Yes M=74% V=3,071 | 1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K |
| 4. Cases Diverted | ** | 0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K | 1.11 S=No M=66% V=61 | 0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K | ** | 0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141 | 1.02 S=No M=74% V=66 | 0.65 S=Yes M=71% V=4.9K |
| 5. Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.71 S=Yes M=13% V=64 | 1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K | 1.52 S=Yes M=65% V=316 | 1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K | ** | 0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.84 S=Yes M=9% V=176 | 1.55 S=Yes M=81% V=334 | 1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K |
| 6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed) | 1.44 S=Yes M=13% V=80 | 1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K | 1.29 S=Yes M=63% V=399 | 1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K | ** | 1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442 | 1.32 S=Yes M=79% V=874 | 1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K |
| 7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings | 0.92 S=No M=12% V=61 | 1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K | 0.98 S=No M=64% V=325 | 1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K | ** | 0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317 | 0.96 S=No M=78% V=526 | 1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K |
| 8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 1.22 S=Yes M=13% V=48 | 1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K | 1.19 S=Yes M=65% V=248 | 1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K | ** | 0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201 | 1.20 S=Yes M=81% V=90 | 1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K |
| 9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities | ** | 1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K | 0.71 S=No M=64% V=35 | 1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K | ** | 1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.70 S=Yes M=6% V=44 | 0.63 S=No M=69% V=363 | 1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K |
| 10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court | ** | 1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124 | ** | 1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305 | ** | 1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | ** | 1.85 S=Yes M=90% V=442 |

2015 Stanislaus County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

| Area of Concern | Decision Stages or Contact Points | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|
| | African-American | Hispanic/Latino | Asian | Native HI/PI | Native American | All Minorities |
| More than 1.00 | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 8. Placement | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement | 2. Juvenile Arrests | * | * | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Placement 10. Adult Court |
| Less than 1.00 | 7. Find Delinquent | 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine | ** | * | * | 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine |

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

**California: Santa Barbara County Relative Rate Index (RRI)
Comparison of County and Statewide Rates for 2015
Analysis and Tracking Sheet**

Santa Barbara County 2015 RRI values for 'All Minorities' are two times higher for cases diverted and lower for cases resulting in placement on probation than the State. The County had higher RRI values than the State and 'White' held constant at 1.0 for 'All Minorities' for secure detention, cases petitioned, delinquent findings, and confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities. The County's RRI value for 'African American' was four times higher for juvenile arrested and two times higher for placed in secure detention than 'White' held constant at 1.0.

| Race/ Ethnicity | African-American | | Hispanic/ Latino | | Asian | | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | | American Indian/ Alaska Native | | Other/ Mixed | | All Minorities | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | SB | CA | SB | CA | SB | CA | SB | CA | SB | CA | SB | CA | SB | CA |
| 1. Population at Risk (10-17) | 555 1.3% | 225K 5.5% | 26,585 62.4% | 2.1mil 51.2% | 1,276 3.0% | 439K 10.8% | 52 0.1% | 14.8K 0.4% | 163 0.4% | 16.6K 0.4% | 1,276 3.0% | 171K 4.2% | 29,907 70.3% | 2.9mil 72.6% |
| 2. Juvenile Arrests | 4.22 S=Yes M=4.5% V=69 | 4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K | 1.35 S=Yes M=69% V=1,058 | 1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K | 0.27 S=Yes M=0.6% V=10 | 0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K | * | * | * | * | 0.82 S=Yes M=2% V=31 | 0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K | 1.33 S=Yes M=76% V=1,168 | 1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K |
| 3. Referrals to Juvenile Court | 0.91 S=Yes M=4% V=126 | 1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K | 1.05 S=Yes M=71% V=2,239 | 1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K | ** | 0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K | * | * | * | * | 0.53 S=Yes M=1% V=33 | 0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K | 1.03 S=Yes M=76% V=2,420 | 1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K |
| 4. Cases Diverted | ** | 0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K | 1.22 S=No M=77% V=116 | 0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K | ** | 0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141 | 1.16 S=No M=79% V=119 | 0.65 S=No M=71% V=4.9K |
| 5. Cases Involving Secure Detention | 2.27 S=Yes M=5.3% V=40 | 1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K | 1.94 S=Yes M=80% V=608 | 1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K | ** | 0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237 | * | * | * | * | 1.3 S=No M=1% V=6 | 0.84 S=Yes M=9% V=176 | 1.94 S=Yes M=86% V=656 | 1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K |
| 6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed) | 1.61 S=Yes M=4.5% V=68 | 1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K | 1.56 S=Yes M=78% V=1,174 | 1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K | ** | 1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571 | * | * | * | * | 1.18 S=No M=1% V=13 | 1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442 | 1.56 S=Yes M=83% V=1,263 | 1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K |
| 7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings | 1.12 S=No M=4.5% V=45 | 1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K | 1.14 S=Yes M=79% V=794 | 1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K | ** | 0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317 | 1.15 S=No M=85% V=856 | 1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K |
| 8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.9 S=No M=5.1% V=24 | 1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K | 0.76 S=Yes M=75% V=356 | 1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K | ** | 0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201 | 0.76 S=Yes M=81% V=384 | 1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K |
| 9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities | 1.7 S=Yes M=4.5% V=19 | 1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K | 1.84 S=Yes M=86% V=362 | 1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K | ** | 1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105 | * | * | * | * | ** | 0.70 S=Yes M=6% V=44 | 1.82 S=Yes M=91% V=386 | 1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K |
| 10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court | ** | 1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124 | ** | 1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305 | ** | 1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | * | * | * | * | ** | 1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | ** | 1.85 S=No M=90% V=442 |

2015 Santa Barbara County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

| Area of Concern | Decision Stages or Contact Points | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|---|
| | African-American | Hispanic/Latino | Asian | Native HI/PI | Native American | All Minorities |
| More than 1.00 | 2. Juvenile Arrest 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 8. Find Delinquent | ** | * | * | 2. Juvenile Arrests 3. Court Referrals 4. Cases Diverted 5. Secure Detention 6. Cases Petitioned 7. Find Delinquent 9. Secure Confine |
| Less than 1.00 | 3. Court Referrals 8. Placement | 8. Placement | 2. Juvenile Arrests | * | * | 8. Placement |

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

California: Mono County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Comparison of County and Statewide Rates for 2015 Analysis and Tracking Sheet

Due to its small overall and at-risk youth population, Mono has race/ethnic groups that are either below the 1% threshold requiring separate analysis or that have an insufficient number of cases for analysis (very small number of occurrences at each decision point). It is significant to note that 'Hispanic/Latino' makes up 49% of the total at-risk youth population and 89% of 'All Minorities' at-risk youth in Mono County.

| Race/ Ethnicity | African-American | | Hispanic/ Latino | | Asian | | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | | American Indian/ Alaska Native | | Other/ Mixed | | All Minorities | |
|--|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| | Mono | CA | Mono | CA | Mono | CA | Mono | CA | Mono | CA | Mono | CA | Mono | CA |
| 1. Population at Risk (10-17) | 2 0.2% | 225K 5.5% | 615 49.2% | 2.1mil 51.2% | 12 1.0% | 439K 0.1% | 1 0.1% | 14.8K 0.4% | 28 2.2% | 16.6K 0.4% | 46 3.7% | 171K 4.2% | 704 56.3% | 2.9mil 72.6% |
| 2. Juvenile Arrests | * | 4.14 S=Yes M=18% V=14K | ** | 1.33 S=Yes M=54% V=41K | * | 0.25 S=Yes M=2.2% V=1.7K | * | * | ** | * | ** | 0.83 S=Yes M=2.8% V=2K | ** | 1.36 S=Yes M=78% V=60K |
| 3. Referrals to Juvenile Court | * | 1.10 S=Yes M=20% V=15K | ** | 1.05 S=Yes M=55% V=42K | * | 0.81 S=Yes M=1.7% V=1.3K | * | * | ** | * | ** | 0.53 S=Yes M=1.4% V=1K | ** | 1.04 S=Yes M=79% V=59K |
| 4. Cases Diverted | * | 0.53 S=Yes M=14% V=1.0K | ** | 0.69 S=Yes M=52% V=3.6K | * | 0.58 S=Yes M=1.4% V=94 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 1.03 S=No M=2.0% V=141 | ** | 0.65 S=No M=71% V=4.9K |
| 5. Cases Involving Secure Detention | * | 1.63 S=Yes M=25% V=4.6K | ** | 1.28 S=Yes M=55% V=10.2K | * | 0.95 S=No M=1.3% V=237 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 0.84 S=Yes M=9% V=176 | ** | 1.35 S=Yes M=84% V=16K |
| 6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed) | * | 1.37 S=Yes M=22% V=8.2K | ** | 1.23 S=Yes M=56% V=20.7K | * | 1.09 S=Yes M=1.6% V=571 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 1.00 S=No M=1.2% V=442 | ** | 1.26 S=Yes M=82% V=30K |
| 7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings | * | 1.06 S=Yes M=23% V=6.5K | ** | 1.07 S=Yes M=57% V=16.5K | * | 0.90 S=Yes M=1.3% V=382 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 0.96 S=No M=1.1% V=317 | ** | 1.06 S=Yes M=83% V=24K |
| 8. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | * | 1.16 S=Yes M=25% V=4.2K | ** | 1.01 S=No M=55% V=10K | * | 0.96 S=No M=1.2% V=205 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 1.13 S=No M=1.2% V=201 | ** | 1.05 S=Yes M=84% V=14K |
| 9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities | * | 1.16 S=Yes M=21% V=1.5K | ** | 1.40 S=Yes M=63% V=4.6K | * | 1.38 S=Yes M=1.4% V=105 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 0.70 S=Yes M=6% V=44 | ** | 1.32 S=Yes M=87% V=6K |
| 10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court | * | 1.91 S=Yes M=25% V=124 | ** | 1.87 S=Yes M=62% V=305 | * | 1.33 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | * | * | ** | * | ** | 1.72 S=No M=1.2% V=6 | ** | 1.85 S=No M=90% V=442 |

2015 Mono County Relative Rate Index (RRI) Areas of Concern

| Area of Concern | Decision Stages or Contact Points | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | African-American | Hispanic/Latino | Asian | Native HI/PI | Native American | All Minorities |
| More than 1.00 | * | ** | * | * | ** | ** |
| Less than 1.00 | * | ** | * | * | ** | ** |

*Group is less than 1% of the youth population

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

---Missing data for some element of calculation (includes data not provided by DOJ or OJJDP)

Phase II: Assessment

The OJJDP Title II FY 2018 solicitation requires a summary of the findings of the statewide DMC assessment study published from 2005-2014. The California DMC Assessment Report dated July 2013 provided a foundation to prioritize race/gender issues for state planning. It also provided an examination of the extent to which DMC/R.E.D. exists within local jurisdictions. Assessment findings illustrated that California's past DMC grant counties have been able to, at various points, reduce both the number of youth of color in contact with the justice system and, at various points, reduce the disproportionate rates at which specific racial and ethnic groups come in contact with the justice system. Data limitations challenge the development of overarching observations regarding progress and opportunity for improvement statewide; however, the findings of the Assessment show where specific jurisdictions have been able to make important and measurable strides toward reducing the representation of youth of color in contact with the justice system and reducing their contact rates relative to their White counterparts. The Assessment also provided recommendations including:

- "California must continue to work toward the implementation of the best practices with respect to uniform data collection and reporting such that the local jurisdictions produce information in a manner that can be reliably analyzed along with data from other jurisdictions."
- "...the conversation about race and ethnicity and the efforts to reduce racial disparity must include an intersectional lens where data collection and disparity reduction strategies apply a gender equity lens that accounts for males and females, their different pathways into and out of the justice system, and how efforts to address racial disparities might need to be tailored to address the specific needs of boys and girls who are uniquely positioned at and impacted by contact with various points along the justice continuum."

Phase III: Intervention

Progress Made in FY 2017

The BSCC implemented many planned activities in its FY 2017 R.E.D. Compliance Plan. This section addresses what activities have been implemented for each individual locality and demonstrates how the funded activities are directly related to the RRI Index values for four local targeted reduction sites, which are the current four R.E.D. grantees.

Activities Implemented

The FY 2017 R.E.D. activities consist of a three-track initiative: (1) direct service through grants aimed at reducing racial and ethnic disparity; (2) education/awareness through our implementation of education for subgrantees and stakeholders; and (3) advocacy and support.

Track 1. Direct Service:

The BSCC's R.E.D. Plan involves providing direct services. Beginning in FY 2005, the BSCC has awarded Title II funds to 18 county probation departments to reduce the identified disparities within their respective local juvenile justice systems. The following grant cycles and corresponding subgrantees are listed below:

| DMC/R.E.D. Grant | Grant Period | Subgrantees |
|--|---------------------|---|
| DMC Technical Assistance Program (TAP) | 2006 – 2009 | Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Cruz |
| DMC Support Grant | 2010 – 2012 | Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz |
| DMC Enhanced TAP II | 2010 – 2012 | Fresno, Humboldt, Marin, Orange, Sacramento, Ventura, and Yolo |
| R.E.D. Support Grant | 2014 | Humboldt, Marin, Orange, Sacramento, and Yolo |
| R.E.D. Enhanced Grant | 2014 – 2018 | Mono, San Joaquin, Santa Barbara, and Stanislaus |

The structure of the current R.E.D. grant program is similar to OJJDP's DMC structure. Specifically, each year of the grant program has a distinct phase of reducing R.E.D.: 1) Identification; 2) Assessment, Education, and Infrastructure; 3) Community Engagement; and 4) Implementation and Monitoring.

In the FFY 2015-2017 State Plan, SACJJDP budgeted \$1 million dollars annually for R.E.D. efforts to reduce youth of color's contact with the justice system. SACJJDP is awaiting the outcomes of the current grant cycle, which ends September 30, 2018, before making decisions about next steps rather than continuing to fund without certainty of this being the best option for California for the next three years. In the meantime, SACJJDP and its R.E.D. Standing Subcommittee are evaluating other options for how best to move forward in this effort in the FFY 2018-2021 State Plan. This information will be included in the Application that the BSCC submits in response to the FFY 2019 solicitation and, if needed, as a budget modification request to the FFY 2018 application.

Track 2: Education

Education is the second component of the BSCC's R.E.D. Plan as youth education and training shared across all systems is necessary in reducing disparities in the justice system. Toward this end, the BSCC:

- Allowed R.E.D. subgrantees to use Title II funds for hiring R.E.D. experts and sponsoring R.E.D. trainings for their staff and local stakeholders.
- Attended R.E.D. training offered by Georgetown.

Track 3: Advocacy and Support

Finally, the BSCC's R.E.D. Coordinator and other relevant staff attend and participate in educational opportunities to ensure that BSCC remains current on the developments of DMC/R.E.D. at a national, state, and local level. This allows the BSCC to be a source of support, advocacy, and technical assistance to the R.E.D. subgrantees.

In 2016, the DMC/R.E.D. coordinator attended relevant training including a Muslim American Cultural Responsiveness Training sponsored by the California Department of Social Services. The DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator and BSCC staff also attended the 2016 and 2017 National DMC Conference and participated in the CJJ Western Region Meeting.

Activities Achieved in 2017

As proposed in the previous DMC/R.E.D. Plan, the BSCC implemented the following activities:

- Local Initiative - R.E.D. Probation Grants: 4 County Probation Departments (Mono, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Santa Barbara) are completing the final year of a four-year grant program focused on reducing racial and ethnic disparity through data driven decision making and implicit bias trainings.
- Data: Developed recommendations and best practices for counties regarding standardization of juvenile justice race and ethnicity data that they collect and reported².
- BSCC staff conducted comprehensive site visits for all four subgrantees and provided on-site and on-going technical assistance. Moreover, the four subgrantees continued to hold their own trainings for their staff and their partners and community members.

Phase IV: Evaluation

The BSCC used a phased approach, focusing on enhancing local leadership and technical assistance to reduce disparity and disproportionality. The BSCC continues to collect and review the following performance measures from its four current grantees:

² These recommendations are expected to be adopted by the BSCC at its February 8, 2018 board meeting.

Performance Measures: Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities (R.E.D.)

California's minority youth are disproportionately represented as they progress through the juvenile justice system. The differences between minority and non-minority juveniles' representation become amplified at each successive decision point from contact through commitment.

Goal: Reduce the number of youth of color coming into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

1. Continue to provide technical assistance as needed for County Probation Departments that have implemented a data driven R.E.D. initiative;
2. Continue to monitor the four funded R.E.D. subgrants to county probation departments, originally based on a competitive process RFP process and now in year four of a four-year project cycle; and
3. Provide R.E.D. information

Activities:

- The R.E.D. grants include three incremental phases (resulting in a four-year grant cycle). Grants are entering their 4th and final year in the period of FFY 2017.
- Site visits to R.E.D. grantees by BSCC field representative
- Include reference to R.E.D. in other BSCC work, including other grant program Requests for Proposals.

Performance Measures (Optional Outputs and Outcomes to be determined):

- The amount of federal funds in whole dollars that are allocated specifically to address R.E.D. during the reporting period; and
- The number of staff trained on R.E.D. within each R.E.D. grant initiative

Number of Subgrants: 4

Budget: Title II Grant Fund allocation

State Plan FFY 2015-2017 set at \$1,000,000 annually

SMART: Not Applicable

Attached to this plan are copies of the Progress Report templates used to measure the progress of the four R.E.D. grantees on a quarterly basis.

Phase V: Monitoring

(1) The BSCC works closely with probation departments, project managers and grantees' evaluators to help projects achieve programmatic objectives. The BSCC will

continue monitoring R.E.D. grantees and collecting quarterly progress reports to track changes over time. The BSCC will continue regular communication with the R.E.D. grantees to collect information about their system improvements, activity implementation, milestones, and successes.

(2) Our full-time DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator will continue monitoring and tracking all the activities and changes pertaining to R.E.D. The DMC/R.E.D. Coordinator will review the RRIs along with the data R.E.D. grantees submit in their quarterly progress reports, which provide specific updates on administrative and operational issues as well as data collection and analysis efforts. The R.E.D. Coordinator/BSCC Staff will also monitor grantee effectiveness and changes in R.E.D. trends by conducting comprehensive monitoring visits onsite to observe program operations, review financial records, and provide oversight of data collection efforts. BSCC staff will provide technical assistance on program implementation, operation, and evaluation issues. These efforts will help to identify issues that may warrant technical assistance, which staff provides on an ongoing basis, in carrying out their project monitoring and support responsibilities. Moreover, the four subgrantees will continue to hold trainings for their staff, partners, and community members.

(3) Quarterly progress reports cover four annual time frames (October-December, January-March, April-June, and July-September) and are submitted on February 15, May 15, August 15, and November 15 of each year.

DMC reduction plan

BSCC requires R.E.D. grantees to collect quantitative data. The BSCC funds four counties with disparities that are either statistically significant and/or have an insufficient number of cases for analysis. The RRI data from the funded counties is measured and compared against statewide initiatives.

The current grants end in September 2018. At the end of that grant cycle, SACJJDP will review current data, review the outcomes and initiatives of the grant cycle, and assess the nationwide practices. This information will inform the future actions of SACJJDP and determine its strategy for next three years. The BSCC will provide a plan and anticipates this plan will be developed by the end of 2018.

The table below indicates the status of the timeline and funding amount (where applicable) for the proposed activities that continue to ensure R.E.D. is a priority within California. The BSCC anticipates taking SACJJDP's preliminary recommendations to its Board for approval in April 2018.

| Activity | Time Frame | Funding |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Other R.E.D. efforts | Not yet determined | Not yet determined |
| R.E.D. Grants | Not yet determined | Not yet determined |